Attachment C

Submissions and Consultation Register 2020
QLDC LD Code of Practice 2020

Submission ID	Section Reference	Submitter Commenting On	Submitter's Proposed Amendment	Submitter Reasoning	Change Y/N	QLDC Reasoning	QLDC Amendment
3	SW (4.3.9.4), WW (5.3.7.5), W (6.3.12.10.1)	Vehicle crossings over existing pipes and how to deal with less than 1m cover (capping, etc).	Add additional comment "unless structural calculations to the appropriate standards have been provided."	Pipes can have less cover than this if designed structurally correctly to the appropriate AS/NZ standards. See worked examples forwarded to council staff previously.	Y	Agree with suggestion	add "unless structural calculations to the appropriate standards have been provided and approved by Council."
3	SW (4.3.9.4), WW (5.3.7.5), W (6.3.12.10.1)	Vehicle crossings over existing pipes and how to deal with less than 1m cover (capping, etc).	There are instances where cover of less than 600mm is required. Suggest a number of standard concrete capping/encasement details are added to the standard drawings based on various cover levels - see Christchurch City Council drawings as an example.	We agree with this amendment noting that it is critical from a constructability point of view that sump leads are able to have a cover of less than 1.0m.	Y	Agree with suggestion	Add "Stormwater pipes in trafficable areas with less than 1.0 m cover shall be concrete capped as per Appendix B Drawing B4-2. Stormwater pipes with less 0.6 m cover shall be concrete encased. The concrete encasement shall be reinforced concrete and structurally designed for required design load by a Structural Engineer."
3	SW (4.3.9.4), WW (5.3.7.5), W (6.3.12.10.1)	Water Main Depth	I've come across the attached water main being installed at a depth of 600min as per COP (drawing B1-4 Berm/non trafficable cross section) – My concern with minimal depth is when installing Fire Hydrants (drawing B2-1) or valves won't meet minimal clearance of 175mm. Generally most subdivisions are done at 1m depth. Also with the Rider-main going to a dead end would it be preferable to extend the 100mm main with a F/H on the end rather than a small section of 50mm rider main that dead ends with no flushing point?		Y	Agree with suggestions	Add note to Drawing B2-1: All Fire Hydrants shall be installed on supply pipes that have a minimum cover of 1000 mm to allow for suitable clearances, if required localised lowering of the supply pipes can be achieved by tapering down from 5 m either side of the Fire Hydrant.
3	SW (4.3.9.4), WW (5.3.7.5), W (6.3.12.10.1)	Vehicle crossings over existing pipes and how to deal with less than 1m cover (capping, etc).	There should be scope to provide analysis to confirm necessary depth to pipe from a loading perspective. Sometimes increasing pipe strength or using concrete capping is acceptable to resolve a cover issue. There should be an option to do this if 1m cover cannot be achieved.	This is overly restrictive.	Y	Agree with suggestion	add "unless structural calculations to the appropriate standards have been provided and approved by Council."
3	SW (4.3.9.4), WW (5.3.7.5), W (6.3.12.10.1)	Vehicle crossings over existing pipes and how to deal with less than 1m cover (capping, etc).	Stormwater pipes in trafficable areas with less than 1000mm cover shall be concrete capped as per QLDC LDSCoP Drawing B4-2: 'Concrete Capping Detail'. Stormwater pipes with less 550mm cover shall be concrete encased. The concrete encasement shall be reinforced concrete and structurally designed for required design load by a Structural Engineer.	Does this meet all QLDC approved materials manufacturers loading specifications?	Y	Agree with suggestion, but have changed 0.55 to 0.6 m	Add "Stormwater pipes in trafficable areas with less than 1.0 m cover shall be concrete capped as per Appendix B Drawing B4-2. Stormwater pipes with less 0.6 m cover shall be concrete encased. The concrete encasement shall be reinforced concrete and structurally designed for required design load by a Structural Engineer." similarly, add to wastewater and water sections
4	4.3.10.6 and 5.3.8.4.1	The Code should specify that all stormwater/wastewater Starters/Finishers should be gritted. This is standard practice, but is missing from the Code.	Add: The connection of PVC pipes to concrete structures, such as manholes will be with a purpose made PVC starter and finisher with a 'gritted' external surface.	Standard practice to have gritted starters with manholes not sumps. Shiphons into sumps do not come gritted will increase cost of sumps by $1000 if two gritted starters need to used. Some other more cost effective method needs to be proposed or sumps removed from wording	Y	Agree. Remove Sumps from sentence	Replace sentence with: "The connection of PVC pipes to concrete structures, such as manholes will be with a purpose made PVC starter and finisher with a 'gritted' external surface."
6	Drawing B1-5	The drawing shows a 900 diameter pipe can have a 90 degree bend with an 1800 manhole. This alone could cause movement issues and strength issues in a manhole and doesn't align with the guidance note for load on circular precast manholes. The result of this will likely be cracking in the road surface resulting in more maintenance repairs.	The Auckland Council table is overly consenvrative and does not address the concern raised if thurst on the wall of the manhole and movement is a concern then engineering calculations can easily be undertaken to prove if this is the case or not. With regards to the size of the manhole this should be governed by the hydraulic effeiecnet required for flow thru the manhole that can differ on a case by case basis and the manhole benching should have radius of 6xD provided with the appropriate drops thru the manholes		Y	Agree. Will add note to allow for deviation from the specified detail. Note that we have substituted this table with the detail from Christchurch's Infrastructure Code.	add note "If a deviation is sought from the requirements in the detail above, justifiable calculations must be given and be to Council's satisfaction."
13	Drawing B2-4	Depiction of the lateral pipe tail	Please show/clarify requirements for the lateral tail (whether the tail end is be exposed above ground or a marker post is required, and what the sealing requirements are for the tail end)	The drawing simply shows a buried lateral tail with no marker post etc, but there is generally a requirement for the tail to be brought up, sealed and be clearly visible above the ground surface (or for a marker post to be installed)	Y	The lateral tail is required to extend 1m above ground and is required to capped at the end. No marker post required.	Add laterail tail and extend 1 m above ground
14	Drawing B2-4	EF elbows	The change to the drawing raises several concerns as there is an increase in failure points now with 4 EF welds, previously zero. It doesn't allow an option for pipes to be installed in accordance with manufacturers minimum bend radius (e.g. 20x OD). Suggest that the code allows for the option of a continuous pipe laid in accordance with manufacture minimum bend radius and if this cannot be achieved then elbows are to be used.		Y	Agree. EF elbows are generally not accepted as there are increased failure points. Rather the lateral should be curved in a radius of no less than 20D as per manufactures specifications. However in areas where the berm distance has been reduced, then EF elbows may be used.	2: Option of a continuous pipe laid in accordance with manufacture minimum bend radius, and if this cannot be achieved then Electro Fusion (EF) elbows are to be used.
14	Drawing B2-4	Electro Fusion (EF) elbows only to be used	If elbows are necessary, Electro Fusion (EF) elbows only to be used	Added clarity	Y	Agree. EF elbows are generally not accepted as there are increased failure points. Rather the lateral should be curved in a radius of no less than 20D as per manufactures specifications. However in areas where the berm distance has been reduced, then EF elbows may be used.	2: Option of a continuous pipe laid in accordance with manufacture minimum bend radius, and if this cannot be achieved then Electro Fusion (EF) elbows are to be used.
15	Drawing B2-4	When there is no option but to install toby box in trafficable driveway / riderway then a 150mm x 150mm (WxD) concrete nib is required	When there is no option but to install a toby box in a trafficable area then a cast box with cast iron lid, surrounded by a 150mm x 150mm (WxD) concrete nib is required.	Added clarity	Y	Agree to clarify - have amended slightly	3: When there is no option but to install a toby box in a trafficable area then a trafficable cast box with cast iron lid is required
17	Drawing B2-8 and B2-9	Commercial Fire System Connection with Potable Supply	The drawing shows an unmetered supply option that requires a meter box for only a valve, should be changed to be a normal valve box to save complications during installation and increase the ease for locating the valve. It is unclear what the minimum offset of the valve and BFP should be from a boundary. Could likely cause significant issues at 224c if located incorrectly and could require rework (highly likely with tight road reserves). Therefore this clarification is required. No indication why the valve needs to be installed on the road, yes it says on (presumably should be road reserve not road). Safer option would be in the berm or footpath for access without the need to impede traffic. There is no Y strainer shown on the side elevation drawing and this makes it unclear if one is required. This will change the box dimension and size. There is no specification or standard for the insulated box to be built to. Guidance is required else could be rejected by QLDC after it is built.		Y	Agree that the meter box should be a valve box. Reluctant to specify a minimum offset for the valve and BFP to the boundary because of the variability between each site. The expectation is that they are as close to the boundary, which Council will be reasonable in assessing. Agree with other comments and have changed accordingly.	changed meter box to valve box. Corrected "road" to "road reserve" Added strainer to elevation

Submission ID	Section Reference	Submitter Commenting On	Submitter's Proposed Amendment	Submitter Reasoning	Change Y/N	QLDC Reasoning	QLDC Amendment
17	Drawing B2-8 and B2-9	Water Supply with Bulk Flow Meter	For the metered option, Drawing 2-9, it is unclear why the meter is optional on a metered supply. QLDC should amend the drawing to avoid mis interpretation. The words state the y strainer should be with the meter in the box but the drawing shows differently. This could change the inground and above ground box sizes. Needs to be corrected.		Y	The new drawings do not show an optional meter on this drawing, and the Y strainer should not be in the meter box and has been removed from the notes	Removed strainer requirement in meter box.
19	Drawing B4-3	Rip Rap Lined Swale	TBC - A comprehensive amendment is beyond the scope of this submission format.	Drawing is terrible and should be replaced.	Y	To be assessed in Stage 3 (next stage) of the code of practice review.	Removed drawing and collated to single drawing in B5-5.
19	Drawing B4-3	Change Drawing B4-3 to state "minimum 200mm below subgrade"	Does the drawing also include side slope angles 1:5 or 1:6?		Y	Cannot add slope at this stage, since we have passed consultation. Added as new item for Stage 3 (next stage) of the code of practice review.	Removed drawing and collated to single drawing in B5-5.
19	Drawing B4-3	Change Drawing B4-3 to state "minimum 200mm below subgrade"	Remove 'minimum 200mm below subgrade' from concrete lined swale detail	Unnecessary - if its concrete lined its not permeable.	Y	Removed drawing from Code of Practice, as a rip rap lined swale is not recommended by QLDC.	Removed drawing and collated to single drawing in B5-5.
19	Drawing B4-3	Change Drawing B4-3 to state "minimum 200mm below subgrade"	Update dimensions	Grade of swale is not correct, max swale grade is 1:3 if not needed to be mown. With the 600mm width to swale invert that would only give you a depth of 200mm, so not able to achieve 200mm below subbase	Y	Removed drawing from Code of Practice, as a rip rap lined swale is not recommended by QLDC.	Removed drawing and collated to single drawing in B5-5.
19	Drawing B4-3	Change Drawing B4-3 to state "minimum 200mm below subgrade"	Could be addressed by changing the type of geotextile used. Maybe unpractical to achieve in a number of situations.		Y	Removed drawing from Code of Practice, as a rip rap lined swale is not recommended by QLDC.	Removed drawing and collated to single drawing in B5-5.
19	Drawing B4-3	Standard swale profiles	Review for consistency. Collate to single section in either roading or stormwater, but not in both	B4-3 requires 200mm below subgrade to the top of the subsoil drain. Consider consistency with B5-5, noting B5-5 is in the roading section but shows no carriageway layers etc.	Y	Removed drawing from Code of Practice, as a rip rap lined swale is not recommended by QLDC.	Removed drawing and collated to single drawing in B5-5.
20	Drawing B5-10: Flat channel or Yard Sump – Private Only & Drawing B5-11 & B5-20 Road Sump Detail	Concrete corbals need to be included in all drawings with manholes.	Note has been added to B5-10, B5-11, and B5-20 which are all sump details - remove note.	Corbals not required inside sumps or manholes	Y	Agree, only required on manhole drawings	Removed corbal notes from B5-10,11,and 20. Add corbal note to B1-5 and B1-6.
21	Drawing B5-10, B5-11, and B5-20	changes to sump depth, sediment storage depth, reduced cover to onl 600mm, and length of pipe with reduced cover to be minimised	Cover likely to be only 450mm as shiphon 1m deep - update the 1.2 m to 1.8 m sump depth		Y	Agree. We have updated all sump depth to 1.8 m	Updated all sumps to 1800 mm depth, and back entry block detail added to show cut out on B5-11 and 13
22	Drawing B5-26		Not sure why the drawing shows two layers of AP40 it should just be 150mm of M/4 AP40 and the note was correct as it was, subgrade should have a CBR of >7 not the basecourse. Note for QLDC to consider, 50 by 50 by 400 pegs aren't usually available. 45 by 45 by 450 are.		Y	Agree with suggestions	Update to 45x45x450 timber pegs, remove 1 layer of AP40, and change back to subgrade CBR>7
22	Drawing B5-26	How deep do they want the footpath construction to be? Do not change wording adjust depth if this is the issue. Min compaction layer for AP40 is 100mm	Suggest make it one 150mm layer of AP40		Y	Agree, doesn't need to be 2 layers - subgrade needs to be CBR>7 and if so, then overlaid with 100 mm M4 AP40	remove 1 layer of 100 mm AP40, and change back to subgrade CBR>7
22	Drawing B5-26	change subgrade to basecourse	"subgrade" is correct, AP40 is basecourse. Subgrade can be rolled, but generally not compacted		Y	Agree, changed basecourse to subgrade	change basecourse to subgrade and specify CBR > 7
22	Drawing B5-26		Drawing B5-26 contains multiple issues: 1. 75mm 'compacted depth of M/4 AP40' should read '100mm compacted depth of AP40' 2. No granulated backfill necessary 3. 'Compacted Basecourse with CBR >7' should read 'Compacted Subgrade with CBR >7'	Incorrect wording	Y	Agree, doesn't need to be 2 layers - subgrade needs to be CBR>7 and if so, then overlaid with 100 mm M4 AP40	change basecourse to subgrade and specify CBR > 8
22	Drawing B5-26	Asphalt footpath basecourse depth. Conflicts with Drawing B5-26. This sections asks for min 100mm depth and the drawing shows 150mm depth	Suggest updating so measurements align		Y	Agree - changed Drawing B5-26 to align with Section 3.4.14.2	Updated thickness of compacted basecourse to 100 mm in Drawing
26	1	This Code of Practice represents a set of minimum standards for developers, ensuring high quality and consistency of infrastructure provision across all of QLDC's various communities. These standards may be exceeded but not compromised.	RPL is opposed to the addition of the paragraph proposed to be inserted at Section 1 of the Code of Practice. We are particularly concerned at the use of the language "may not be compromised". This appears to be totally at odds with the philosophy of the Code of Practice which specifically provides for flexibility.Also, the "min standards" conflicts with an earlier statement that "this Standard provide(s) good practice guidelines..."	"NZS 4404:2010 provides local authorities, developers, and their professional advisors with standards for design and construction of land development and subdivision infrastructure. NZS 4404:2010 encourages sustainable development and modern design that emphasises liveability and environmental quality. It will also provide as much consistency as possible on land development and subdivision infrastructure while still allowing flexibility for local variations to suit local circumstances."	Y	Agree with suggested change	change to "may be exceeded but not compromised, unless specifically agreed to by Council for a deviation"
27	Schedule 1D	Amendment (b)	not to limit roading assets to RAMM database Reece's elaboration: I was asking whether the data specification and list of details of above ground as-builts was supposed to be linked to the RAMM database? If so should reference RAMM, or was there another database, or GIS???		Y	QLDC discussed with WSP via phone to understand that their concern was that we weren't getting the expected quality with our data submissions. QLDC have improved clarity to Schedule 1D and are happy that no change needs to be made at this time.	change schedule 1D to suggested format
27	Schedule 1D	mainly a consistency and format change to make it easier to read.	Replace Schedule 1D with table format for clarity	provides clarity	Y	QLDC are satisfied that Schedule 1D has no material changes and is an improvement on the clarity	change schedule 1D to suggested format
29	1.2.1.4	Normative and Informative Appendices	RPL opposes the proposal to delete interpretation item 1.2.1.4. This may appear to be a minor change but it has a potentially significant effect. There are five Appendices to the Code of Practice. Three of them are informative and two of them are normative.	Removing the above explanation would have the effect of changing the status of all of the Appendices to normative. . Their purpose is to help professionals choose the most appropriate option and then confirm its suitability with Council through the Engineering Acceptance process. It is simple logic that the options cannot all be mandatory. RPL submits that it is imperative that the interpretation provision 1.2.1.4 be retained.	Y	Accepted to leave the clause in the Code, and updated appendices that were missing normative/informative labels under the heading	re-inserted caluse 1.2.1.4, and updated the following appendices: Appendix B - Normative Appendix F - Informative Appendix G - Normative Appendix H - Informative Appendix I - Informative Appendix J - Normative Appendix K - Normative

