

## **LGIDA BOARD'S CONSIDERATION OF SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED ON VERSION 5 OF THE IDM.**

### **INTRODUCTION**

The LGIDA Board at its meeting on the 18 March 2016 resolved to place version 5 of the IDM on public exhibition for a 6 week period inviting submissions on the content of the IDM and associated documents prior to the Technical Committee and the Board adopting version 5 of the IDM.

Version 5 of the IDM was placed on public exhibition on the 15 April 2016 and closed on the 27 May 2016.

264 stakeholders were invited by email to make a submission and a further 194 invitations were sent by mail. The website also had a section allocated to the proposed new release of version 5. A newsletter was also prepared which detailed the major changes to the IDM proposed in version 5 and give details of making submissions.

### **SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED**

At the close of the public exhibition period 10 submissions were received as detailed below:

1. Nathan Bawden Tomkinson Group
2. Simon Carson Moira Shire Council
3. Evan Nisbett Baw Baw Shire Council
4. Gordon Templeton ALDE
5. Felicia Davis Land Urban Consulting
6. John Bryce Greater Geelong City Council
7. Barry Dyson
8. Peter Brasier Greater Bendigo City Council
9. John Inglis
10. Steve Skinner

### **CONSIDERATION OF SUBMISSIONS BY THE LGIDA BOARD**

The LGIDA Board held a special meeting on the 3 June 2016 to consider the 10 submissions received in relation to version 5 of the IDM.

The 10 submitters have raised 50 issues as detailed below. The Board has considered each submission and made a recommendation to the LGIDA Technical Committee for their consideration.

Issue Number	Submitter	Description of Issue	Requested Change	Clause or SD Number	LGIDA Board Recommendations to Technical Committee
1	Nathan Bawden Tomkinson Group	Section 19.3.4 example calculation should have answers in litres not m <sup>3</sup> (i.e. 5,400l and 4,200l not 5,400 m <sup>3</sup> and 4,200 m <sup>3</sup> )	Change the units to litres	19.3.4	Agree to request
2	Nathan Bawden Tomkinson Group	SD 620 Collector Level 1 is only shown as 11.0m carriageway when it should now be 11.6m	Change the SD to show a 11.6m carriageway	SD605	Agree to request
3	Simon Carson Moira Shire Council	Advising of selection table choices for Selection Table 7.9.1; 12.7.6; 16.16; and 24.4.8	Make changes to selection table as requested		Agree to request
4	Simon Carson Moira Shire Council	Why is the IDM insisting that all S173 Agreements be generated by the Council, as the MSC would prefer this wording removed, then providing flexibility as to whom can prepare these agreements? From experience, this becomes an onerous task administered by our Planning Department, including recovering costs of such agreement. We see this process being the Applicants responsibility and not Councils. In doing this would remove the onerous task on Council and in most cases expedite this process too.	Request wording be changed to provide greater flexibility to allow applicants to have the option to prepare the agreement.	Appendix G	Existing wording in IDM states “ <b>Councils</b> will prepare and lodge S173 agreements for on-site detention at the cost of the Developer.”  <b>Recommendation</b> <b>Councils</b> may prepare and lodge S173 agreements for on-site detention at the cost of the Developer. Where Councils choose not to prepare such agreements it will be the applicant’s responsibility to do so.
5	Simon Carson Moira Shire Council	Would the Committee also be open to providing some further context to standardise the wording of Appendix G. I’m suggesting the inclusion of any deferred works to be included into the	Adding additional words to provide for deferred works	Appendix G	The 2 <sup>nd</sup> line of this appendix states “The following is an extract of the <b>typical</b> wording of the ‘Covenants of the Owner’.”