Submission ID	Section Reference	Submitter Commenting On	Submitter's Proposed Amendment	Submitter Reasoning	Change Y/N	QLDC Reasoning	QLDC Amendment
30	1.2.2 Definitions		Freeboard now includes overland flows. No definition of overland flow. If QLDC include sheet flow, then all houses now need to be built 500mm above the ground as in a 100 year event overland flows is usually sheet flow across lots. This doesn't align with the building code. Suggest QLDC clarify overland flow, seek advice and review the Auckland COP for freeboard requirements.		Y	Remove ammendments and review at stage 3 (next stage) of the code of practice review - See Auckland Definitions	Removed ammendments regarding overland flow
30	1.2.2 Definitions	Definition of 'freeboard' is ambiguous whether it's ponding water only or if it includes overland flow path as well.	Also, how will the freeboard requirement be enforced when homeowner change the lay of the land and build their house. It implies a whole lot more work around registering notices on titles about freeboard requirements.		Y	Remove ammendments and review at stage 3 (next stage) of the code of practice review - See Auckland Definitions	Removed ammendments regarding overland flow
31	C1.8.6	Name Change	ACENZ have changed their name to ACE		Y	Agree with updates	An appropriate level of supervision can be selected by reference to the Construction Monitoring Services information published by the Engineering New Zealand (**EngNZ**) and the Association of Consulting Engineers New Zealand (**ACE New Zealand**).
31	C1.8.6	Name Change	Should be: EngNZ, ACE New Zealand		Y	Agree with updates	An appropriate level of supervision can be selected by reference to the Construction Monitoring Services information published by the Engineering New Zealand (**EngNZ**) and the Association of Consulting Engineers New Zealand (**ACE New Zealand**).
31	C1.8.6	Name Change	Note (INZ) should be (ENZ)		Y	Agree with updates	An appropriate level of supervision can be selected by reference to the Construction Monitoring Services information published by the Engineering New Zealand (**EngNZ**) and the Association of Consulting Engineers New Zealand (**ACE New Zealand**).
31	C1.8.6	Name Change	Abbreviation for Engineering NZ is incorrect it should be EngNZ		Y	Agree with updates	An appropriate level of supervision can be selected by reference to the Construction Monitoring Services information published by the Engineering New Zealand (**EngNZ**) and the Association of Consulting Engineers New Zealand (**ACE New Zealand**).
31	C1.8.6	Name Change	TBC - A comprehensive amendment is beyond the scope of this submission format.	INZ = Immigration NZ	Y	Agree with updates	An appropriate level of supervision can be selected by reference to the Construction Monitoring Services information published by the Engineering New Zealand (**EngNZ**) and the Association of Consulting Engineers New Zealand (**ACE New Zealand**).
35	1.8.7.1	This easement shall make mention that Council reinstatements will be asphalt or brushed concrete in roadways, or as agreed by Council, and no special reinstatements will be undertaken	Should read: This easement shall make mention that Council reinstatements will be asphalt or brushed concrete in roadways and no special reinstatements will be undertaken unless agreed by Council.	Reworded for clarity	Y	Agree to clarify sentence	Amend to "This easement shall make mention that Council reinstatements will be asphalt or brushed concrete in roadways and no special reinstatements will be undertaken unless agreed by Council."
40	7.4.6.3	Min width of new verges	New verges that incorporate street tree planting shall generally be no less than 1.8m in width in order to provide the new trees with a suitable rooting environment and increase their likelihood of becoming successfully established without disrupting the surrounding infrastructure. Appropriate alternative methods should be used in cases where less room is available and street trees would provide amenity.	The rest of this section provides a good understanding of the issues and the techniques available for creating a suitable rooting environment. Section 7.4.6.3 itself is prefaced by the words "Given the generally modified nature of soil in subdivisions it is essential that a suitable tree planting pit be prepared. The approach shall be to have:" and this is then followed by 12 criteria. Later in the section there is a discussion on achieving sufficient soil volume on sites where the planting area is subjected to loading such as car parking, footpaths and roads. Taken together these provisions give a designer techniques for dealing with situations where the available berm may be less than 1.8 metres in width (which can occur in a multitude of situations; eg where there is indented parking and separate locations are provided for trees or the grassed area is narrowed to provide for a wider footpath, a trail, a shared path, a bus stop, a transformer or other in-road infrastructure or where the topography requires that retaining structures will occupy part of the verge).	Y	QLDC support the proposed amendment to allow for cases where 1.8 m in the verge is not possible.	Amend "Unless specifically agreed otherwise by Council, new verges that incorporate street tree planting shall be no less than 1.8m in width in order to provide the new trees with a suitable rooting environment and increase their likelihood of becoming successfully established without disrupting the surrounding infrastructure. **Appropriate alternative methods should be used in cases where less room is available and street trees would provide amenity."**
40	7.4.6.3	The maximum verge width possible is Council's preference when establishing new street trees and ensuring that they are sustainable and will not damage kerbing or pathways. In addition, a reasonable verge width is crucial to the establishment and success of grass within these spaces. Code currently requires 0.9 m. Add clause for minimum width of verge for planting street trees	Add: The minimum width of new verges that incorporate street tree planting shall be no less than 1.8m in width in order to provide the new trees with a suitable rooting environment and increases the their likelihood of becoming successfully established without disrupting the surrounding infrastructure.	There are other ways to ensure tree growth i.e tree cells as mentions above wording to limited.	Y	QLDC support the proposed amendment to allow for cases where 1.8 m in the verge is not possible.	Amend "Unless specifically agreed otherwise by Council, new verges that incorporate street tree planting shall be no less than 1.8m in width in order to provide the new trees with a suitable rooting environment and increase their likelihood of becoming successfully established without disrupting the surrounding infrastructure. **Appropriate alternative methods should be used in cases where less room is available and street trees would provide amenity."**
42	7.3.13 (new section)		Approving designs before consent is very backwards. As per the general comment the code of practice cannot take precendence over the consent process		Y	Revised wording to allow flexibility	add after Manager. "It is strongly advised this is done..."
44	7.3.1	Additional criteria	add to the final sentence "This will be assessed based on appropriate levels of service and traffic management requirements in addition to the above criteria."	Section 7 of The Code of practice deals with landscape and the two pages that precede the proposed addition provide a detailed discussion and a range of criteria for selecting suitable trees. This narrative also incorporates reference to the "QLDC Street Tree Planting Guidelines Appendix I". Perhaps unintentionally, the proposed addition, as worded, would limit the consideration of street trees in roads (of 50km/hr and above) to two matters: appropriate levels of service and traffic management requirements. It would prevent Council from taking into account the other matters that are discussed in Section 7 of the Code of Practice. RPL submits that the other criteria for tree selection (including the QLDC Street Tree Planting Guidelines) should also be taken into account when approving the proposals for street planting in such roads	Y	Agree with suggestion	add to the final sentence "This will be assessed based on appropriate levels of service and traffic management requirements **in addition to the above criter**ia."

Submission ID	Section Reference	Submitter Commenting On	Submitter's Proposed Amendment	Submitter Reasoning	Change Y/N	QLDC Reasoning	QLDC Amendment
45	3.3.4	Safety barrier	Clarify grade of 1m drop, or horizontal extent.	It is not clear what horizontal extent the 1.0m height drop is over. Traditionally 1:1 has been used. The 1:3 reference is only "may be necessary". This needs clarified.	Y	clarified clause to avoid confusion	Where roads, private ways or other vehicular or pedestrian access, whether public or private, run parallel with land which drops away to a height of greater than 1.0m within 3.0 meters of the carriageway, the side shall be provided with safety barriers to protect pedestrian and vehicular traffic. The safety barrier shall be placed within 2.0m of the edge of the road or footpath. If the land drops away at an angle greater than 1V : 3H within the clear zone as defined in Austroads Guide to Road Design - Part 06 then a barrier may be necessary and the final decision is at the discretion of Council.
45	3.3.4	Safety barrier	Remove reference to pedestrians - covered by 3.3.4.1 below in CoP. Consider re-wording so that previous wording (3.3.4) is retained and only the reference to '45 degrees' is changed to a 'slope of 1 in 3.'	Currently inconsistent and poorly worded.	Y	clarified clause to avoid confusion	Where roads, private ways or other vehicular or pedestrian access, whether public or private, run parallel with land which drops away to a height of greater than 1.0m within 3.0 meters of the carriageway, the side shall be provided with safety barriers to protect pedestrian and vehicular traffic. The safety barrier shall be placed within 2.0m of the edge of the road or footpath. If the land drops away at an angle greater than 1V : 3H within the clear zone as defined in Austroads Guide to Road Design - Part 06 then a barrier may be necessary and the final decision is at the discretion of Council.
45	3.3.4	Safety barrier	This clause needs re-worded. The first sentence currently reads that if the land drops away by more than 1m at any angle then a rail is to be provided and that rail shall be within 2m of the edge of road or footpath. It also needs to clearly distinguish between road safety barriers required as per Austroads Guide to Road design part 6 and pedestrain safety railing assessed against the building code.		Y	clarified clause to avoid confusion	Where roads, private ways or other vehicular or pedestrian access, whether public or private, run parallel with land which drops away to a height of greater than 1.0m within 3.0 meters of the carriageway, the side shall be provided with safety barriers to protect pedestrian and vehicular traffic. The safety barrier shall be placed within 2.0m of the edge of the road or footpath. If the land drops away at an angle greater than 1V : 3H within the clear zone as defined in Austroads Guide to Road Design - Part 06 then a barrier may be necessary and the final decision is at the discretion of Council.
46	3.3.11.1 and 3.4.14.1	Tactile pavers	The change is supported by RPL. There is, however, another reference to tactile pavers at Section 3.3.11.1 and RPL submits that this provision should also be amended to include the same new wording: "or tactile tiles as specified in Council's Approved Materials List. Where tactile tiles are used, an appropriate adhesive shall be used and agreed to by Council."	to ensure consistency	Y	Agree, should be consistent.	add to end of clause: "...or tactile tiles as specified in Council's Approved Materials List. Where tactile tiles are used, an appropriate adhesive shall be used and agreed to by Council."
47	3.3.20	TTOC documents	Create QLDC specific guidance document	TTOC document is not fit-for-purpose and only creates complexity and confusion. QLDC does not have TOC capabilities as mentioned throughout the documents and uses WTOC not TTOC for operation of signals. Cold weather climates such as QL have some different material and equipment needs than a warm weather climate like Tauranga. For example southern regions install heater bars within the controller cabinet to combat freezing and moisture. Where are the QLDC regional specific guidelines for street lighting power and electricity revenue meters within a cabinet as mentioned in P43? Is QLDC going to "assign an experienced signals practitioner to the Road Safety Audit team" as specified in TTOC-01 Part 3? Should the applicant be referring to TCC Infrastructure Development Code for street lighting as specified in TTOC-01 Part 5.2? TTOC-04 is redundant Is TTOC-08 consistent with QLDC RAMM data format? TTOC-13C QLDC does not have SCATS operators	Y	Agree - will need to change document for Stage 3 (next stage) of the code of practice review, and not include in this version of the Code	Removed Appendix until it's updated for QLDC in Stage 3.
49	3.4.10	minimum stand-down of 3 months	6 months preferred		Y	Agree with 6 months stand down period	Update stand down period to 6 months
50	3.2.4.2	Link context needs a speed environment context for each subsection.	Remove references to typical operating speeds.	Inconsistencies created if left in because different typical operating speeds are included in table 3.3 for the various area types.	Y	Being considered in Stage 3 (next stage) of the code of practice review. Review for typical operating speeds so have removed this from 3.2.4.2 for now.	removed operating speeds from section 3.2.4.2
51	3.3.1.3, Table 3.2, & 3.3.6	change 3.3.1.3 to align with 3.3.16 (Replace last sentence in 3.3.1.3)"To allow vehicles to pass, accesses shall have widening to not less than 5.5 m over a 15 m lengthadd in E1 and E4 in table 3.3: Passing up to 100 m distance where visibilty is available from bay to bay at not more than 50 m spacing.total shoulder 0.5 m (on each side), sealed	Additions to table 3.3 for figures E1 to E4 do not make sense. QLDC need to review the wording to clearly state what they mean. Also, QLDC need to review how a 5.5m road where passing is to occur will fit in a road reserve of 6m with a 0.5m sealed shoulder on each side. The math doesn't work.		Y	Carriageway in E1 and E4 is less than 3m, considering this, passing areas can be provided. Have reworded amendment in Table 3.3 to clarify intention.	Amend in Table 3.3 "Passing bay required every 100 m if visibilty is available from bay to bay. If visibility is not available, passing bays required every 50 m."

Submission ID	Section Reference	Submitter Commenting On	Submitter's Proposed Amendment	Submitter Reasoning	Change Y/N	QLDC Reasoning	QLDC Amendment
51	3.3.1.3, Table 3.2, & 3.3.6	change 3.3.1.3 to align with 3.3.16 (Replace last sentence in 3.3.1.3)"To allow vehicles to pass, accesses shall have widening to not less than 5.5 m over a 15 m lengthadd in E1 and E4 in table 3.3: Passing up to 100 m distance where visibilty is available from bay to bay at not more than 50 m spacing.total shoulder 0.5 m (on each side), sealed	Consider re-wording - we can't evaluate until the proposed amendment is correctly reworded to make sense		Y	Have reworded amendment in Table 3.3 to clarify intention.	Amend in Table 3.3 "Passing bay required every 100 m if visibilty is available from bay to bay. If visibility is not available, passing bays required every 50 m."
51	3.3.1.3, Table 3.2, & 3.3.6	Table 3.2 contains a provision to "allow for passing up to every 50 m, total shoulder 0.5 m, sealed bays."	RPL submits that the provision should be amended so that its intention and application is clear or the amendment should be removed and the existing standard should apply.	The intention is to provide for passing bays. The draft revision proposes to amend the wording to "Passing up to 100 m distance where visibility is available from bay to bay at not more than 50 m spacing." No explanation is provided for limiting roads with passing bays to 100 metres (if this is the intention). The visibility requirement is not unreasonable but not a limitation on distance – especially when the provision also applies to private ways and low trafficked links. What is the problem with multiple passing bays at 50 metre spacings where visibility is available?	Y	Have reworded amendment in Table 3.3 to clarify intention.	Amend in Table 3.3 "Passing bay required every 100 m if visibilty is available from bay to bay. If visibility is not available, passing bays required every 50 m."
51	3.3.1.3, Table 3.2, & 3.3.6	Road design standards	Clarify surface type for movement lane and for shoulders (including width) for all types. Total sealed width only need to be 3.0m for E1	Ammendment creates an inconsistent shoulder rerference. Why has only the most insignificant road (E1) been adjusted? Operating speed doesn't match changes to 3.2.4.2.	Y	Agree with clarification of Table 3.3. QLDC have amended so the heading defines each side in the column. Have clarified inconsistent operating speeds in the Code. Council are satisfied with keeping the minimum sealed width at 3.5 m for E1.	Add "(each side)" after "Passing, parking, loading and shoulder" column header of Table 3.3. Have removed operating speeds in section 3.2.4.2
52	3.3.11.2	Cycle paths	Suggest to include Austroads Guide to Road Design Part 6A Paths for walking and cycling and NZTA Cycling Network Guidance webpage. With more active travel projects developing this section should include more information on what is required		Y	agree - add references as guides only. Noting that we are doing a full review in Stage 3 (next stage) of the code of practice review.	Add "Useful guidance on cycleway design can be found in Auckland Transport publication: Urban Street and Road Design Guide, 2019, Austroads Gude to Road Design Part 6A: Paths for Walking and Cycling, 2017, and NZTA webpage: Cycling Network Guidance – planning and design."
54	3.4.4.1 and 1.10	Require a defects liability bond for 12 months for after the second coat seal is done.	Add after second paragraph: When there is a second coat required to be undertaken by the developer, the defects liability period will be extended to 12 months beyond the second coat seal date.	Defects period shall be amended to cover only the second coat.	Y	agree to clarification	Update to: When there is a second coat required to be undertaken by the developer, the defects liability period **for the second coat** will be extended to 12 months beyond the second coat seal date.
55	3.4.1	QLDC may allow extensions if conditions and treatments allow	QLDC may agree to extensions if conditions and treatments allow	RPL supports the proposed amendment to Section 3.4.1 which deals with climatic conditions that limit road construction. The proposed wording is, however, somewhat clumsy	Y	agree to clarification	QLDC may agree to extensions if conditions and treatments allow
56	3	Defect Liability Period	Inspection every 4 weeks for 12 months seems excessive. Clarity as to how this is reported otherwise it means nothing. Change to bi-monthly inspection. Include reporting requirement from sealing contractor.	Excessive requirement.	Y	Happy with bi monthly, design consultant should be supplying report, design consultant is responsible for the project not a subcontractor	Change inspections to bi-monthly
56	3	Tack Coat	in my opinion and we should have a membrane seal under every asphalt layer on a road with tack coats accepted for footpaths only. Has this been discussed in the past and / or risk accepted by QLDC.	I have just noticed that on page 7, we appear to allow tack coats (which have only about 0.2 litre/m2 of binder) under asphalt and do not require a membrane seal (which adds waterproofing and would typically be over 1 litre/m2 of binder). This is a risk	Y	updated in both Practice Note and Code of Practice	Add "Note, all carriageway areas that include asphalt must have a membrane seal. The only areas which do not require a membrane seal are footpaths."
56	3	Stand Down Period	(3.4.4) Stand down period should be a min of 24 hours only not 24-48 hrs, there is no need for a maximum timeframe as asphalting can occur anytime from 48hrs to weeks or months later depending on circumstances.		Y	The intention here was not to set a maximum time frame. We have taken out the 24hrs and just state that a minimum of 48hrs is required to inspect the surface.	change min 48 hours
56	3	Subgrade checking	Use CoP categories. Remove requirement for Benkleman Beam testing of SG unless particular circumstances	The amendment is overly complex.Why introduce another standard being ONRC Catagories? Amend to use catagories already included in CoP.Benkelman Beam is a measure of uniformity. Its can only be used on subgrade by back calculation from a pavement design. You refer to section 3.4.11 which only relates to deflections for completed pavement prior to sealing. Generally not an industry recognised method as subgrade checking, unless utilising raft design for subgrade improvement. There are no deflection standards for the beam test on subgrade as table 3.4 is for completed basecourse layer.	Y	BB and FWD is only if the designer requires it and on arterial routes. The Road Construction Practise note is designed to make the process easier and merely highlights requirements already required under the CoP. We have not introduced anything new. The Benkelman Beam actually measures the surface deflection. Most pavement designers use deflection as the main factor in the road design and TNZ/F1 actually states that Benkelman Beam testing is accepted means of testing this. The soaked CBR test measures bearing which is the other component to pavement design. Hence both tests are required at Subgrade, unless the road is being designed for a low volume of traffic.	Testing of the subgrade is required on all roads classified as a Primary Collector or above (ONRC Categories) or at the discretion of the designer for lower road classifications. The tests required below are mandatory on all roads: (a) Site specific scalas (see section 3.3.3.2) (b) Soaked CBR results (see section 3.3.3.2) (c) Proof Rolling (documented) The tests required below are optional on roads below Primary Collector classification or at the discretion of the designer (it is the designer responsibility to provide target deflections) as follows or mandatory for classifications above Primary Collector: (a) Benkelman Beam testing or Falling Weight Deflectometer
56	3	Testing	(3.4.5, 3.4.7 & 3.8.4.1) does it require all the tests to be done , only one of the test or some of the test. Clarification is needed.		Y	Agree, clarify wording on requirements	Have clarified which tests are required.
56	3	Sub-base testing	Make consistent	Inconsistent as to when to test. Test on subgrade 3.4.5 but not sub-base?	Y	Agree, updated to clarify testing requirements	updated testing requirements in 3.4.5, 3.4.7.1, 3.4.7.1
56	3	Spreader test/mat test or stockpile frequency	3.4.7.1 and 3.4.8.1 - what is the frequency requirement for the spreader test/mat test or stockpiles? And 3.4.8.1 states that acceptance of the basecourse is only by one of the methods, this is not correct it would normally be them all. This section highlights the risks of trying to use the COP as a specification as it is muddling information already in referenced NZTA specfications with additional wording in the COP		Y	Agreed. The Road Construction Practise Note was set out to clarify these inconsistencies and reflects what is required in the NZTA documentation and what is considered to be best practise in the industry.	updated testing requirements in 3.4.5, 3.4.7.1, 3.4.7.1
56	3	Basecourse testing	Make consistent	Says will be measured by one of the methods. Should be all these test for basecourse and final pavement where appropriate. No indication as when testing required.	Y	Agree - needs to be clarified. Tests are required at all stages of the pavement construction, subgrade, subbase and basecourse and preseal.	updated testing requirements in 3.4.5, 3.4.7.1, 3.4.7.1
56	3	Acceptance of the basecourse will be measured by one of the methods outlined below	Acceptance of the basecourse will be measured by any one or more of the methods outlined below, depending on the class/type of road/carriageway	The current wording could be interpreted to suggest that only one of the listed types of testing is required for a basecourse to be accepted; however, each test serves a different purpose and multiple types of testing will often be required. Which tests are required will depend on the type/class (and length?) of carriageway/road. It may be worth clarifying in this section what testing is standard on certain classes/types of road/carriageway?	Y	Agree, clarify wording on requirements	Have clarified which tests are required.

Submission ID	Section Reference	Submitter Commenting On	Submitter's Proposed Amendment	Submitter Reasoning	Change Y/N	QLDC Reasoning	QLDC Amendment
58	3.4.4 Road surfacing materials	A polymer modified seal should be designed to meet the district's challenging conditions (>2% shall be added where the site stress factor from table 6-2 of CSNZ is greater than 4 and/or where the site is in winter shade for greater than 4 hours.)	"site is in winter shade for greater than 4 hours DAILY". Chipsealing in New Zealand (CSNZ) (NZTA 2005)	CSNZ - Give full document reference.	Y	agreed to align with CSNZ	site is in winter shade for greater than 4 hours DAILY
60	3.4.11	deflection constraints	Depends on AC. Want to change max deflection from 1.2 to 1 mm Also, add that table 3.4 does not apply to AC Note: spelling error of asphaltic		Y	ok to change to NZ spelling	changed "asphaltic" to asphalt
60	3.4.11	deflection constraints	Please clarify which standard is required Table 3.4 or NZTA table 13?		Y	Table 3.4 is the maximum deflections for pavements surface with chipseal, designer are required to assess pavement for fatigue if AC is to be used, NZTA table 13e provides some guidance on the magnitude of deflection that AC can tolerate. It is the designer responsibility to ensure that the pavement deflection is suitable for the the surfacing chosen"	Updated section 3.4.11 to clarify
60	3.4.11	deflection constraints	3.4.11 introduces a separate guide for deflection requirements which has different requirements to the table in the COP, which is QLDC going to accept? Noting that the NZTA document referred to is a guide so not a stated requirement. If the intention is that the existing table is for chip seal surfaces and the NZTA guide is for asphalt and must be adhered to then this should be clearly stated.		Y	Table 3.4 is the maximum deflections for pavements surface with chipseal, designer are required to assess pavement for fatigue if AC is to be used, NZTA table 13e provides some guidance on the magnitude of deflection that AC can tolerate. It is the designer responsibility to ensure that the pavement deflection is suitable for the the surfacing chosen"	Updated section 3.4.11 to clarify
60	3.4.11	deflection constraints	Concerns with specified deflections and their suitability for use for asphalt design. We currently allow up to 1.8 mm of deflection prior to surfacing for local and 1.5 mm for collector "live and play" roads. This is fine for chip seal but is too high for asphalt.	The guide and limits referenced do not apply to new construction just overlays where access to the subgrade is not available. A Deflection limit of 0.7mm not practical for most roads. Current limits have worked well roads have failed in the past due to poor workmanship and bad materials.	Y	the full table provides guidance for different levels of pavement, 0.7mm is the highest classification, medium application road deflection are 1.0mm. Acknowledge that the table is intended for AC overlay however the theory is the same, these are the recommended maximum value for AC on a certain deflection. That is why it is for guidance only.	Updated section 3.4.11 to clarify
61	1.8.4.3	Clarification	Does this include Pavement Design?		Y	We have clarified this section, including section (b) which does include Pavement Design	Where investigations and reports are required by a Suitably Qualified and Experienced Person (SQEP), this person or persons will have nationally recognised qualifications and experience in the field they are working in. The person or persons will normally be expected to be professionally recognised in the area of competence claimed and to carry professional indemnity insurance to a level suitable for the purpose but in any case not less than $1,000,000 per project. Council reserves the right to have any work peer reviewed regardless of any prior approval as to the acceptability of the suitably qualified person. The cost of all peer review work will be borne by the developer. Specific requirements are outlined below that are required for any person to be deemed suitably qualified in these work areas: a)Traffic and transportation assessment, road safety audits, and road safety audit exemptions – Suitably Qualified and Experienced Person shall be Qualified in Traffic Engineering and work or have worked in a role whose primary activity is Traffic Safety Engineering; b)Road Pavement Design for pavements designed for a medium load or above (5 x 105 to 5 x 106 ESA / ONRC Primary Collector or above) - Suitably Qualified and Experienced Person is required to sign off design and that person shall be a CPEng with a practice area in Pavement Design; c)Stormwater engineering incorporating flood mitigation, catchment analysis or stormwater system design - Suitably Qualified and Experienced Person shall be a CPEng with recognised Stormwater discipline competence. Requirements may be relaxed at Council's sole discretion subject to the development site complying with the each of the following: ~~- The development does not require the physical alteration,~~
61	1.8.4.3	Suitably Qualified Persons	Please see attached letter dated 26 June 2020: - remove bracketed wording (CPEng with recognised discipline competence) from subclauses a - f and bracketed wording from g-i. - definition of suitably qualified person properly contained in initial paragraph, with minor amendments: "Where investigations and reports are required by a Suitably Qualified and Experienced Person (SQEP), this person or persons will have nationally recognised qualifications and accreditation, such as Chartered Professional Engineer (CPEng), Registered Professional Surveyor (RPSurv) or Licensed Cadastral Surveyor. The person or persons will normally be expected to be professionally recognised in the area of competence claimed and to carry professional indemnity insurance to a level suitable for the purpose but in any case not less than $1,000,000 per project."	Please see attached letter dated 26 June 2020	Y	We've removed SQEP requirements from disciplines apart from Road Safety Audits, Pavement Design, and Stormwater Assessment and Design. Council is currently working with various parties including Survey and Spatial (NZ) to more clearly define the requirements for a SQEP in the next stage of amendments. We have changed SQP to SQEP as suggested.	see above
61	1.8.4.3	Suitably Qualified Persons	Items b, c, d, e, f should all include RPSurv as a suitable qualification. May need to clarify selection criteria as current wording is vague. Remove reference to insurance and have a separate clause, perhaps under 1.7.1 to address insurance.	Registered Professional Surveyor is a nationally recognised qualification that includes many aspects of civil engineering. Also refer to Survey + Spatial submission on behalf of the wider profession. There is no clear method of determining whom is suitably qualified. Therefore the process remains subject to individual Council staff opinion. There is potential for significant conflict and delay. We understand that Council have a right to peer review. But what if we have peer reviewed by an appropriately qualified person prior to submission? The acceptance of prior peer reviews should be clarified. Insurance is all ready covered under 1.7.1. "Geo-professional" term is not included in this section but is used in Section 2. Needs to be consistent so that one term used throughout the COP.	Y	We've removed SQEP requirements from disciplines apart from Road Safety Audits, Pavement Design, and Stormwater Assessment and Design. Council is currently working with various parties including Survey and Spatial (NZ) to more clearly define the requirements for a SQEP in the next stage of amendments. We consider it appropriate for Council to retain the discretion regarding peer reviews. Council would like to retain the clause around insurance as it provides more clarity and is more specific.	see above
61	1.8.4.3	Suitably Qualified Persons	Defer final decision on this item until further consultation has occurred. Recommend include with Stage 3 review	Further discussion required, see attached letter from PPGroup dated 22 June 2020, Letter form Survey & Spatial NZ dated 25 June 2020 and the letter form the Otago University dated 25 June 2020.	Y	We've removed SQEP requirements from disciplines apart from Road Safety Audits, Pavement Design, and Stormwater Assessment and Design. Council is currently working with various parties including Survey and Spatial (NZ) to more clearly define the requirements for a SQEP in the next stage of amendments.	see above

Submission ID	Section Reference	Submitter Commenting On	Submitter's Proposed Amendment	Submitter Reasoning	Change Y/N	QLDC Reasoning	QLDC Amendment
61	1.8.4.3	Suitably Qualified Persons	The statement around council reserving the right to have work peer reviewed could lead to confusion over who is liable for investigations/reports/designs as well as unnessary costs. If the council already requires a suitably qualified person to be signing off work and taking liability why is there a need for a peer review as well?		Y	Council are satisfied with the requriement to have peer reviews undertaken at their discretion to ensure the systems are reviewed independently.	see above
61	1.8.4.3	Definition of 'Suitably Qualified Person'	The amendments register proposes restricting items (a) to (f) to a CPEng and items (h) & (f) to RPS / LCS. My submission is that this wording is amended and specific qualification removed. 'Suitably qualified' should permit all people with relevant experience and skills from undertaking work in their chosen field, the only restriction should be as required by relevant New Zealand Legislation.	I have been working in the field of land develpoment for 20 years in the Queenstown District, my qualfication of NZCE(Civil) and relevant experience has allowed me to submit numerous designs for engineering approval, and prepare subdivision & landuse consents. I have also personally supervised construction of multiple civil projects. My pracitce holds relevant Professional Indemnity insurance. The proposed change would have a significant detrimental effect on my ability to continue with the current business model, and I imagine a lot of other businesses as well.	Y	We've removed SQEP requirements from disciplines apart from Road Safety Audits, Pavement Design, and Stormwater Assessment and Design. Council is currently working with various parties including Survey and Spatial (NZ) to more clearly define the requirements for a SQEP in the next stage of amendments.	see above
61	1.8.4.3	Traffic and transportation engineering (CPEng with recognised discipline competence)	Traffic and transportation engineering (CPEng with recognised discipline competence, Registered Professional Surveyor (RPSurv) with recognised discipline competence, or Licensed Cadastral Surveyor (LCS) with MS+SNZ)	A Registered Professional Surveyor (RPSurv) with recognised discipline competence, or a Licensed Cadastral Surveyor (LCS) with MS+SNZ (full membership with Survey and Spatial NZ) will have been required to satisfy relevant land development engineering competencies as set by Survey and Spatial NZ (S+SNZ). They will also be governed by the S+SNZ Code of Ethics so they will be required to "recognise their own professional or technical limitations or inexperience and shall at all-time act in a manner appropriate to the circumstances". There are often times when a dedicated traffic engineer may, for example, be required/engaged to provide the necessary expertise, but an RPSurv, or LCS with MS+SNZ, can typically carry out traffic/transportation consideration, design, and construction supervision. Further reasoning for the recognition of RPSurv and LCS with MS+SNZ has been provided with the recent S+SNZ submission.	Y	We've removed SQEP requirements from disciplines apart from Road Safety Audits, Pavement Design, and Stormwater Assessment and Design. Council is currently working with various parties including Survey and Spatial (NZ) to more clearly define the requirements for a SQEP in the next stage of amendments.	see above
61	1.8.4.3	Stormwater engineering and flood mitigation (CPEng with recognised discipline competence)	Stormwater engineering and flood mitigation (RPSurv, mS+SNZ or CPEng with recognised discipline competence)	RPSurv & mS+SNZ hold appropriate nationally recognised qualifications with comptetency in the field of land development engineering, and as such should be included in the examples of suitably qualified persons for stormwater engineering and flood mitigation.	Y	We've removed SQEP requirements from disciplines apart from Road Safety Audits, Pavement Design, and Stormwater Assessment and Design. Council is currently working with various parties including Survey and Spatial (NZ) to more clearly define the requirements for a SQEP in the next stage of amendments.	see above
61	1.8.4.3	Stormwater engineering and flood mitigation (CPEng with recognised discipline competence)	Stormwater engineering and flood mitigation (Registered Professional Surveyor, or Liscenced Cadastral Surveyor MS+SNZ and CPEng with recognised discipline competetence)	Professional competencies ans recofnised by Survey and Spatial New Zealand and outlined in supporting letter	Y	We've removed SQEP requirements from disciplines apart from Road Safety Audits, Pavement Design, and Stormwater Assessment and Design. Council is currently working with various parties including Survey and Spatial (NZ) to more clearly define the requirements for a SQEP in the next stage of amendments.	see above
61	1.8.4.3	Stormwater engineering and flood mitigation (CPEng with recognised discipline competence)	Stormwater engineering and flood mitigation (Registered Professional Surveyor, or Licensed Cadastral Surveyor MS+SNZ and CPEng with recognised discipline competence)	Registered Professional Surveyors, or Licensed Cadastral Surveyor MS+SNZ hold a relvant qualification and are professionally recognised in the area of Stormwater engineering and flood mitigation and carry professional indemnity insurance. As such should be included as being suitably qualified.	Y	We've removed SQEP requirements from disciplines apart from Road Safety Audits, Pavement Design, and Stormwater Assessment and Design. Council is currently working with various parties including Survey and Spatial (NZ) to more clearly define the requirements for a SQEP in the next stage of amendments.	see above
61	1.8.4.3	Stormwater engineering and flood mitigation (CPEng with recognised discipline competence)	Stormwater engineering and flood mitigation (Registered Professional Surveyor, or Licensed Cadastral Surveyor MS+SNZ or CPEng with recognised discipline competence)	Professional competencies as recognised by Survey and Spatial New Zealand and outlined in supporting letter from Queenstown Lakes & Central Otago Branch Chairman, S+SNZ. I would make the observation that surveyors have demonstrated their competence in subdivision engineering work in Queenstown for many decades. I also note that the several graduates I have worked with and mentored over the past decade or two have clearly received good engineering instruction at the Otago Survey School.	Y	We've removed SQEP requirements from disciplines apart from Road Safety Audits, Pavement Design, and Stormwater Assessment and Design. Council is currently working with various parties including Survey and Spatial (NZ) to more clearly define the requirements for a SQEP in the next stage of amendments.	see above
61	1.8.4.3	Stormwater engineering and flood mitigation (CPEng with recognised discipline competence)	Stormwater engineering and flood mitigation (CPEng with recognised discipline competence, Registered Professional Surveyor (RPSurv) with recognised discipline competence, or Licensed Cadastral Surveyor (LCS) with MS+SNZ)	A Registered Professional Surveyor (RPSurv) with recognised discipline competence, or a Licensed Cadastral Surveyor (LCS) with MS+SNZ (full membership with Survey and Spatial NZ) will have been required to satisfy relevant land development engineering competencies as set by Survey and Spatial NZ (S+SNZ). They will also be governed by the S+SNZ Code of Ethics so they will be required to "recognise their own professional or technical limitations or inexperience and shall at all-time act in a manner appropriate to the circumstances". There are often times when a dedicated stormwater (or three waters) engineer may, for example, be required/engaged to provide the necessary expertise, but an RPSurv or LCS with MS+SNZ can typically carry out stormwater consideration, design, and construction supervision. Further reasoning for the recognition of RPSurv and LCS with MS+SNZ has been provided with the recent S+SNZ submission.	Y	We've removed SQEP requirements from disciplines apart from Road Safety Audits, Pavement Design, and Stormwater Assessment and Design. Council is currently working with various parties including Survey and Spatial (NZ) to more clearly define the requirements for a SQEP in the next stage of amendments.	see above
61	1.8.4.3	Stormwater engineering and flood mitigation (CPEng with recognised discipline competence)	Stormwater engineering and flood mitigation (Registered Professional Surveyor, or Licensed Cadastral Surveyor MS+SNZ and CPEng with recognised discipline competence)	Professional competencies as recognised by Survey + Spatial New Zealand and outlined in supporting letter.	Y	We've removed SQEP requirements from disciplines apart from Road Safety Audits, Pavement Design, and Stormwater Assessment and Design. Council is currently working with various parties including Survey and Spatial (NZ) to more clearly define the requirements for a SQEP in the next stage of amendments.	see above
61	1.8.4.3	Stormwater engineering and flood mitigation (CPEng with recognised discipline competence)	Stormwater engineering and flood mitigation (Registered Professional Surveyor with recognised discipline competence or CPEng with recognised discipline competence)	Professional competencies as recognised by Survey and Spatial New Zealand and outlined in supporting letter	Y	We've removed SQEP requirements from disciplines apart from Road Safety Audits, Pavement Design, and Stormwater Assessment and Design. Council is currently working with various parties including Survey and Spatial (NZ) to more clearly define the requirements for a SQEP in the next stage of amendments.	see above
61	1.8.4.3	Stormwater engineering and flood mitigation (CPEng with recognised discipline competence)	Stormwater engineering and flood mitigation (Registered Professional Surveyor, or Licensed Cadastral Surveyor MS+SNZ and CPEng with recognised discipline competence)	Professional competencies as recognised by Survey and Spatial New Zealand and outlined in supporting letter.	Y	We've removed SQEP requirements from disciplines apart from Road Safety Audits, Pavement Design, and Stormwater Assessment and Design. Council is currently working with various parties including Survey and Spatial (NZ) to more clearly define the requirements for a SQEP in the next stage of amendments.	see above
61	1.8.4.3	In the examples c,d,e,f CPEng specifed only..... to recognise Registered Professional Surveyor, or Licensed Cadastral Surveyor MS+SNZ as suitably qualified persons in addition to CPEng	To include in the examples Registered. Professional Surveyor, or Licensed Cadastral Surveyor MS+SNZ as suitably qualified persons. Or simply don't overcomplicate it with examples "sutiably qualified person" is clear.	Full Licensed members of the S&SNZ who have gained the certificate of competency in Land Development and Land Development Engineering or RPSurv have the suitably qualified expertise to carry out the design and supervision of land development and subdivisions. See accompanying letter.	Y	We've removed SQEP requirements from disciplines apart from Road Safety Audits, Pavement Design, and Stormwater Assessment and Design. Council is currently working with various parties including Survey and Spatial (NZ) to more clearly define the requirements for a SQEP in the next stage of amendments.	see above
61	1.8.4.3	Wastewater engineering (CPEng with recognised discipline competence)	Wastewater engineering (RPSurv, mS+SNZ, or CPEng with recognised discipline competence)	RPSurv & mS+SNZ hold appropriate nationally recognised qualification with competency in the field of land development engineering, and as such should be included in the examples of suitably qualified persons for waterwater engineering.	Y	We've removed SQEP requirements from disciplines apart from Road Safety Audits, Pavement Design, and Stormwater Assessment and Design. Council is currently working with various parties including Survey and Spatial (NZ) to more clearly define the requirements for a SQEP in the next stage of amendments.	see above
61	1.8.4.3	Wastewater engineering (CPEng with recognised discipline competence)	Wastewater engineering (Registered Professional Surveyor, or Liscenced Cadastral Surveyor MS+SNZ and CPEng with recognised discipline competetence)	Professional competencies ans recofnised by Survey and Spatial New Zealand and outlined in supporting letter	Y	We've removed SQEP requirements from disciplines apart from Road Safety Audits, Pavement Design, and Stormwater Assessment and Design. Council is currently working with various parties including Survey and Spatial (NZ) to more clearly define the requirements for a SQEP in the next stage of amendments.	see above