Issue Number	Submitter	Description of Issue	Requested Change	Clause or SD Number	LGIDA Board Recommendations to Technical Committee
		wording of this agreement. For example, works to be completed “prior to the use commencing” or “prior to connecting to Council’s LPD” as from experience in allot of the cases OSD works are deferred until the parcel of land (vacant) is developed. In doing this, will ensure the correct OSD infrastructure is installed and at the right time, also removes the need for bonds being held by Council for unknown timeframes and sometime indefinite?			<p>This gives Councils the flexibility that is being requested. Furthermore dot point 2 of the covenants already gives this flexibility “Each on-site detention stormwater system on the specified lots will be completed prior to connection to <b>Council’s</b> drainage system.”</p> <p><b>Recommendation: No change required.</b></p>
6	Simon Carson Moira Shire Council	Can greater flexibility be considered to be written into this clause? For example the inclusion of, “unless otherwise agreed to in writing by the Responsible Authority”. The inclusion of this statement will give Councils a greater digression and flexibility to vary the level of road and drainage infrastructure to be provided in LDRZ areas and in this case, allow for a lessor standard of infrastructure. Should the blanket approach remain, then will mean these areas could become unviable to develop and pre-empt being challenged and overturned by Council decision in granting planning approval. The lessor standard I am referring to is to allow	Introduce greater flexibility into Clause 12.3	12.3	The Board discussed this and agreed to make the requirements relating to LDRZ clearer by clearly stating that lots between 2000 m <sup>2</sup> and <4000m <sup>2</sup> will be treated as urban lots with urban infrastructure requirements as per Table 2 and lots >4000 m <sup>2</sup> will be treated as rural lots with rural infrastructure requirements as per Table 6.

Issue Number	Submitter	Description of Issue	Requested Change	Clause or SD Number	LGIDA Board Recommendations to Technical Committee
		for open drains and gravel shoulder roads, opposed to kerbing and underground drainage. We also realise in some cases the higher standard of infrastructure will be most appropriate and can be achieved / provided and in other cases, just not viable, nor fitting with the surrounds.			
7	Simon Carson Moira Shire Council	Standard Drawings SD610 (Typical Road Profiles Low Density Residential Collector / Rural Access) and SD615 (Typical Road Profiles Rural Living Access and Collector / Low Density Residential Access) are not consistent with Clause 12.3 (Urban Roads) and Table 12 (Urban Road / Street Characteristics), unless I am mistaken. The Clause refers to LDRZ areas requiring kerbing and underground drainage to be provided, while the SD's show gravel shoulders and open drains and I can just pre-empt an inconsistency for Developers to hang their hat on per se.	Ensure SD reflect the requirements of the IDM	12.3 and Table 12	See recommendation for Issue 6.
8	Evan Nisbett Baw Baw Shire Council	Advising of Council's choice in relation to selection table 7.9.1	Insert selection	7.9.1	Agree to request
9	Gordon Templeton ALDE	The definition of contractor needs to be added	Insert definition based on AS4000 -1997. "Contractor – The person bound to carry	2	Not all works are carried out under contract and therefore the definition needs to reflect this

Issue Number	Submitter	Description of Issue	Requested Change	Clause or SD Number	LGIDA Board Recommendations to Technical Committee
			out and complete the works under Contract”		reality. Need to make it clear who appoints the contractor. <b>Recommendation:</b> Contractor is the person, legal identity or company nominated by the Developer to carry out the works.
10	Gordon Templeton ALDE	Amend the definition of Developer. The current definition “The person or company that owns a development” is incorrect as many of the larger developers have shareholders or have syndicates and do not always own the development.	Change the definition to “The person or company that is undertaking the land development” or alternatively use the definition in the Water Authority Development Agreements.	2	Agree to change the definition to “The person or company that is undertaking the land development”
11	Gordon Templeton ALDE	Developer’s Representative and Developer’s Consultant seem to be used interchangeably. It is assumed that the Developer’s Representative is the same as the Developer’s Consultant – these terms should be defined in the Definitions clause.	Include the new definitions as identified The superintendent is only generally involved in the construction of the works, not the design process, in addition some developers appoint a separate project manager.  The Developers Representative is a person or company	2	The Board considered the various references to Consultant within the IDM and agreed to change all references to Consultant’s representative to Developer’s representative. It further agreed to change Consultant’s Reference to Applicant’s Reference.  The terms Consultant and Developer’s Representative are both defined terms and the Board believes that no further definitions are required.