Submission ID	Section Reference	Submitter Commenting On	Submitter's Proposed Amendment	Submitter Reasoning	Change Y/N	QLDC Reasoning	QLDC Amendment
61	1.8.4.3	Wastewater engineering (CPEng with recognised discipline competence)	Wastewater engineering (Registered Professional Surveyor, or Licensed Cadastral Surveyor MS+SNZ and CPEng with recognised discipline competence)	Registered Professional Surveyors, or Licensed Cadastral Surveyor MS+SNZ hold a relvant qualification and are professionally recognised in the area of wastewater engineering and carry professional indemnity insurance. As such should be included as being suitably qualified.	Y	We've removed SQEP requirements from disciplines apart from Road Safety Audits, Pavement Design, and Stormwater Assessment and Design. Council is currently working with various parties including Survey and Spatial (NZ) to more clearly define the requirements for a SQEP in the next stage of amendments.	see above
61	1.8.4.3	Wastewater engineering (CPEng with recognised discipline competence)	Wastewater engineering (Registered Professional Surveyor, or Licensed Cadastral Surveyor MS+SNZ or CPEng with recognised discipline competence)	As above	Y	We've removed SQEP requirements from disciplines apart from Road Safety Audits, Pavement Design, and Stormwater Assessment and Design. Council is currently working with various parties including Survey and Spatial (NZ) to more clearly define the requirements for a SQEP in the next stage of amendments.	see above
61	1.8.4.3	Wastewater engineering (CPEng with recognised discipline competence)	Wastewater engineering (CPEng with recognised discipline competence, Registered Professional Surveyor (RPSurv) with recognised discipline competence, or Licensed Cadastral Surveyor (LCS) with MS+SNZ)	A Registered Professional Surveyor (RPSurv) with recognised discipline competence, or a Licensed Cadastral Surveyor (LCS) with MS+SNZ (full membership with Survey and Spatial NZ) will have been required to satisfy relevant land development engineering competencies as set by Survey and Spatial NZ (S+SNZ). They will also be governed by the S+SNZ Code of Ethics so they will be required to "recognise their own professional or technical limitations or inexperience and shall at all-time act in a manner appropriate to the circumstances". There are often times when a dedicated wastewater (or three waters) engineer may, for example, be required/engaged to provide the necessary expertise, but an RPSurv or LCS with MS+SNZ can typically carry out wastewater consideration, design, and construction supervision. Further reasoning for the recognition of RPSurv and LCS with MS+SNZ has been provided with the recent S+SNZ submission.	Y	We've removed SQEP requirements from disciplines apart from Road Safety Audits, Pavement Design, and Stormwater Assessment and Design. Council is currently working with various parties including Survey and Spatial (NZ) to more clearly define the requirements for a SQEP in the next stage of amendments.	see above
61	1.8.4.3	Wastewater engineering (CPEng with recognised discipline competence)	Wastewater engineering (Registered Professional Surveyor, or Licensed Cadastral Surveyor MS+SNZ and CPEng with recognised discipline competence)	Professional competencies as recognised by Survey + Spatial New Zealand and outlined in supporting letter.	Y	We've removed SQEP requirements from disciplines apart from Road Safety Audits, Pavement Design, and Stormwater Assessment and Design. Council is currently working with various parties including Survey and Spatial (NZ) to more clearly define the requirements for a SQEP in the next stage of amendments.	see above
61	1.8.4.3	Wastewater engineering (CPEng with recognised discipline competence)	Wastewater engineering (Registered Professional Surveyor with recognised discipline competence or CPEng with recognised discipline competence)	Professional competencies as recognised by Survey and Spatial New Zealand and outlined in supporting letter.	Y	We've removed SQEP requirements from disciplines apart from Road Safety Audits, Pavement Design, and Stormwater Assessment and Design. Council is currently working with various parties including Survey and Spatial (NZ) to more clearly define the requirements for a SQEP in the next stage of amendments.	see above
61	1.8.4.3	Wastewater engineering (CPEng with recognised discipline competence)	Wastewater engineering (Registered Professional Surveyor, or Licensed Cadastral Surveyor MS+SNZ and CPEng with recognised discipline competence)	Professional competencies as recognised by Survey and Spatial New Zealand and outlined in supporting letter.	Y	We've removed SQEP requirements from disciplines apart from Road Safety Audits, Pavement Design, and Stormwater Assessment and Design. Council is currently working with various parties including Survey and Spatial (NZ) to more clearly define the requirements for a SQEP in the next stage of amendments.	see above
61	1.8.4.3	Potable water supply engineering (CPEng with recognised discipline competence)	Potable water supply engineering (RPSurv, mS+SNZ or CPEng with recognised discipline competence)	RPSurv & mS+SNZhold appropriate nationally recognised qualification with competency in the field of land development engineering, and as such should be included in the examples of suitably qualified persons for potable water supply engineering.	Y	We've removed SQEP requirements from disciplines apart from Road Safety Audits, Pavement Design, and Stormwater Assessment and Design. Council is currently working with various parties including Survey and Spatial (NZ) to more clearly define the requirements for a SQEP in the next stage of amendments.	see above
61	1.8.4.3	Potable water supply engineering (CPEng with recognised discipline competence)	Potable water supply engineering (Registered Professional Surveyor, or Liscenced Cadastral Surveyor MS+SNZ and CPEng with recognised discipline competetence)	Professional competencies ans recofnised by Survey and Spatial New Zealand and outlined in supporting letter	Y	We've removed SQEP requirements from disciplines apart from Road Safety Audits, Pavement Design, and Stormwater Assessment and Design. Council is currently working with various parties including Survey and Spatial (NZ) to more clearly define the requirements for a SQEP in the next stage of amendments.	see above
61	1.8.4.3	Potable water supply engineering (CPEng with recognised discipline competence)	Potable water supply engineering (Registered Professional Surveyor, or Licensed Cadastral Surveyor MS+SNZ and CPEng with recognised discipline competence)	Registered Professional Surveyors, or Licensed Cadastral Surveyor MS+SNZ hold a relvant qualification and are professionally recognised in the area of potable water engineering and carry professional indemnity insurance. As such should be included as being suitably qualified.	Y	We've removed SQEP requirements from disciplines apart from Road Safety Audits, Pavement Design, and Stormwater Assessment and Design. Council is currently working with various parties including Survey and Spatial (NZ) to more clearly define the requirements for a SQEP in the next stage of amendments.	see above
61	1.8.4.3	Potable water supply engineering (CPEng with recognised discipline competence)	Potable water supply engineering (Registered Professional Surveyor, or Licensed Cadastral Surveyor MS+SNZ or CPEng with recognised discipline competence)	As above	Y	We've removed SQEP requirements from disciplines apart from Road Safety Audits, Pavement Design, and Stormwater Assessment and Design. Council is currently working with various parties including Survey and Spatial (NZ) to more clearly define the requirements for a SQEP in the next stage of amendments.	see above
61	1.8.4.3	Potable water supply engineering (CPEng with recognised discipline competence)	Potable water supply engineering (CPEng with recognised discipline competence, Registered Professional Surveyor (RPSurv) with recognised discipline competence, or Licensed Cadastral Surveyor (LCS) with MS+SNZ)	A Registered Professional Surveyor (RPSurv) with recognised discipline competence, or a Licensed Cadastral Surveyor (LCS) with MS+SNZ (full membership with Survey and Spatial NZ) will have been required to satisfy relevant land development engineering competencies as set by Survey and Spatial NZ (S+SNZ). They will also be governed by the S+SNZ Code of Ethics so they will be required to "recognise their own professional or technical limitations or inexperience and shall at all-time act in a manner appropriate to the circumstances". There are often times when a dedicated water supply (or three waters) engineer may, for example, be required/engaged to provide the necessary expertise, but an RPSurv or LCS with MS+SNZ can typically carry out water supply consideration, design, and construction supervision. Further reasoning for the recognition of RPSurv and LCS with MS+SNZ has been provided with the recent S+SNZ submission.	Y	We've removed SQEP requirements from disciplines apart from Road Safety Audits, Pavement Design, and Stormwater Assessment and Design. Council is currently working with various parties including Survey and Spatial (NZ) to more clearly define the requirements for a SQEP in the next stage of amendments.	see above
61	1.8.4.3	Potable water supply engineering (CPEng with recognised discipline competence)	Potable water supply engineering (Registered Professional Surveyor, or Licensed Cadastral Surveyor MS+SNZ and CPEng with recognised discipline competence)	Professional competencies as recognised by Survey + Spatial New Zealand and outlined in supporting letter.	Y	We've removed SQEP requirements from disciplines apart from Road Safety Audits, Pavement Design, and Stormwater Assessment and Design. Council is currently working with various parties including Survey and Spatial (NZ) to more clearly define the requirements for a SQEP in the next stage of amendments.	see above
61	1.8.4.3	Potable water supply engineering (CPEng with recognised discipline competence)	Potable water supply engineering (Registered Professional Surveyor with recognised discipline competence or CPEng with recognised discipline competence)	Professional competencies as recognised by Survey and Spatial New Zealand and outlined in supporting letter	Y	We've removed SQEP requirements from disciplines apart from Road Safety Audits, Pavement Design, and Stormwater Assessment and Design. Council is currently working with various parties including Survey and Spatial (NZ) to more clearly define the requirements for a SQEP in the next stage of amendments.	see above
61	1.8.4.3	Potable water supply engineering (CPEng with recognised discipline competence)	Potable water supply engineering (CPEng with recognised discipline competence, Registered Professional Surveyor (RPSurv) with recognised discipline competence, or Licensed Cadastral Surveyor (LCS) with MS+SNZ)	Professional competencies as recognised by Survey and Spatial New Zealand and outlined in supporting letter.	Y	We've removed SQEP requirements from disciplines apart from Road Safety Audits, Pavement Design, and Stormwater Assessment and Design. Council is currently working with various parties including Survey and Spatial (NZ) to more clearly define the requirements for a SQEP in the next stage of amendments.	see above
61	1.8.4.3	Non- potable or rural water supply engineering (CPEng with recognised discipline competence)	Non- potable or rural water supply engineering (RPSurv, mS+SNZ, or CPEng with recognised discipline competence)	RPSurv & mS+SNZ hold appropriate nationally recognised qualification with competency in the field of land development engineering, and as such should be included in the examples of suitably qualified persons for non-potable water or rural water supply engineering.	Y	We've removed SQEP requirements from disciplines apart from Road Safety Audits, Pavement Design, and Stormwater Assessment and Design. Council is currently working with various parties including Survey and Spatial (NZ) to more clearly define the requirements for a SQEP in the next stage of amendments.	see above
61	1.8.4.3	Non- potable or rural water supply engineering (CPEng with recognised discipline competence)	Non- potable or rural water supply engineering (Registered Professional Surveyor, or Liscenced Cadastral Surveyor MS+SNZ and CPEng with recognised discipline competetence)	Professional competencies ans recofnised by Survey and Spatial New Zealand and outlined in supporting letter	Y	We've removed SQEP requirements from disciplines apart from Road Safety Audits, Pavement Design, and Stormwater Assessment and Design. Council is currently working with various parties including Survey and Spatial (NZ) to more clearly define the requirements for a SQEP in the next stage of amendments.	see above
61	1.8.4.3	Non- potable or rural water supply engineering (CPEng with recognised discipline competence)	Non- potable or rural water supply engineering (Registered Professional Surveyor, or Licensed Cadastral Surveyor MS+SNZ and CPEng with recognised discipline competence)	Registered Professional Surveyors, or Licensed Cadastral Surveyor MS+SNZ hold a relvant qualification and are professionally recognised in the area of non potable water engineering and carry professional indemnity insurance. As such should be included as being suitably qualified.	Y	We've removed SQEP requirements from disciplines apart from Road Safety Audits, Pavement Design, and Stormwater Assessment and Design. Council is currently working with various parties including Survey and Spatial (NZ) to more clearly define the requirements for a SQEP in the next stage of amendments.	see above

Submission ID	Section Reference	Submitter Commenting On	Submitter's Proposed Amendment	Submitter Reasoning	Change Y/N	QLDC Reasoning	QLDC Amendment
61	1.8.4.3	Non- potable or rural water supply engineering (CPEng with recognised discipline competence)	Non- potable or rural water supply engineering (Registered Professional Surveyor, or Licensed Cadastral Surveyor MS+SNZ or CPEng with recognised discipline competence)	As above	Y	We've removed SQEP requirements from disciplines apart from Road Safety Audits, Pavement Design, and Stormwater Assessment and Design. Council is currently working with various parties including Survey and Spatial (NZ) to more clearly define the requirements for a SQEP in the next stage of amendments.	see above
61	1.8.4.3	Non- potable or rural water supply engineering (CPEng with recognised discipline competence)	Non- potable or rural water supply engineering (CPEng with recognised discipline competence, Registered Professional Surveyor (RPSurv) with recognised discipline competence, or Licensed Cadastral Surveyor (LCS) with MS+SNZ)	A Registered Professional Surveyor (RPSurv) with recognised discipline competence, or a Licensed Cadastral Surveyor (LCS) with MS+SNZ (full membership with Survey and Spatial NZ) will have been required to satisfy relevant land development engineering competencies as set by Survey and Spatial NZ (S+SNZ). They will also be governed by the S+SNZ Code of Ethics so they will be required to "recognise their own professional or technical limitations or inexperience and shall at all-time act in a manner appropriate to the circumstances". There are often times when a dedicated water supply (or three waters) engineer may, for example, be required/engaged to provide the necessary expertise, but an RPSurv or LCS with MS+SNZ can typically carry out water supply consideration, design, and construction supervision. Further reasoning for the recognition of RPSurv and LCS with MS+SNZ has been provided with the recent S+SNZ submission.	Y	We've removed SQEP requirements from disciplines apart from Road Safety Audits, Pavement Design, and Stormwater Assessment and Design. Council is currently working with various parties including Survey and Spatial (NZ) to more clearly define the requirements for a SQEP in the next stage of amendments.	see above
61	1.8.4.3	Non-potable or rural water supply engineering (CPEng with recognised discipline competence)	Non-potable or rural water supply engineering (Registered Professional Surveyor, or Licensed Cadastral Surveyor MS+SNZ and CPEng with recognised discipline competence)	Professional competencies as recognised by Survey + Spatial New Zealand and outlined in supporting letter.	Y	We've removed SQEP requirements from disciplines apart from Road Safety Audits, Pavement Design, and Stormwater Assessment and Design. Council is currently working with various parties including Survey and Spatial (NZ) to more clearly define the requirements for a SQEP in the next stage of amendments.	see above
61	1.8.4.3	Non- potable or rural water supply engineering (CPEng with recognised discipline competence)	Non- potable or rural water supply engineering (Registered Professional Surveyor with recognised discipline competence or CPEng with recognised discipline competence)	Professional competencies as recognised by Survey and Spatial New Zealand and outlined in supporting letter	Y	We've removed SQEP requirements from disciplines apart from Road Safety Audits, Pavement Design, and Stormwater Assessment and Design. Council is currently working with various parties including Survey and Spatial (NZ) to more clearly define the requirements for a SQEP in the next stage of amendments.	see above
61	1.8.4.3	Non- potable or rural water supply engineering (CPEng with recognised discipline competence)	Non- potable or rural water supply engineering (Registered Professional Surveyor, or Licensed Cadastral Surveyor MS+SNZ and CPEng with recognised discipline competence)	Professional competencies as recognised by Survey and Spatial New Zealand and outlined in supporting letter.	Y	We've removed SQEP requirements from disciplines apart from Road Safety Audits, Pavement Design, and Stormwater Assessment and Design. Council is currently working with various parties including Survey and Spatial (NZ) to more clearly define the requirements for a SQEP in the next stage of amendments.	see above
67	3.3.2.5	Design and check vehicles	Does this align with vehicle dimensions in RTS18Has a 0.5m clearance to vehicle dimensions been allowed for?		Y	Already have reference to RTS 18 and changed "8m rigid truck" to "medium rigid truck" to align with the standard. No clearance has been allowed for, but will include 500 mm clearance on each side.	changed "8m rigid truck" to "medium rigid truck" in Table 3.2 added "An additional 500mm clearance shall be added to each side of all vehicles."
67	3.3.2.5	Design and check vehicles	Is the design vehicle and check vehicle around the correct way? Should the design vehicle be able to navigate within the lane lines and the check vehicle which is the larger vehicle should be able to navigate within the kerb lines? Third row - All other intersections (assuming this is local to local or smaller). Design vehicle = 90% car, Check vehicle = 8m rigid truck.	Catering for a tour bus in local residential streets is excessive especially given that the tour bus would not be able to navigate smaller roads such as cul-de-sac as the turning head would not provide sufficient manoeuvring. Recommend further discussion with a traffic engineer.	Y	Design and Check Vehicles have been corrected. Regarding the tour bus in local residential streets, Council have assessed and will leave the design and check vehicle as originally suggested. This allows for larger vehicles for either furniture removal or construction activities. Also sometimes truck drivers will park their vehicles outside their houses.	switched "design" and "check" in the text.
67	3.3.2.5	Design and check vehicles	Incorrect wording not in accordance with Austroads. A design vehicle for any particular turning movement can turn from the appropriate approach lane to an appropriate departure lane/s with adequate clearances to features such as kerbs and roadside furniture, while the check vehicle may be permitted to run over kerbs and encroach on adjacent lanes. The way it has been written means the check vehicle cannot do this. This will result in larger openings on corners and intersections that could result in higher speeds by smaller vehicles. This could be very unsafe, particularly for pedestrians crossing in these locations. QLDC need to review and revise this.		Y	Design and Check Vehicles have been corrected. Regarding the tour bus in local residential streets, Council have assessed and will leave the design and check vehicle as originally suggested. This allows for larger vehicles for either furniture removal or construction activities.	switched "design" and "check" in the text.
67	3.3.2.5	Design and check vehicles	Clarify what are lane lines for check vehicles because in rural area there is often no roadmarking.Wording difficult to interpret. Perhaps use urban, suburban and rual context the same as table 3.3Add where no lane marking use edge of seal	Further clarification is necessary to avoid future confusion on interpretation	Y	Yes. Amended so that design/check vehicles at rural intersections are agreed on case-by-case basis with TA. Also, more sweeping changes suggested to try and get more clarity on the wording to align with Table 3.3.Using the edge of seal when no lane marking is understood without explaining. No change required.	Amended Table 3.2 and section 3.3.2.5 for added clarity
68	3.3.2.1	Priority of road design manuals	State the priority of each standard. Noting that several details in Table 3.3 do not meet Austroads standards		Y	Code takes priority >Austroads. Will clarify this in the Code, and will be considered again when Table 3.3 is reviewed in Stage 3 (next stage) of the code of practice review. .	Amended: Roads shall be designed to the basic standards in Table 3.3 of this Code of Practice, **which take precedence over any other referenced design guides.** Detailed design must be completed following the relevant Austroads guides, and supplemental guides and technical memoranda listed in on the NZTA's Geometric Design webpage at:
68	3.3.2.1	Road Design Parameters	Roads shall be designed to the basic standards in Table 3.3 of this Code of Practice or following the relevant Austroads guides, and supplemental guides and technical memoranda listed in on the NZTA's Geometric Design webpage at:	opposes the deletion of the word "or" from the current provision. The Section should be reworded to reinstate its original intention while adding in the reference to the State Highway Geometric Design Manual in accordance with QLDC's preferred hierarchy.	Y	Code takes priority >Austroads. Will clarify this in the Code, and will be considered again when Table 3.3 is reviewed in Stage 3 (next stage) of the code of practice review. .	Amended: Roads shall be designed to the basic standards in Table 3.3 of this Code of Practice, **which take precedence over any other referenced design guides.** Detailed design must be completed following the relevant Austroads guides, and supplemental guides and technical memoranda listed in on the NZTA's Geometric Design webpage at:
71	3.3.16.1 and Table 3.3	Private way gradients	Allow 20% in rural as per table 3.3	Gradients don't match Table 3.3. In rural no access to be steeper than 1 in 6 (16.7%) yet table 3.3 says 20%	Y	Agree there is a contradiction, want to go with the more conservative, 16%. Any deviations will need to be brought to Council for approval	Changed table 3.3 to max grade 1 in 6 (16%)
72	4.3.5.1	The "developed site" in a subdivision should be permitted impermeable area under the district plan as the houses won't be built by the developer	Re-word clause	Mimicking the type of overland flow is often not achievable nor desirable in some cases i.e. requiring sheet flow discharge above steep banks or neighbour retaining walls.	Y	Have amended clause for clarity	Changed first sentence to "All developments shall provide onsite primary network drainage capacity for the 5% AEP peak flowrate from all contributing upstream catchments from either the maximum impermeable areas permitted by the District Plan or the maximum impermeable area restricted by a legal instrument (e.g. resource consent, consent notice, etc.)." and delete the rest of the paragraph
72	4.3.5.1	The "developed site" in a subdivision should be permitted impermeable area under the district plan as the houses won't be built by the developer	Wording is very confusing and unclear on what it is trying to say. To be rewritten with clarity.		Y	Have amended clause for clarity	Changed first sentence to "All developments shall provide onsite primary network drainage capacity for the 5% AEP peak flowrate from all contributing upstream catchments from either the maximum impermeable areas permitted by the District Plan or the maximum impermeable area restricted by a legal instrument (e.g. resource consent, consent notice, etc.)." and delete the rest of the paragraph

Submission ID	Section Reference	Submitter Commenting On	Submitter's Proposed Amendment	Submitter Reasoning	Change Y/N	QLDC Reasoning	QLDC Amendment
73	4.1,4.2.4, 4.2.7, 4.3.5.1, 4.3.7.4, etc	Pre-construction discharge rate	TBC - A comprehensive amendment is beyond the scope of this submission format.	Statement is technically ambiguous and prone to misinterpretation.	Y	Undertaking further analysis and review of stormwater changes under Stage 3 (next stage) of the code of practice review.	revert back to "pre-development" until Stage 3
73	4.1,4.2.4, 4.2.7, 4.3.5.1, 4.3.7.4, etc	Clarify the use of "pre-development" and consider replacing with "pre-construction" to clarify attenuation requirements when developing on already-developed land	Add definition for: Pre-construction discharge rate: The rate at which stormwater is discharged from the site in its current state prior to the proposed works And replace all (9) instances of "pre-development" with "pre-construction"	Pre-development standard wording used thru out country seems strage to change.	Y	Undertaking further analysis and review of stormwater changes under Stage 3 (next stage) of the code of practice review.	revert back to "pre-development" until Stage 3
73	4.1,4.2.4, 4.2.7, 4.3.5.1, 4.3.7.4, etc	Clarify the use of "pre-development" and consider replacing with "pre-construction" to clarify attenuation requirements when developing on already-developed land	TBC - A comprehensive amendment is beyond the scope of this submission format.	Amendment assumes that all current stormwater discharges meet ORC Plan Change 6A water quality discharge limits. As this is highly unlikely it forces QLDC to undertake end of pipe treatment solutions which are expensive and most likely unfeasible due to land availability	Y	Undertaking further analysis and review of stormwater changes under Stage 3 (next stage) of the code of practice review.	revert back to "pre-development" until Stage 3
73	4.1,4.2.4, 4.2.7, 4.3.5.1, 4.3.7.4, etc	Clarify the use of "pre-development" and consider replacing with "pre-construction" to clarify attenuation requirements when developing on already-developed land	recommend further discussion with an expert stormwater engineer such as Fluent Solutions. In some cases the pre-construction nature of a site could be manipulated in advance of applying i.e. clearance of vegetation		Y	Undertaking further analysis and review of stormwater changes under Stage 3 (next stage) of the code of practice review.	revert back to "pre-development" until Stage 3
73	4.1,4.2.4, 4.2.7, 4.3.5.1, 4.3.7.4, etc	Clarify the use of "pre-development" and consider replacing with "pre-construction" to clarify attenuation requirements when developing on already-developed land	TBC - A comprehensive amendment is beyond the scope of this submission format.	Pre-Construction and Pre-Development have 2 different definitions with regards to SW Quality and Quantity. This needs sorting out properly otherwise QLDC will do themselves a huge injustice by changing all references of pre-development to pre-construction. Unfortunately the fix isn't this simple.	Y	Undertaking further analysis and review of stormwater changes under Stage 3 (next stage) of the code of practice review.	revert back to "pre-development" until Stage 3
76	4.3.4.2	during a 5% AEP design storm, the velocities shall be such that the carriageway is passable by pedestrians.	TBC - A comprehensive amendment is beyond the scope of this submission format.	Proposed amendment doesn't make sense. Why would a more frequent storm event create a higher velocity flows than a less frequent storm event?	Y	Resolved with Andrew via phone call. Update resolves this issue.	Replace clause: Ponding or secondary flow in all events up to 1% AEP design storm event shall be limited to a 100 mm maximum height at the centre line, and roads shall be passable by pedestrians as defined by the flow depth x average velocity (dgVave) specified below: -Lower likelihood dgVave <0.6 m2/s -Higher likelihood dgVave <0.4 m2/s NOTE - A higher likelihood of pedestrians crossing the overland flowpath is provided where pedestrians are directed to, or most likely to cross water paths (such as marked crossings and corners of intersections. dg = flow depth in the channel adjacent to the kerb i.e. at the invert (m) Vave = average velocity of the flow (m/s)
76	4.3.4.2	during a 5% AEP design storm, the velocities shall be such that the carriageway is passable by pedestrians.	Specify maximum velocity for pedestrian passage	Specify velocity to provide clarity.	Y	Maximum velocity, expressed as a function of the depth and velocity (dV) has been specified.	Replace clause: Ponding or secondary flow in all events up to 1% AEP design storm event shall be limited to a 100 mm maximum height at the centre line, and roads shall be passable by pedestrians as defined by the flow depth x average velocity (dgVave) specified below: -Lower likelihood dgVave <0.6 m2/s -Higher likelihood dgVave <0.4 m2/s NOTE - A higher likelihood of pedestrians crossing the overland flowpath is provided where pedestrians are directed to, or most likely to cross water paths (such as marked crossings and corners of intersections. dg = flow depth in the channel adjacent to the kerb i.e. at the invert (m) Vave = average velocity of the flow (m/s)
76	4.3.4.2	during a 5% AEP design storm, the velocities shall be such that the carriageway is passable by pedestrians.	This change in wording has just introduced more uncertainty. What velocities are passable by pedestrians? We suggest the previous wording should be retained.		Y	Maximum velocity, expressed as a function of the depth and velocity (dV) has been specified.	Replace clause: Ponding or secondary flow in all events up to 1% AEP design storm event shall be limited to a 100 mm maximum height at the centre line, and roads shall be passable by pedestrians as defined by the flow depth x average velocity (dgVave) specified below: -Lower likelihood dgVave <0.6 m2/s -Higher likelihood dgVave <0.4 m2/s NOTE - A higher likelihood of pedestrians crossing the overland flowpath is provided where pedestrians are directed to, or most likely to cross water paths (such as marked crossings and corners of intersections. dg = flow depth in the channel adjacent to the kerb i.e. at the invert (m) Vave = average velocity of the flow (m/s)
76	4.3.4.2	during a 5% AEP design storm, the velocities shall be such that the carriageway is passable by pedestrians.	during a 5% AEP design storm, the velocities shall be such that the carriageway is passable by pedestrians. A velocity of xx shall not be exceeded.	There needs to be direction on what Council considers reasonable if this comment is to be added.	Y	Maximum velocity, expressed as a function of the depth and velocity (dV) has been specified.	Replace clause: Ponding or secondary flow in all events up to 1% AEP design storm event shall be limited to a 100 mm maximum height at the centre line, and roads shall be passable by pedestrians as defined by the flow depth x average velocity (dgVave) specified below: -Lower likelihood dgVave <0.6 m2/s -Higher likelihood dgVave <0.4 m2/s NOTE - A higher likelihood of pedestrians crossing the overland flowpath is provided where pedestrians are directed to, or most likely to cross water paths (such as marked crossings and corners of intersections. dg = flow depth in the channel adjacent to the kerb i.e. at the invert (m) Vave = average velocity of the flow (m/s)

Submission ID	Section Reference	Submitter Commenting On	Submitter's Proposed Amendment	Submitter Reasoning	Change Y/N	QLDC Reasoning	QLDC Amendment
76	4.3.4.2	Secondary Systems Ponding or secondary flow (1% AEP design storms) on local roads shall be limited to a 100 mm maximum height at the centre line, and during a 5% AEP design storm, the velocities shall be such that the carriageway is passable by pedestrians.	Ponding or secondary flow (1% AEP design storms) on roads within the development shall be limited to a 100 mm maximum height at the centre line. Flow depth and velocity in primary and secondary overland flow systems downstream of the development shall not be adversely affected.	The draft clause is at odds with Clause 4.3.5.1 where: "All sites shall provide onsite primary network drainage capacity for the 5% AEP developed site peak flowrate." This means that, within the site, the swales and pipes of the primary system are to contain the 5% AEP flow – there should be no secondary overland flow on a carriageway in a 5% AEP storm. Offsite: In some circumstances existing infrastructure downstream of a site may be under capacity for the revised design storm rainfalls for a 5% AEP event and therefore there will be secondary overland flow in the carriageway for a 5%AEP event but not caused by a proposed development. In this case it would be reasonable to expect that the new development would not increase velocities on the carriageways around the site but it is not reasonable that a new development should be, by implication, be required to upgrade the existing primary and secondary flow path infrastructure downstream to achieve "passable by pedestrians" requirement - for example, for 2km downstream to the discharge point for a large stormwater catchment to a lake. For the 1% AEP event the limiting the depth to 100mm is a reasonable expectation within the site. As above, where the existing primary and secondary flow path infrastructure is under capacity the objective should be the that the proposed development does not adversely affect roads and property downstream.	Y	Agreed. Clause amended to only specify maximum allowable depth and velocity for secondary overland flow.	Replace clause: Ponding or secondary flow in all events up to 1% AEP design storm event shall be limited to a 100 mm maximum height at the centre line, and roads shall be passable by pedestrians as defined by the flow depth x average velocity (dgVave) specified below: -Lower likelihood dgVave <0.6 m2/s -Higher likelihood dgVave <0.4 m2/s NOTE - A higher likelihood of pedestrians crossing the overland flowpath is provided where pedestrians are directed to, or most likely to cross water paths (such as marked crossings and corners of intersections. dg = flow depth in the channel adjacent to the kerb i.e. at the invert (m) Vave = average velocity of the flow (m/s)
81	4.3.7.9		There is a conflict that will cause issues as soakage devices are to have a capacity (assumed storage) for a 5%AEP storm but the referenced guideline requires the sizing to be done based of the catchment for a 10% AEP storm. QLDC need to correct this and thoroughly go through the referenced document before using it.		Y	Agreed, but this is an interim measure and we are developing QLDC specific guidance for Stage 3 (next stage) of the code of practice review.	Amend to "Full or partial subdivision soakage systems shall be designed (including soakage testing) in accordance with Auckland City Council Soakage Design Manual 2003, except that the design storm used shall be based on a 5% AEP rainfall event."
84	4.3.9.9		Connection of subsoil drains to collection sumps are to be positioned such that the invert of the subsoil drain is above the soffit of the sump's outlet pipe.	Provides greater clarity	Y	Agreed, this will prevent backflow and filling the sump up with sediment. Will change	Amend to "Connection of subsoil drains to collection sumps are to be positioned such that the invert of the subsoil drain is above the soffit of the sump's outlet pipe."
86	4.2.8	stormwater treatment for carparks over 30 spaces	Would recommend that first flush treatment of runoff from all vehicle areas be a requirement, or if a limit needs to be set, then 10 spaces. But also devices indicated proprietary, but raingarden/grassed swales/ponds would also be acceptable.		Y	Don't want to specify the type of treatment, developers can propose a system to council and identify the contaminants to be treated. Treatment devices can include rain gardens and other proprietary systems, but design must be based on the contamination loading and agreed by QLDC. We do want to ensure contaminants from vehicles are being treated properly, so a more conservative number (10) will be acceptable	Add "justification for the stormwater treatment systems for the level of treatment should be provided to QLDC for approval" change 30 to 10 carparks
86	4.2.8	Stormwater treatment in large parking lots should be a standard. Make sure this aligns with the Trade Waste Bylaw (in progress).	Add: Stormwater treatment is to be included in stormwater systems that service a carpark that has 30 or more parking spaces.	Is council going to treeat run off from all roads? Where does 30 carpark limit come from needs to be reviewed against treatment flows and cost effective solutions available to the market.	Y	Agree with carparks on roads comment. Will change accordingly. Guide of 30 car parks is from Auckland Design Manual GD08, but we want to ensure contaminants from vehicles are being treated properly, so a more conservative number (10) will be acceptable	Update to "off-road carparks"
89	6.3.6.2	Council's preference is to have all backflow preventors above ground, where possible. This needs to be stated in the Code.	Only applies to RPZ type - Acuflo. Other BFPs need to be above ground. Double check valves for irrigation should be allowed under ground.		Y	It is Council's preference that BFP's are located above ground, where possible. However, we agree that RPZ is the only one where there is no allowance for below ground installations, so we have added this to the Code and Appendix B.	Added to paragraph "If using a RPZ backflow preventer, it shall be installed above ground."
90	5.3.6.8 and 6.3.12.9	requirement to sleeve all pipes installed by trenchless technology	Reconsider this requirement	This is overkill for all situations, as the idea of trenchless is that a standard of backfill compaction is not required around the pipe when you are in undisturbed ground (i.e. subgrade below roads). You would sleeve if under high-risk structures such as level 2 state highways or railway crossings so that there is protection to the asset by preventing blowouts to the road or rail. Further guidance around understanding the physics of how this works can be provided by our specialist Tony Gordon. But if this goes ahead, you will be adding a lot of extra cost for unnecessary benefit.	Y	Can see your point. They should be sleeved, unless an acceptable reason for not sleeving are accepted by Council.	Amend "Any pipes installed using trenchless technology under roads shall be sleeved, unless an acceptable reason for not sleeving is accepted by Council."
New Item	1.11	Approved Materials	add: Note that Approved Materials for Street Lighting can be found in Southern Light Technical Specification	refer to SLS	Y	Agree	Added "Approved Materials for Street Lighting can be found in Southern Light Technical Specification"
New Item	1.8.1	Documentation	Replace 1.8.11(b) with: Asbuilts submitted for all Parks, Roading and Three Waters infrastructure and landscaping assets listed in Schedule 1D, and submitted according to the Asbuilt/Data Specifications on the QLDC Land Developments and Subdivisions website. Remove 1.8.11(b) because it's a double-up Replace 1.8.11(g) with: Other documentation required by the TA including, but not limited to: -operation and maintenance manuals for 3 waters facilities, irrigation systems, specialised playground equipment, playground safety surfaces, toilets, all-weather sports surfaces, sports field lighting, drinking fountains; -warranties for new facilities (involves electrical and mechanical plant or stormwater low impact design facilities); and -asset valuations for all infrastructures to be taken over by the TA.	provides clarity	Y	Agree - minor amendments (clarification)	Made changes proposed.
New Item	1.8.1.1	Prior to, or as a condition of, granting a resource consent for subdivision or development of land, or as otherwise required by a district plan, or as otherwise considered necessary by QLDC when considering applications to construct infrastructure, QLDC shall require documents to be submitted including the following	the word "may" in Section 1.8.1.1 has been wrongly replaced with the word "shall".	This section is intended to allow Council to require a developer to provide information at various stages of a proposal. It makes no sense to use a word that effectively removes Council's discretion.	Y	agree to clarify	amend "Council may require documents to be submitted ..."
New Item	1.8.2 Drawings	Drawing Standards	TBC - A comprehensive amendment is beyond the scope of this submission format.	CAD and 12D standard needed.	Y	Drawings currently being drafted in CAD	see updated Appendix B