Issue Number	Submitter	Description of Issue	Requested Change	Clause or SD Number	LGIDA Board Recommendations to Technical Committee
			appointed by the developer to oversee the project and could be a project manager, the developer's consultant or developers design engineer.		
12	Gordon Templeton ALDE	Developers may at times use qualified engineers to supervise civil works, however contractors from civil construction companies are also used and are not always qualifies engineers but are still qualified to monitor and sign off on civil works. This is a much more cost effective method and any reduction in cost of development makes the housing end more affordable.	Amend definition of Qualified Engineer. Given that Council can approve an "engineer" who is not a qualified engineer, it is recommended that the IDM provides some guidance as to the minimum competence required, say Certificate 4 in Civil Construction or Certificate 4 in Project Management.	2	<p>The definition for Construction Engineer states "Construction Engineer Unless otherwise agreed by the Council, all road and drainage construction supervision should be undertaken by a Qualified Engineer who will hereafter be referred to as the Construction Engineer."</p> <p>This definition already gives developers the ability to use suitably experienced personnel to monitor and sign off on civil works by making application to Council in writing to Council to do so for those actions within the IDM that require a qualified engineer.</p> <p>In relation to Construction Supervision the definition of Construction Supervision states "Construction Supervision</p>

Issue Number	Submitter	Description of Issue	Requested Change	Clause or SD Number	LGIDA Board Recommendations to Technical Committee
					<p>Construction Supervision is the responsibility of the Developer, and is to be carried out by the Construction Engineer or another person appointed by the Developer.”</p> <p>The IDM already allows what is being requested.  <b>Recommendation.</b>  No change required.</p>
13	Gordon Templeton ALDE	Request amendment to definition of verge	The definition of verge should be amended to read “the distance between the invert of kerb or line of table drain and near road reserve boundary.	2	<p>Current definition is “The distance between the invert of kerb and the near road reserve boundary.”  The Board requested John Inglis to review the definitions of verge contained within Austroads and advise members.</p> <p>John has completed this and advises as follows:</p> <p>I propose that the term verge be retained in the context of the definition adopted in the Austroads Design Guidelines Part 3 Geometric Design and VicRoads Supplement Part 3 Geometric Design and as shown in Standard Drawing SD600.</p>

Issue Number	Submitter	Description of Issue	Requested Change	Clause or SD Number	LGIDA Board Recommendations to Technical Committee
					<p><b>Recommendation:</b> Modify Clause 12.3 to reflect the term Roadside in the Road Management Act 2004 Code of Practice - Management of Infrastructure in Road Reserves.</p> <p>Proposed Clause 12.3 to be amended to include the following.</p> <p>The width of the Roadside is defined as the area between the invert of kerb or edge of formation where there is no kerb and the near road reserve boundary.</p>
14	Gordon Templeton ALDE	When a development involves construction of engineering works, or may potentially impact upon the existing Council roads and drainage systems, a plan checking and supervision (we suggest that as you may charge for supervision that is what you should do. The solution is to change the wording to reflect the real intent, ie construction audits, hold points) fee may apply. Unless otherwise agreed in writing, this fee will be in accordance with the Subdivision Act and will be 3.25% of	We suggest that as you may charge for supervision that is what you should do. The solution is to change the wording to reflect the real intent, ie construction audits, hold points	5.4	<p>The wording in the clause reflects the wording used in the Subdivision Act.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> It was agreed to change the wording of Clause 5.4 from “It is not the responsibility of the Council to design, construct, or supervise the construction of roads and drainage <b>Infrastructure</b> for private land development. It is the responsibility of the <b>Developer</b> to engage suitably qualified and experienced personnel who will</p>