Submissions and Consultation Register 2020
QLDC LD Code of Practice 2020

Submission ID	Section Reference	Submitter Commenting On	Submitter's Proposed Amendment	Submitter Reasoning	Change Y/N	QLDC Reasoning	QLDC Amendment
New Item	3.3 Table 3.3	Reference Table 3.3	There are two table 3.3's which one are they meaning? Needs to be clear		Y	agree to update to correct references	Updated References
New Item	3.3 Table 3.3	Reference Table 3.3	check consistency, there are two different Table 3.3's in the document. Check against references.	Table 3.3 is on page 68 as "road design standards, and again on page 103 as "Recommended surfacing standards"	Y	agree to update to correct references	Updated References
New Item	3.3.2.2	Street Trees - Stage 1 change	Low planting, screen planting and hedges within sight lines of pedestrian crossing access areas are to have a maximum mature height of 500mm. Taller planting shall not have a material effect on sight lines.	RPL understands the intention of this insertion but the provision, as worded, does not provide for alternative options that could still maintain sight lines and meet the safety objective. For instance, a suitable street tree that has been limbed up so that there are no horizontally extending branches below 2.5 metres, could add street amenity without adversely affecting sight lines at a pedestrian crossing.	Y	This will need to be applied for on a case-by-case basis (using your example, what if the limbed up tree was planted before it's mature height). Council will consider deviations if applied for.	added "Any deviations will require approval from Council."
New Item	4.2.1	The designer shall agree the approach to be taken for stormwater with the Property and Infrastructure Team of Council prior to commencing any work or applying for resource consent.	The designer shall agree the approach to be taken for stormwater with the Property and Infrastructure Team of Council prior to commencing any work and may agree the approach prior to, or when, applying for resource consent.	Amendment to be made to give applicants the option to agree the approach to be taken for stormwater with P&I before, or when, applying for resource consent. It is clear from this statement that the Code of Practice kicks in once an applicant has obtained resource consent for a proposal. Of course, this should not prevent a developer from discussing a proposal with the Property and Infrastructure Team of Council either before lodging a resource consent application or during the processing of that application. RPL fully understands the requirement to agree the stormwater design before commencing any work but the Code of Practice should not purport to limit a land owner's rights under the RMA.	Y	Amendment agreed to give applicants the option to agree the approach to be taken for stormwater with P&I before, or when, applying for resource consent	Amend to "The designer shall agree the approach to be taken for stormwater with the Property and Infrastructure Team of Council prior to commencing any work and may agree the approach prior to, or when, applying for resource consent."
New Item	6.3.8.1	Pipes shall be centrally located within an easement	Pipes shall generally be centrally located witihn an easement.	In some more intensive developments the only option may be to have water infrastruture close to a boundary, however defintely located within one property boundary. It does not make sense to put a 0.5m wide easement (for example) on a neighbouring section to comply with this requirement, there should be flexibility depending on final property boundaries.	Y	Agree with suggestion	Revise to: "Pipes shall generally be centrally located witihn an easement."
New Item	6.5.3.1	backfilling requirements	reference to standard drawings is wrong - should be B1-2 and B1-3 for under carriageways		Y	agree B1-4 is irrelevant	....as per Appendix Drawing B1-2 and Drawing B1-3
New Item	6.5.3.2	backfilling requirements	reference to standard drawings is wrong - should be B1-4 for berms		Y	agree. B1-4 is correct	.... in accordance with the requirements of Appendix B Drawing B1-4.
New Item	Appendix B	Drawing references	TBC - A comprehensive amendment is beyond the scope of this submission format.	Drawing references are incorrect - Has anyone else noticed this over the past year btw?	Y	All drawing references have been cross-checked with the newly updated Appendix B drawing set.	Have updated Appendix B and drawing references in text.
New Item	Appendix G	Poor quality electrical standard drawings	At the rear of the QLDC pump station code of practice are layout and wiring drawings for their standard pump station. I want to make our SLD match their designs as far as possible, but unfortunately the quality of the embedded drawings is too poor to make out the detail requirements.	recommend allowing materials such as profile wall PE and GRP pipe for wastewater applications in the larger sizes. Can be more cost effective than PE lined concrete. Also, there is good data from companies such as Romold (Australasia Moulding) about the trafficability of their PP chambers which are now allowed by NZTA and can be an easier to install option for contractors when lined manholes are necessary.	Y	Agree drawings are poor quality. Have amended online version so it is in a readable format	Amended Appendix G so that the drawings are original PDF's rather than screenshots pasted into the document. No material changes
New Item	Drawing B1-8	Drawing B1-8	The internal dropper detail should be the same as an external dropper, if the inlet section "Tee piece" of the internal dropper is Vertical, then the outside pipe cannot be accessed with water blaster for clearing, if the "Tee piece" is horizontal the clearing of the outside pipe can occur. this includes CCTV/ manhole inspection CCTV.		Y	Agree with this suggestion. Please note that we have combined the internal and external drop manholes into 1 drawing, B1-7.	Rotated internal cap so that the Tee-piece is horizontal.
New Item	Drawing B4-3	Rip Rap Lined Swale	Add label for angle of side slopes of 1:1.5	The angle of repose for the size of stone we would expect to line a swale is 32-34 degrees which translates to 1:1.4 to 1:1.6, If we note the max grade of the side slope is 1:1.5 I would be comfortable with that.	Y	To be assessed in Stage 3 (next stage) of the code of practice review. Drawing removed at this stage.	Removed drawing and collated to single drawing in B5-5.
New Item	Drawing B4-6	Dimension between surface and top of soak pit changes from 800 to 702 between the two elevations	Update dimensions		Y	The dimensions are site-specific and should be removed for a typical soakpit drawing	Removed dimensions and added note stating "Soakpit dimensions to be determined based on ground conditions and specific design"
New Item	Drawing B5-4		Minimum cover of 600mm for sump leads will cause a construction issue with subsoil drains as Drawing 5-4 requires the invert of subsoil drains to be deeper than 600mm (depending on pavement depth). QLDC should revise Drawing 5-4 or change the minimum cover requirement to prevent construction complications or mis interpretation.		Y	agreed there is a contradiction. We have updated the drawing B5-4	Change drawing B5-4 to show 1000 mm dimension to be "min 200 mm below subgrade level, and as determined by designer"
New item	Drawing B5-8	Flip No. 3 so slip form is facing the other way. All other kerb profiles have the road on the left and footpath on the right	Update drawing		Y	agree - we have switched No. 3 Slip Form Kerb to align with the other orientations	mirror No. 3 Slip Form Kerb so the footpath is on the right.
New Item	Drawing B6-3 and 3.3.12	References	The reference to the code, including the clause, all needs to be updated. We need to refer to the TCD Manual Part 2, Section 7, but tempered with whatever was in section 3.11.8 referred to on the picture. And my only change to the TCD is the first diagram in the positioning of signs should have 1 and 2 change around.		Y	Agree to update to correct references, and include this in the Code with the exception suggested re: table 7.7	Add to 5th paragraph "Placement of the road name signs shall be in accordance with TCD (2004), except for the sign positioning in Table 7.7 at T intersections of: (a) minor road with minor road, or (b) minor road with undivided major road shall have positions 1 and 2 switched." Update reference in Drawing B6-3 to "Refer to TCD Manual Part 2: Section 7 for street name signs, and QLDC's infrastructure code clause 3.3.12 for fonts and colours within QLDC" and to align with the Street Sign Specification, 2002.
New Item	General		References to, or requirements for, approval relating to resource consents in the code of practice is inappropriate. The resource consent process takes precedence over the code of practice.		Y	Have clarified wording in section 7.3.13. The requirements to gain agreement with Council prior to resource consent in relation to assets that will likely be vested aims to reduce any delays to applicants.	Amended 7.3.13 to "New playground designs are to be signed off by the Parks and Open Spaces Planning Manager. It is strongly advised this is done before resource consent is issued. "
New Item	General	Search and replace LA/TA?	Confirm if its LA or TA		Y	agree, QLDC is a Territorial Authority.	replaced "LA" with "TA" in all instances
New Item	General	Reference to LA's. Should this be TA's?			Y	agree, QLDC is a Territorial Authority.	replaced "LA" with "TA" in all instances
New Item	Referenced Documents - Roads	Road Safety Audit Standard	update to: Road safety audit procedures for projects, NZ Transport Agency, Interim Release May 2013	Old standard referenced in CoP	Y	agreed - This document updates and replaces Road Safety Audit Procedures for Projects. Guideline. Transfund New Zealand Manual No. TFM9.	Updated Reference

Submission ID	Section Reference	Submitter Commenting On	Submitter's Proposed Amendment	Submitter Reasoning	Change Y/N	QLDC Reasoning	QLDC Amendment
New Item	3.4.4.2	2nd Coat Chip Seal	Need to clarify section 3.4.4.1 to reflect that Option 2 (2nd coat by QLDC's roading maintenance contractor) is only available for QLDC vested roads, not private roads or right of ways. Wording is unclear currently.		Y	Agree with change to Code of Practice and Roading Construction Practice Note	Reword to: There are 2 options available for completion of the second coat seal, depending on the ownership of the road: 1) Independently by the developer, this includes private roads and right of ways. A bond will be required if this work will occur post-224c certification to ensure it is completed within the next available sealing season following the first coat application. Details of the second coat seal whall be provided to Council on completion via the Roading Asset data provision/RAMM update sheet process. Council will retain 5% of the bond for 12 months following completion of the second coat to cover any defects occurring within that period. 2) For Council-vested roads, the work may be completed as part of the Council's annual sealing programme and the developer covers costs paid to the council for undertaking this work. The developer shall provide payment to Council to cover the cost of this work prior to 224c certification for subdivision.
2	5.3.7.9/Table 5.6 and 4.3.9.1 for SW	Pipe crossings	Seem a bit over the top when you consisder the backfill and bedding around the pipe should be comapacted to a level that results in reasonable low soil con?????		N	Council are satisfied with the requirement proposed.	
2	5.3.7.9/Table 5.6 and 4.3.9.1 for SW	Pipe crossings	There is no clarification for drainage pipes crossing under kerbs i.e. is the kerb and channel considered a stormwater line? This has previously become an issue and resulted in extra manholes and pipes (sometimes unnecessarily). Clarification on this matter is needed.		N	The clause uses the term "pipe" therefore, kerb and channel is not considered to be relevant.	
3	SW (4.3.9.4), WW (5.3.7.5), W (6.3.12.10.1)	"shall be no less than 0.6m"	need to consider future use outside paved areas to avoid alterations or moving in future		N	Future uses should be considered by designers, and if they want to avoid concrete capping in areas of future trafficable areas, they should provide increased cover.	
5	7.4.11.2	The maintenance period for reserves requires clarity in the Code for approval by the Parks and Open Spaces Planning Manager	The maintenance period should be set at 3 years - rather than a minimum.	This is all that's needed to ensure the grasses, vegetation and landscaping is established properly.	N	There can be extraordinary circumstances which require longer or shorter periods – e.g some trees can take up to 5 years to establish or other times a one year maintenance period may be sufficient (e.g if there are QLDC works proposed in the reserve).	
5	7.4.11.2	The maintenance period for reserves requires clarity in the Code for approval by the Parks and Open Spaces Planning Manager	The wording used here can lead to uncertainty. If the requirement is to be 3 years maintenance then this should be clearly stated and then it is clear for all.		N	There can be extraordinary circumstances which require longer or shorter periods – e.g some trees can take up to 5 years to establish or other times a one year maintenance period may be sufficient (e.g if there are QLDC works proposed in the reserve).	
5	7.4.11.2	The maintenance period for reserves requires clarity in the Code for approval by the Parks and Open Spaces Planning Manager	Amend clause: Generally, the maintenance period for new reserves shall be minimum three years from receiving section 224c certification, but to be approved by Parks and Open Spaces Planning Manager.	Standard NZS 3910 defects maintenance period 12 months. Three years is to long and not justifiable	N	Establishment of trees, shrubs and grass is different to a defects maintenance period. 3 years ensures there is adequate irrigation, healthy plant stock, correct planting procedures etc. Many plantings can fail in the first year	
15	Drawing B2-4	When there is no option but to install toby box in trafficable driveway / riderway then a 150mm x 150mm (WxD) concrete nib is required	We suggest amending Note 3 on Drawing B2-4 to include other options such as a hydrant concrete surround and a Hygrade BMCICH cast iron heavy duty frame and lid (load rated to Class B) or as approved by Council.	This option has recently been approved by Council. There are also other options available, hence the additional comment 'as approved by Council'	N	Code sets out minimum standards. There are other options which are listed in Council's Approved Materials List. Anything not listed is to be approved by Council.	
20	Drawing B5-10: Flat channel or Yard Sump – Private Only & Drawing B5-11 & B5-20 Road Sump Detail	Concrete corbals need to be included in all drawings with manholes.	Should be un reinforced concrete haunching not corbals will not be able to be tied into wall of the precast manholes		N	We are considering reinforced concrete corbals for Stage 3 (next stage) of the code of practice review.	
23	Drawing B5-27	Road failures at concrete thresholds	For settlement, QA required for compaction. Or is this caused by water ingress? Alternatively, could provide a membrane seal with the asphalt		N	It's most likely caused by poor compaction against the concrete threshold exacerbated by downward impact from the vehicles	
23	Drawing B5-27	Road failures at concrete thresholds	Recommend further checking about impact of the concrete slab being an inflexible part of the pavement under only 200mms of compacted basecourse and asphalt. Unsure if the rigidity will lead to cracking and failure along the line of concrete specifically in the asphalt surface.		N	I think it may be regarding reflective cracking above the end of the approach slab. Yes this could happen. The slab could be made more elaborate so that it slopes up to the threshold, but this would be difficult to construct and thus there is some risk of reflective cracking	
23	Drawing B5-27	Road failures at concrete thresholds	most likely poor compaction of bascourse during construction. Approach slab typically do not work just moves issues else where and reflective		N	Agree, but the approach slab requires the contractor to compact the 200mm of material with a plate compactor or smaller and thus the chance of poor compaction resulting from large equipment not getting close enough to the edge is minimised. Because the pavement is only 200mm deep over the approach slab, it isn't going to compact much anyway. Justin is right about reflective cracking at the toe of the approach slab. It could happen. This could be minimised by sloping the approach slab but this would be expensive. Alternatives may be to increase the length of the threshold so that any vehicle 'bounce' is over the concrete, or simply to leave out the approach slab and have rigorous supervision. Never the less there always seems to be settlement against a concrete edge, thus the approach slab is intended to minimise this. It basically boils down to an issue or risk vs cost	
25	Easements in multiple sections 4.3.5, 5.3.7.4, 6.3.8	Stormwater easement width	Change to be 3m as is standard practice	It is not appropriate to use the easement width in the manner sugested to efectively dictate building location. Ground levels can change over time and therefore make the easment width irrelevant. It is an unfair impedement on the landowner. A very deep service would requie an excessive easement width, but the loading of a structure above a deep service may be negligible. The zone of influence is only applicable when applying for a structure near a service, and that relationship should be analysed through the building consent process. A thoughtful foundation design can allow for buildings close to a service, and that process should not be further impeded by having to adjust easement widths.A standard width has been a consistent and historical standard practice for many years. Council has no ability to change the multitude of existing easements that are laid out in this manner.It also creates a messy survey plan, where uneven terrain may require a constantly changing easement width and excessive survey requirements.	N	3m easement may not be appropriate for deeper pipes, so Council have stated "unless otherwise agreed by Council".	

Submission ID	Section Reference	Submitter Commenting On	Submitter's Proposed Amendment	Submitter Reasoning	Change Y/N	QLDC Reasoning	QLDC Amendment
25	Easements in multiple sections 4.3.5, 5.3.7.4, 6.3.8	easement shall be 3m wide or to the full extent of the zone of influence, whichever is greater.	Easement shall be 3m wide, or if the zone of influence extends further than this discussions shall be entered into with Council regarding alternative means of compliance for protection of infrastructure.	QLDC encompasses some very steep terrain and some higher density development. In some instances, a small section (unit development for example) may be permissable with deep infrastrure due to topographical constraints. To then require a 10m wide easement (for example) may be unneccessary when the same protection coulod be achieved by means of a consent notice on the title regarding the zone of influence on building location and design.	N	3m easement may not be appropriate for deeper pipes, so Council have stated "unless otherwise agreed by Council".	
25	Easements in multiple sections 4.3.5, 5.3.7.4, 6.3.8	Sewer easement width	Change to be 3m as is standard practice	as above (4.3.5.d.iii)	N	3m easement may not be appropriate for deeper pipes, so Council have stated "unless otherwise agreed by Council".	
25	Easements in multiple sections 4.3.5, 5.3.7.4, 6.3.8	Water supply easement width	Change to be 3m as is standard practice	as above (4.3.5.d.iii)	N	3m easement may not be appropriate for deeper pipes, so Council have stated "unless otherwise agreed by Council".	
25	Easements in multiple sections 4.3.5, 5.3.7.4, 6.3.8	The Code requires a minimum of 3 meter wide easements through private land. As pipes are getting deeper the zone of influence extends greater then 3 meters. The Code should be amended for a wider easement to the full extent of the Zone of Influence. The Code needs to reflect this so developers are aware when wanting to put pipes in private	Change the wording to: An easement shall be 3 m wide or to the full extent of the zone of influence, whichever is greater, or unless otherwise agreed by Council. and add definition to Zone of Influence: A triangular area defined by lines extending 45° upwards from 150 mm below a pipe invert, to the ground surface.	Zone of influence is more complex than that. Needs clarification to the reason of the easement. 1. Future access. 2. Projection fo pipe from surface loadings. 3. Projection of building foundations from pipe failure and settlement. Different solutions to address each area of concern are available.	N	3m easement may not be appropriate for deeper pipes, so Council have stated "unless otherwise agreed by Council".	
25	Easements in multiple sections 4.3.5, 5.3.7.4, 6.3.8	Change the wording to: An easement shall be 3 m wide or to the full extent of the zone of influence, whichever is greater, or unless otherwise agreed by Council. and add definition to Zone of Influence: A triangular area defined by lines extending 45° upwards from 150 mm below a pipe invert, to the ground surface.	Agree with amendment provided 'or unless otherwise agreed by Council's retained - sometimes easements wider than 3m are not achievable especially in private property but the protection of the pipeline can be achieved by a consent notice "zone of influence" being identified alongside the easement. This would still allow buildings to be built closer to the easement but alerts the owner that specific foundation design is required.		N	3m easement may not be appropriate for deeper pipes, so Council have stated "unless otherwise agreed by Council".	
25	Easements in multiple sections 4.3.5, 5.3.7.4, 6.3.8		The easement needs to be wide enough to allow access for future maintenance but it needs to be recognised that the zone of influence can be dealt with through engineering design for any buildings in the vicinity of the pipe (using the build over section of the COP). There is a concern that council will blankely enforce the zone of influence without recognising that there are appropriate engineering solutions that can avoid the need for overly large easements.		N	3m easement may not be appropriate for deeper pipes, so Council have stated "unless otherwise agreed by Council".	
26	1	This Code of Practice represents a set of minimum standards for developers, ensuring high quality and consistency of infrastructure provision across all of QLDC's various communities. These standards may be exceeded but not compromised.	Waste of time the COP does not ensure quality only consistency in design and in some case inadequacy in design.		N	QLDC have assessed this submission and have decided to keep this clause in the Code.	
27	Schedule 1D		We note the proposed amendment requires plans to be submitted. How does this fit in with Council's proposed approach that all as-built data be submitted via the GIS portal.		N	That's the direction we're heading in, but just not there yet. RAMM update sheets for now until we get the portal connected.	
27	Schedule 1D	Add detail to data specification for roading as-built information.	Under Roading change to : a) A plan indicating road names as approved by the TA, to include consent and stage boundaries, and numbering of Street Light Poles b) Details of above ground roading assets such as road markings, signs, signals, roading drainage (Kerb & Channel, culverts, surface water channels), footpaths and traffic calming, roading retaining walls, and traffic signals.	will this remove the need to supply ramm add or is this extra over this data	N	We are not getting rid of the need for RAMM. Will need these plans as well.	
28	1.1		What is the purpose of having relevant standards in the COP if developers must consult with QLDC staff on them. Secondly who needs to be consulted with, there is no clarification around this. QLDC to remove the statement in consultation with QLDC Staff.		N	Consultation with QLDC is in instances where the Code doesn't have required standards, and will need to look at the referenced standards and discuss with QLDC	
33	1.3.3	Add a note to clarify that the Code of Practice should govern when there are contradicting requirements.		Are these departures necessary - should Council be working to aligning the building code with the CoP where relevant.	N	QLDC are satisfied that the Code is reasonable and should be given precidence	
33	1.3.3		QLDC could have major issues with this as there are several conflicts between the two documents.		N	QLDC are satisfied that the Code is reasonable and should be given precidence	

Submission ID	Section Reference	Submitter Commenting On	Submitter's Proposed Amendment	Submitter Reasoning	Change Y/N	QLDC Reasoning	QLDC Amendment
34	1.8.7.3	The developer shall give the network utility operator 15 working days' notice of intention to connect to existing services. Where required, new services shall be tested and approved by the network utility operator prior to connection.	Change to 10 working days	15 working days is too long	N	Council are happy for the approvals to be processed earlier, and then to allow for 5 days for the inspection to occur. The EA Process is being updated to reflect requirements for connections, thereby providing consitency.	
34	1.8.7.3		Implies another QLDC approval is required for connection to existing service. Adds another delay to construction and could be costly as there will likely be disconnection between an EA accepted drawing and what is required here resulting in additional works to comply with both.		N	Council are happy for the approvals to be processed earlier, and then to allow for 5 days for the inspection to occur. The EA Process is being updated to reflect requirements for connections, thereby providing consitency.	
34	1.8.7.3	notice time	reduce time to 5 days	RPL submits that this change is unreasonable and, if introduced, would signal a reluctance on the part of Council to meet the needs of developers to undertake work in a reasonable timeframe. The New Zealand Standard is to provide 5 days notice and RPL contends that there is no sound reason for QLDC to triple this notice period – especially not in the urban areas where access for Council staff and contractors is simple and frequent. If a longer period of notice was required for more remote areas that are visited less frequently, then this could be signalled.	N	Council are happy for the approvals to be processed earlier, and then to allow for 5 days for the inspection to occur. The EA Process is being updated to reflect requirements for connections, thereby providing consitency.	
34	1.8.7.3	Council is developing a new 3 waters connection process, whereby Property and Infrastructure will need 10 days to review the connection details, and the maintenance contractor will need up to 5 days to schedule the connection inspection. Therefore, the developer should allow for 15 days notice to QLDC.	Revise to: The developer shall give the network utility operator 15 working days' notice of intention to connect to existing services. Where required, new services shall be tested and approved by the network utility operator prior to connection.	To long 5 working days should be more than enough	N	Council are happy for the approvals to be processed earlier, and then to allow for 5 days for the inspection to occur. The EA Process is being updated to reflect requirements for connections, thereby providing consitency.	
38	7.4.6.6	Plant Cells in high movement areas require specification to achieve sufficient soil volume to provide a suitable rooting environment for tree establishment.	Providing a suitable rooting environment is crucial to successful tree establishment. Ensuring a newly-planted tree has sufficient good quality, uncompacted soil increases the trees likelihood of becoming successfully established without disrupting the surrounding infrastructure. Certain specialist design features may reduce the soil volumes required within the pit itself, such as interconnected pits, or incorporation of root paths to nearby uncompacted soil. Achieving sufficient soil volume on sites where the planting area is subjected to loading such as car parking, footpaths, roads above tree roots requires a system of below ground support. Two of the most commonly used methods are structural soils and below-ground, pre-engineered cells. Structural soils are appropriate where other, non-structural soil is also readily available to the tree. For example, trees planted within a parking area adjacent to a soft landscape area, where tree roots can grow freely beneath the hard surfacing, but have access to adjacent uncompacted soil. Pre- engineered cells filled with suitable soil may be necessary in more urban areas where tree roots have fewer opportunities to access soil beyond the tree pit. The use of either approach requires specialist knowledge and advice should be sought from the manufacturer/supplier before being included in the tree pit design.	What a load of ??????????????????	N	Council have assessed the suggestion and would like to keep the section after discussing with a tree specialist, who believes QLDC should expect any developer investing in new tree planting to have either an arborist or professional in the field of landscaping on the team to advise around tree pit design and incorporating the principles included in this section into any proposed new tree planting.	
40	7.4.6.3	The maximum verge width possible is Council's preference when establishing new street trees and ensuring that they are sustainable and will not damage kerbing or pathways. In addition, a reasonable verge width is crucial to the establishment and success of grass within these spaces. Code currently requires 0.9 m. Add clause for minimum width of verge for planting street trees to be min 1.8m.	QLDC need to review and consider the implication of increasing the berm width from 1.2 to 1.8m. Footpaths will now be closer or hard up against the boundary if road reserves are to be minimum width as defined in the COP and hence service boxes will end up in footpaths instead of berms		N	In order for trees to successfully establish within the harsh environment associated with relatively narrow road reserves (heat sink from road and path, competition from grass for moisture and nutrients, presence of below ground and above ground services, usually modified and compacted soil environment, close proximity of built structures) and to allow trees to form adequate root zones for stability purposes, the planting environment needs to be as large as possible in all aspects. I therefore consider that the proposed minimum of 1.8 meters to be adequate, though where space allows, it would be my preference to see this increased. Should provision be required for service boxes, I see no reason why the path cannot be routed around these boxes as long as the box is located between street trees.	
41	7.4.5.1	Update Section 7.4.4 for gardens to have wood edging requirements for community and local gardens to retain the mulch and top soil.	When will this be determined as it will have cost implication on landscaping design and construction if it is decided last minute. QLDC to clarify when this needs to be determined.		N	You can discuss the requirements of the timber edging with Council pre-application for development.	
41	7.4.5.1	Update Section 7.4.4 for gardens to have wood edging requirements for community and local gardens to retain the mulch and top soil.	Mulched areas timber edging to be maintained at 100 mm minimum' - what does this mean? Consider putting together typical detail covering gardens and wood edging etc.		N	You can discuss the requirements of the timber edging with Council pre-application for development.	

Submission ID	Section Reference	Submitter Commenting On	Submitter's Proposed Amendment	Submitter Reasoning	Change Y/N	QLDC Reasoning	QLDC Amendment
46	3.3.11.1 and 3.4.14.1	Tactile pavers	QLDC should specify the adhesive for use on tactile pavers or at least state in accordance with manufactures requirements instead of making the developer seek their approval.		N	Manufacturers requirements do not necessarily deal with their products being used in an alpine setting. Stick down tactile pavers have been avoided in the past because council has experienced difficulties with pavers becoming unstuck and a safety hazard. However, it is recognised that there can be alternative adhesives that work in alpine conditions so Council will consider them on a case by case basis. If a specific specification can be determined this will be included in the COP .The alternative is to continue to avoid stick down tactile pavers as an option.	
46	3.3.11.1 and 3.4.14.1	Tactile pavers	Suggest Polyurethane and steel studs are removed from accepted materials as they do not last and become slippery		N	QLDC have reviewed the use of tactile paver and considered that the yellow and stainless steel are both acceptable.	
48	3.3 Table 3.3	Details for pedestrians, cyclists and movement lane widths do not meet Austroads standards.	Suggest removing this table and using Austroads standards for geometric road design.	Confusing details	N	Stage 3 review of road design (Table 3.3)	
53	3.3.16.3 , 3.4.14.2 and 3.4.3.1	update to min 30mm	Alternatively, could have 25mm with "mix 10"		N	Council have assessed the suggestion and would like to keep it at 30 mm	
54	3.4.4.1 and 1.10	Second coat	Is second coat a defined factor? Refine terminology		N	refer to: 3.4.4.1 First and second coat chip seals	
55	3.4.1	Sealing Season	This needs better clarity between sealing outside the season and construction of basecourse pavement layers outside the season. The technical bulletin referred to only only deals with sealing. Construction of basecourse pavement layers should be permitted.		N	If agreed as a sealing exception, intuitively basecourse construction would be allowed under that process –otherwise no basecourse construction in winter	
56	3	Inspections	(overall) having two inspections one at pre-seal then one after sealing seems like an increase in delays and waste of time given the QLDC inspectors require 7 days' notice and are usually very busy. The QLDC Practice note for road construction is not a public available document yet. This reference can't be made until such time as the practice note is issued.		N	I am not aware of any delays in inspections and am not aware of where the 7 day notice period comes from and so I am unable to comment on this. However the two inspections are certainly required, one at preseal and one after the seal coat(membrane) has been applied to ensure that a complete coverage has been achieved and that there is no damage to the seal coat. We also ensure that there is a tight bond between the two surfaces. Hence the two inspections are indeed required and are both important to the overall product being presented to Council as an asset.	
56	3	Ensure the Code of Practice aligns with the Practice Note for Roading Construction, 2020.	Delay changes until practice note is available	Can't comment as practice note is not available	N	Practice Note for Roading Construction is published on Council's website.	
56	3	Line Marking	(3.3.12) QLDC to change wording so that the second coat is completed between 1 and 3 months of the first coat. Line markings do require a second coat but not within 24 hours		N	Experience we have had with line marking is that one coat is applied and then left for weeks, by the time the second coat is applied the 1st coat has gone and you are back to square one. Prefer to keep the requirement of the coat being done within 24 hours and aligns with the NZTA specifications	
56	3	Surface Irregularities	Code is stating finished surface 5mm above channel fenders and is not allowing any tolerance, this is not practically achieveable. Should at least be 0-5mm. Also all very good to have these requirements but when they are not achieved there is a risk of a whole load of patches everywhere to rectify issues. Some common sense will be needed when imposing these requirements, main point being the surface should not pond water.		N	The 5mm above the concrete channel is a maximum, hence the 0-5mm as mentioned is implied. This is explained rather well in M10:2014. Practical tolerance is certainly applied on site when conducting the inspections and rather that looking for areas of non compliance, we look for consistantancy, thus minimising the need for remedial works and patches. This does however require a greater emphasis to be placed on the site QA which, if done correctly, should minimise the need for any such repairs to be required.	
56	3	Sub-base	AP 65 is specified in 3.4.2.2, so is M/3 needed here?	Definition of AP65 is covered by section 3.4.2.2. Now refers to NZTA M/3. Why give finishes of surface when covered by B/2.	N	Council are merely highlighting what is required and will now be requiring confirmation of this from site, in accordance with TNZ/B2.	removed first sentence from 3.4.7
56	3	Sub-base testing requirements	Clegg Hammer should be allowed for testing with specific CIV values, even if for trench reinstatement only (i.e. CIV 25 minimum)	Clegg Hammer is an allowable testing method in other New Zealand Codes of Practice (reference Waitato Regional Infrastructure Technical Specifications, section 3.8.3.3 for example) and should be allowed for in QLDC also. It would require some minimum CIV value tables added.	N	We only allow Clegg Hammer testing on footpaths and vehicle crossings. We require far more information at subgrade that a clegg hammer cannot provide. It can be used in conjunction with NDM but not on its own for roading.	
56	3	Sub-base testing requirements	Nuclear Densometer compliance minimum and average vaules to be added with minimum number of tests (min 92% MDD average 95% MDD)	Specifying testing types also would naturally require specifying of required compliance values so there is no room for misinterpretation of compliance requirements	N	We are merely emphasising what is required in TNZ/B2 Spec	
56	3	Basecourse testing requirements	Clegg Hammer should be allowed for testing with specific CIV values, even if for trench reinstatement only (i.e. CIV 40 minimum)	Clegg Hammer is an allowable testing method in other New Zealand Codes of Practice (reference Waitato Regional Infrastructure Technical Specifications, section 3.8.3.3 for example) and should be allowed for in QLDC also. It would require some minimum CIV value tables added.	N	We only allow Clegg Hammer testing on footpaths and vehicle crossings. We require far more information at subgrade that a clegg hammer cannot provide. It can be used in conjunction with NDM but not on its own for roading.	
56	3	Basecourse testing requirements	Nuclear Densometer compliance minimum and average vaules to be added with minimum number of tests (min 95% MDD average 98% MDD)	Specifying testing types also would naturally require specifying of required compliance values so there is no room for misinterpretation of compliance requirements	N	We are merely emphasising what is required in TNZ/B2 Spec	
59	3.3.12	No parking off a roadway signage	Further discussion required.	This will not prevent parking on road berms, people currently park on road berms where there are vertical barrier kerbs, you just drive in via a vehicle crossing. The extra signage is a waste of time.	N	We have been informed by Regulatory that these signs are to enable enforcement. They may also inform drivers that they cannot park off a roadway.	
68	3.3.2.1		Check relevance of NZTA Guide reference		N	NZTA Guidance contains the most up to date Austroads Guides and Supplementary Info	
71	3.3.16.1 and Table 3.3	Private way gradients	Inconsistent - Max grade under 'Rural Live and Play' lanes in table 3.3 is 20%. Private ways and driveways should align with this also, otherwise you have tighter controls over private ways and driveways than the lanes etc that feed them, which is counter intuitive.		N	16% is considered reasonable. Deviations may be accepted if DP rules are met. Generally don't want grades at 20%	
71	3.3.16.1 and Table 3.3	Centreline grades should be revised to align with the District Plan	Amend (a) and add (b): (a)Not be steeper than 1 in 6 for any private way used for vehicle access (b)In residential zones where a private way serves no more than 2 residential units the maximum gradient may be increased to 1 in 5 provided: i.The average gradient over the full length of the private way does not exceed 1 in 6; and ii.The maximum gradient is no more than 1 in 6 within 6m of the road boundary; and iii.The private way is sealed with non-slip surfacing	No practical for a number of site develiped in the past and still to be developed on steep areas of queenstown 1 in 4 with appropriate vertical curves better limit.	N	16% is considered reasonable. Deviations may be accepted if DP rules are met. Generally don't want grades at 20%	
72	4.3.5.1		TBC - A comprehensive amendment is beyond the scope of this submission format.	RCP6.5 should be considered	N	No change needed. P&I have decided to take a conservative approach and use 'worst case' scenarios - review over time will occur.	
75	4.3.4	Critical Structures	When are the critical structures to be determined by QLDC? If at EA this will just cause more delays with approvals as this will likely be something a peer review will do and there will be a lot of back and forward. EA should have a time limit.		N	Undertaking further analysis and review of defining 'critical structures' being considered in Stage 3 (next stage) of the code of practice review.	
75	4.3.4	Critical Structures	Agree but there should be some guidance as to what are critical structures		N	Undertaking further analysis and review of defining 'critical structures' being considered in Stage 3 (next stage) of the code of practice review.	
75	4.3.4	Stormwater system design	Delete reference to critical structures	Critical structures are determined by Council? This is subjective and not appropriate as it is the responsibilty of the designer to determine primary structures as part of the design	N	Undertaking further analysis and review of defining 'critical structures' being considered in Stage 3 (next stage) of the code of practice review.	

Submission ID	Section Reference	Submitter Commenting On	Submitter's Proposed Amendment	Submitter Reasoning	Change Y/N	QLDC Reasoning	QLDC Amendment
81	4.3.7.9	Soakage design guide	Consider alternative guidance	We have done a lot of work developing soakage best practice for other councils. It is best to test in accordance BRE365 (applicable to alluvial gravels), do design in accordance with CIRIA 156 (UK design guide/international best practice) but note that this will contradict the NZBC, but the NZBC is not entirely appropriate (low of FoS). Best to test all durations and both NZBC and CIRIA and take the larger of the two. We have a specialist who can assist with this (Mark Groves)	N	Council are investigating better soakage design guidelines currently, but as an interim improvement on the NZBC E1/VM1 methodology, we have added Auckland City Council because VM1 is meant for design of individual buildings, wherease Auckland's methodology is for larger scales/networks	
81	4.3.7.9	There is no soakage test methodology and E1/VM1 keeps getting reverted to which isn't ideal Need to specify which methodology is to be used	Add: Full or partial subdivision soakage systems shall be designed (including soakage testing) in accordance with Auckland City Council Soakage Design Manual 2003. Also update Referenced Documents	Auckland guide not applicable	N	Different soakage test methodology is in the Auckland design manual. Further review being undertaken in Stage 3 (next stage) of the code of practice review.	
82	4.3.7.9 (b)	Capping maximum permeability rates for soakage system design allows for reduced performance over time due to infiltration of fines, rubbish, organics and lack of maintenance. Also recommend a standardised soakage test.	Requires longer pre-soak times and more importantly the tests to be repeated if water drains quickly.	Limits should be set as to max soakage rate for different soil type unless detailed site investiagtion done and a basic soakge test may not be applicable	N	Council are investigating better soakage design guidelines currently, but as an interim improvement on the NZBC E1/VM1 methodology, we have added Auckland City Council because VM1 is meant for design of individual buildings, wherease Auckland's methodology is for larger scales/networks	
83	C.4.3.5.1		Unsure if should be designing to a higher unlikely scenario? Recommend further consultation with expert stormwater engineer.		N	We want to look at the more conservative models in terms of climate change projections and our record of exceeding the limits	
83	C.4.3.5.1	NIWA HIRDS rainfall data system has changed to version 4, RCP, and QLDC would like to specify an RCP of 8.5 when using NIWA HIRDS for rainfall design data.	Replace clause: Rainfall intensity shall allow for climate change. Rainfall intensity design charts developed from NIWA High Intensity Rainfall Design Systems (HIRDS) V4 RCP 8.5 data for 2081-2100 should be used for rainfall design.	Overly conservative assumes global warming not addressedd in any way increases peak flows by 50% increasing pipe sizes.	N	The RCP scenario covers the 2.1 degrees of climate change, so no change necessary.	
83	C.4.3.5.1	Rainfall intensity shall allow for climate change.	Rainfall intensity shall allow for 2.1 degrees Celcius of climate change.	Example of climate change requirement only. Would avoid variations in calculations provided to Council for engineering approval if a figure was specified here.	N	The RCP scenario covers the 2.1 degrees of climate change, so no change necessary.	
83	C.4.3.5.1	Stormwater Design Parameters	Are you able to provide any feedback as to why some of the ambiguous references regarding stormwater design parameters haven't been addressed? In particular it would be helpful to have a direct reference to HIRDS and what climate change assumptions need to be allowed for when selecting design storm.		N	C4.3.5.1 covered Nigel's concerns. "Thanks, yes that was the source of the current confusion and I had missed that proposed change in the amendment list but good to have that spelt out."	
86	4.2.8	stormwater treatment for carparks over 30 spaces	No change until Trade Waste bylaw released.	Ensure aligns with Trade Waste bylaw as stated.	N	Currently this is good practice, used with other Councils in NZ. If there are any changes in the Bylaw, we will amend the Code.	
86	4.2.8		TBC - A comprehensive amendment is beyond the scope of this submission format.	How are these to be monitored and maintained. To what standard should they be designed.	N	To be ensured in the consent process, but could explore the requirements for design of these systems	
87	4.3.5	Design Storm AEP/ARI	TBC - A comprehensive amendment is beyond the scope of this submission format.	ARI to AEP isn't always a straighforword conversion.	N	Undertaking further analysis and review of stormwater changes under Stage 3 (next stage) of the code of practice review.	
88	4.3.7.7	For raingardens, the design storm should be the primary design storm (i.e. the 5% AEP, not 10% AEP)	The implications of having swales to accommodate 5% AEP storm have not been fully assessed as it will mean non compliance other COP requirements e.g. it will make them extremely big and not able to fit in the road reserve. Re think this clause and wording before changing.		N	The primary event needs to be accomodated, so will leave it at 5% and swales with other conveyance solutions should be considered if space is limited.	
88	4.3.7.7	For raingardens, the design storm should be the primary design storm (i.e. the 5% AEP, not 10% AEP)	Replace 10% with 5%	Raingardens desinged for Water treatment flow and volume with bypass for other flows see appropriate rain garden design guides Christchurch and Auckland City	N	Code requires 5% to be managed by raingarden not treated by raingarden. Managed refers to management of primary network flows diverted to scruffy dome, manholes etc.	
New Item	4.3		TBC - A comprehensive amendment is beyond the scope of this submission format.	Soakage design standard requires updating	N	not consulted on - move to Stage 3 (next stage) of the code of practice review.	
New Item	4.3		TBC - A comprehensive amendment is beyond the scope of this submission format.	Small catchment Hydrology assessment method required with standard calculations/calcsheets	N	not consulted on - move to Stage 3 (next stage) of the code of practice review.	
New Item	4.3		TBC - A comprehensive amendment is beyond the scope of this submission format.	Medium/large catchment Hydrology assessment method required with standard calculations/calcsheets	N	not consulted on - move to Stage 3 (next stage) of the code of practice review.	
New Item	4.3		TBC - A comprehensive amendment is beyond the scope of this submission format.	Complex catchment Hydrology assessment method required with hydrological modelling variables and calibration	N	not consulted on - move to Stage 3 (next stage) of the code of practice review.	
New Item	4.3		TBC - A comprehensive amendment is beyond the scope of this submission format.	LID requires definition and methodology	N	not consulted on - move to Stage 3 (next stage) of the code of practice review.	
New Item	4.3.7.7	Rain Gardens	TBC - A comprehensive amendment is beyond the scope of this submission format.	Statement is technically ambiguous and prone to misinterpretation.	N	not consulted on - move to Stage 3 (next stage) of the code of practice review.	
New Item	1.8.1.2	Allow EA and RC processess to run in tandem	1.8.1.2 Notwithstanding 1.8.1.1, a designer, land owner or developer may submit documents for design review and acceptance at any time and, in such instances, the applicant will be solely responsible for any additional processing costs that arise from any changes made by the applicant and/or any changes made in response to conditions of the resource consent or other requirements of council. The applicant will be responsible for providing any additional information that council may require to complete its assessment.	There is clear direction in the Code of Practice (eg at Section 1.8.4.2) that construction shall not commence until resource consents have been issued (and section 116 of the RMA has been complied with) and the council "has approved any other consents and the drawings, specifications and calculations for the specific infrastructure that is required in accordance with 1.8.4.1.".	N	not consulted on - move to Stage 3 (next stage) of the code of practice review.	
New Item	1.8.4.1	timing of EA process "In considering project design and giving its review and acceptance, the LA shall act without undue delay"	In considering project design and giving its review and acceptance, the LA shall act without undue delay and these processes should be completed within 10 working days.	RPL has had many instances where delays in the processing of such approvals have been unacceptably long. Other legislation, such as the Building Act and the Resource Management Act contain clearer guidance on what timeframes are acceptable for Council processes. RPL submits that a similar provision should be added to the Code of Practice and submits that there is no reason not to have some discipline introduced into the process.RPL believes that the development community would see such an initiative on Council's part as a signal that QLDC was keen to support development and help developers.	N	The requirement in the National Code of Practice to act without undue delay is considered reasonable.	
New Item	2.3.1		Could add a section on cold weather, eg frost depth,		N	not consulted on - move to Stage 3 (next stage) of the code of practice review.	
New Item	2.3.1	An overarching 'Natural Hazards assessment' would cover off the design factors			N	not consulted on - move to Stage 3 (next stage) of the code of practice review.	

Submission ID	Section Reference	Submitter Commenting On	Submitter's Proposed Amendment	Submitter Reasoning	Change Y/N	QLDC Reasoning	QLDC Amendment
New Item	2.3.1	The subheadings following 2.3.1 don't follow the (a) - (j) list.	Suggest that the section is recorded to suit		N	not consulted on - move to Stage 3 (next stage) of the code of practice review.	
New Item	2.3.1 - (j)	Geothermal issues - there really aren't any in QLDC	Remove reference		N	not consulted on - move to Stage 3 (next stage) of the code of practice review.	
New Item	2.3.2	Suggest a specific liquefaction section is added	Reference MBIE guidance- Planning and engineering guidance for potentially liquefaction-prone land 2017		N	not consulted on - move to Stage 3 (next stage) of the code of practice review.	
New Item	2.3.2 (d)	Foundation stability	Suggest add reference to MBIE Module 4 - Earthquake resistant foundation design		N	not consulted on - move to Stage 3 (next stage) of the code of practice review.	
New Item	2.3.2 (e)	Stream instability	Appears unfinished, and not highly relevant, should maybe reference lateral spread		N	not consulted on - move to Stage 3 (next stage) of the code of practice review.	
New Item	2.3.2 (f)	Local conditions	This should potentially actual reference local conditions within the region, this may be more helpful		N	not consulted on - move to Stage 3 (next stage) of the code of practice review.	
New Item	2.3.2 (g)	Peer review references	The Crawford and Millar Geomechanics News reference is unclear - Confirm which one it is. https://www.eqc.govt.nz/research/research-papers/the-design-of-permanent-slopes-for-residential-building-development, or Crawford and Millar 1998. More up to date references could be included.		N	not consulted on - move to Stage 3 (next stage) of the code of practice review.	
New Item	2.3.4	Stability criteria applicable to land development in NZ are published or recommended by the NZGS (see Reference documents)	There are no referenced documents. Confirm which Stability criteria are expected		N	not consulted on - move to Stage 3 (next stage) of the code of practice review.	
New Item	2.3.5	Local conditions	This should potentially actual reference local conditions within the region, this may be more helpful (see also 2.3.2 (f)		N	not consulted on - move to Stage 3 (next stage) of the code of practice review.	
New Item	2.3.8	Seismic Considerations	Seismic considerations should perhaps be more expanded, referencing the NZGS guidelines, and actual requirements QLDC are looking for https://www.building.govt.nz/building-code-compliance/b-stability/b1-structure/geotechnical-guidance/		N	not consulted on - move to Stage 3 (next stage) of the code of practice review.	
New Item	2.3.9	Surcharge loading	Other TAs have a requirement for the surcharge loading for the top of retaining walls. QLDC could consider adding a note that 12kPa as unfactored load should be applied for roads.		N	not consulted on - move to Stage 3 (next stage) of the code of practice review.	
New Item	2.3.9	Design parameters	Provide specific reference to MBIE guidance https://www.building.govt.nz/building-code-compliance/b-stability/b1-structure/module-6-earthquake-retaining-wall-design/		N	not consulted on - move to Stage 3 (next stage) of the code of practice review.	
New Item	2.6.1	Section 3.3.7 of NZS3604:2011	This will require that each new development has 5 Scala tests to confirm good ground. Unsure if this is currently the case.		N	not consulted on - move to Stage 3 (next stage) of the code of practice review.	
New Item	2.6.1	Geotech completion report for all developments	Amend clause 1 to allow for situations where there is an existing 2A for the previous / original subdivision. Dispensation for small infill within existing residential zones such as unit titles or subdivisions where the dwellings are already constructed. Clause 10 reworded to reflect existing 2A also.	Additional expense to the small developer that is unnecessary. If a 2A has historically been provided and no modification of the site has occurred that should be allowed for.	N	not consulted on - move to Stage 3 (next stage) of the code of practice review.	
New Item	3.2.7	Road Safety audits	Addition: Road Safety Audits should be completed by a suitably qualified person who is independent from the project. Suggested additional addition: A Road Safety Audit should be comprised of team, with a minimum of 2 members.	Outline qualification requirements, and that they should be independent.	N	not consulted on - move to Stage 3 (next stage) of the code of practice review.	
New Item	3.4.15	Kerb & channel basecourse, no mention of it in this section. Drawing B5-8 states kerb & channels are to have min 200mm depth of compacted AP40 or GAP65 under them	Update section to include this detail		N	not consulted on - move to Stage 3 (next stage) of the code of practice review.	
New Item	4.2.1	The designer shall agree the approach to be taken for stormwater with the Property and Infrastructure Team of Council prior to commencing any work or applying for resource consent.	This change is at odds with the purpose of the Code of Practice and RPL submits that it needs to be deleted.	It appears that the underlined words were added earlier this year (29 January 2020) without any consultation.RPL is also very concerned that such a change, which could potentially have a huge negative effect on the rate at which development in this district proceeds, could be made without any consultation with the development community.	N	QLDC have made the requested change on the bases of earlier submission to allow for agreement when applying for resource consent.	
New Item	5.3.11	pump stations	suggest it is good to include more detail around what is acceptable to QLDC: preferred pump suppliers, example arrangement of smaller stations (items required for land developers), guidance around how deep the reticulation should get to before a pump station is necessary (i.e. Christchurch only allows about 3.5 m depth of incoming invert), preferred pipe materials for in wetwell and valve chamber (i.e. WaterCare want SS, CCC want sch 80 steel)		N	not consulted on - move to Stage 3 (next stage) of the code of practice review.	
New Item	5.3.5.3	Sewer. Minimum pipe sizes Original clause C5.3.5.3: For infill situations, particularly where upgrading of existing DN 100 connections in sound condition and at reasonable grades would be impractical, it is common practice for up to six dwelling units to use the existing connection. However, such connections would not normally be taken over as public pipes by the TA.	Reinstate this clause that was removed without consultation in the previous COP amendment	This is a practical solution for infill and avoids uncessary disturbance of the street in cases where the existing pipe size and hydraulics can be shown to be suitable	N	We removed section C5.3.5.3 from the code in Stage 1 because there was a conflict between this section and Table 5.3, where C5.3.5.3 allowed for up to 6 dwellings to be serviced by a 100mm lateral, and Table 5.3 states 150mm pipes shall service more than 1 dwelling unit. QLDC agreed that 150mm takes precedence so therefore removed C5.3.5.3. In cases where the existing pipe size and hydraulics can be shown to be suitable, this should be discussed with Council on a case-by-case basis.	

Submission ID	Section Reference	Submitter Commenting On	Submitter's Proposed Amendment	Submitter Reasoning	Change Y/N	QLDC Reasoning	QLDC Amendment
New Item	7.3.1	Street Trees - Stage 1 change "All new trees in reserves and road reserves require the approval of the QLDC Arborist unless trees are approved species from QLDC Street Tree Planting Guidelines Appendix I. When garden assets lie within the road corridor and are in areas of 50 km/hr and above, approval by QLDC's Parks and Opens Spaces Manager is required. This will be assessed based on appropriate levels of service and traffic management requirements."		Concerned that this provision could be applied in very slow vehicle speed environments (eg shared spaces where the anticipated speeds are less than 10kph) These spaces generally also require specific attention to landscaping and CPTED because they are high pedestrian areas. Among those requirements will be the provision of shade and the elimination of places where people might hide. So it is important that developers are able to use taller trees that make for safe environments.	N	Justification can be provided for any specific design submitted.	
New Item	Appendix B	Attenuation	TBC - A comprehensive amendment is beyond the scope of this submission format.	Standard design required	N	not consulted on - move to Stage 3 (next stage) of the code of practice review.	
New Item	Appendix B	Raingarden	TBC - A comprehensive amendment is beyond the scope of this submission format.	Standard design required	N	The stormwater section of the Code will be reviewed in more depth for Stage 3 (next stage) of the code of practice review.	
New Item	Appendix C and 4.3.10.6	Manhole testing	I wasn't able to find any direct reference to manhole flood testing although we do at least make a clear 'watertight' requirement (4.3.10.6). Suggest we should be capturing this within Appendix C, along with the pipe testing requirements. Use Watercare test requirements (see email from Simon on 16/7/2020)		N	Not consulted on - move to Stage 3 (next stage) of the code of practice review.	
New Item	Approved Materials List - Wastewater	no updates?	recommend allowing materials such as profile wall PE and GRP pipe for wastewater applications in the larger sizes. Can be more cost effective than PE lined concrete. Also, there is good data from companies such as Romold (Australasia Moulding) about the trafficability of their PP chambers which are now allowed by NZTA and can be an easier to install option for contractors when lined manholes are necessary.		N	QLDC has to go through a formal procedure to add new materials into the approved materials list, so this will be moved to Stage 3 (next stage) of the code of practice review. QLDC will get in touch around WSP's suggestion for profile wall PE and GRP pipe for wastewater applications.	
New item	C2.3.7.1		Should there be a reference to e.g. Auckland Council TP90 as a best practice?		N	No, TP90 is out of date and has been supersed by GD05. QLDC now have a Guideline for Environment Management Plans that references GD05 and other best practice sources. We condition that environmental management is undertaken in accordance with the guideline at Resource Consent.	
New Item	Drawing B2-11	Water smapling point	improve image quality	poor image quality	N	QLDC have redone all Appendix B drawings in CAD, so they will be better quality now.	
New Item	Drawing B4-6	Soakpit	TBC - A comprehensive amendment is beyond the scope of this submission format.	Standard design requires updating	N	Will be assessed in Stage 3 (next stage) of the code of practice review, including mudtank/siphon detail	
New Item	Drawing B5-14	Hillside sump alternative	improve image quality	poor image quality	N	QLDC have decided to remove this alternative sump detail, because in rare situations that will require this large-scale solution should be engineered and agreed at the EA stage.	
New item	Drawing B5-15	Pipe Bends	TBC - A comprehensive amendment is beyond the scope of this submission format.	Pipe bends shown conflict with CoP	N	not consulted on - move to Stage 3 (next stage) of the code of practice review.	
New Item	General	Document Format	It was convenient to have the amendments proposed in the current review shown in a different coloured typeface. We did however note that there were some new insertions (eg a new paragraph inserted within section 3.3.2.2) that were not coloured, so they would not have been readily seen by anyone wishing to review the changes. Also of concern were instances of deletions from the Code that were not highlighted. For example at 3.3.4 the changes proposed by the authors could have been better understood if the key words that are proposed to be deleted had been marked using "strikethrough" (strikethrough).		N	Deletions are clear in the amendments register and Council have decided to omit this from the word document. We also have the old Code of Practices on our website (2015, 2018 V1 and V2, and soon 2020) so a designer can review the relevant version of the Code to see the changes	add 2018 V1 to website
New Item	General	Document Format	all current and past insertions and amendments made by QLDC should be readily identifiable. This could be simply achieved using coloured text and strikethrough (strikethrough). RPL notes that the 2018 version of the QLDC Code of Practice showed the then recent additions and the historic additions in separate colours. Using multiple colours to show the history of all past changes was useful but is probably not necessary, so long as a reader can readily see both the additions and the deletions from NZS 4404:2010.	This is important because NZS 4404:2010 is a national standard and having the local additions and deletions clearly marked would allow professionals, who use NZS 4404:2010 in other districts, to easily identify where different standards apply in the Queenstown Lakes District. It also means that the Code of Practice becomes a tool that would help QLDC to illustrate (both to external users and to Council's own staff and consultants) the different emphasis Council may wish to give to certain matters and where Council's issues and priorities may, in some circumstances, differ from those in other districts	N	Deletions are clear in the amendments register and Council have decided to omit this from the word document. We also have the old Code of Practices on our website (2015, 2018 V1 and V2, and soon 2020) so a designer can review the relevant version of the Code to see the changes	add 2018 V1 to website

267 **items total**