Issue Number	Submitter	Description of Issue	Requested Change	Clause or SD Number	LGIDA Board Recommendations to Technical Committee
		the value of the works to be taken over by Council.			<p>carry out these functions to the satisfaction of the <b>Council.</b>"</p> <p>To</p> <p>"It is the responsibility of the <b>Developer</b> to engage suitably qualified and experienced personnel to design, construct, or supervise the construction of roads and drainage <b>Infrastructure</b> for private land development to the satisfaction of the <b>Council.</b>"</p>
15	Gordon Templeton ALDE	It is not the responsibility of the Council for designing, constructing, or supervising the construction of roads and drainage Infrastructure for land development. It is the responsibility of the Developer who is responsible for engaging suitably qualified and experienced personnel who will to carry out these functions to the satisfaction of the Council.	Request amendment to the wording as shown in the description of issue column.	5.4	See recommendation for Issue 14.
16	Gordon Templeton ALDE	Superintendent(amend) 3. The Council will expect the Developer is to ensure that the Superintendent acts fairly at all times.	Request amendment to the wording as shown in the description of issue column.	Pre-start Meeting Checklist – Civil Works	Agree to request
17	Gordon Templeton ALDE	We note that there was some discussion at our recent Board meeting in relation to the			Note the observation

Issue Number	Submitter	Description of Issue	Requested Change	Clause or SD Number	LGIDA Board Recommendations to Technical Committee
		Construction engineer to be appointed by the developer that might be construed as being the design engineer, but this is not necessarily the case.			
18	Felicia Davis Land Urban Consulting	Lot layouts are not required to be shown on a Development Plan (as recent planning review for Wodonga City Council has confirmed). Development Plans are strategic documents which should not have too much and prescriptive detail. However, a lot layout needs to be shown on a Planning Permit.	Correct to remove this requirement for Development Plans.	3.3	<p>The Board agreed that the clause needed to be reworded as follows:</p> <p><b>Council</b> will expect certain basic engineering information to be provided by the <b>Developer</b> when submitting a <b>Development Plan</b> or applying for a <b>Planning Permit</b>, in order to ensure that the submission can be reviewed or permit conditions formulated by <b>Council's Engineering Department</b> in a timely and effective manner.</p> <p><i>The Developer should refer to checklist #C1 to C5 to establish the level of detail required for each stage of the development.</i></p> <p>The basic information submitted for all but the simplest and smallest developments should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>plans indicating the scale, location and overall layout of the development; and</li> </ul>

Issue Number	Submitter	Description of Issue	Requested Change	Clause or SD Number	LGIDA Board Recommendations to Technical Committee
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• existing surface level contours to Australian Height Datum (AHD) as per Table 1; and</li> <li>• any existing natural or constructed features that may impact upon the engineering design; and</li> <li>• a layout plan indicating the approximate size, range, shape and orientation of allotments (for planning permit applications only); and</li> <li>• a demonstration that that all allotments will have legal and practical access (for planning permit applications only); and</li> <li>• the proposed locations and dimensions of reserves and public open space; and</li> <li>• the proposed road layout and hierarchy.</li> </ul>
19	Felicia Davis Land Urban Consulting	In the clause “confirmation that all allotments will have legal and practical access;” what does "confirmation"	Re-word to make it clearer.	3.3	See recommendation to Issue 18

Issue Number	Submitter	Description of Issue	Requested Change	Clause or SD Number	LGIDA Board Recommendations to Technical Committee
		mean? What type of information is expected to be received from Consultants to demonstrate this "confirmation"?			
20	Felicia Davis Land Urban Consulting	Clause 3.4 states “- appropriate easements and/or drainage reserves have been created wherever necessary” This implies that easements are created (or at least 'locked in') at the Development Plan or Planning stage. This is not correct.	Remove or reword. Maybe it could say "can be created".	3.4	Change the relevant dot point of Clause 3.4 to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “appropriate easements and/or drainage reserves have been identified wherever necessary”</li> </ul>
21	Felicia Davis Land Urban Consulting	Clause 3.4 states “- the nature, scale and location of WSUD quality treatment facilities have been established” At the Development Plan or Planning stage design aspects are still conceptual.	Suggest saying "the approximate nature, scale and location of WSUD quality treatment facilities have been established".	3.4	Change the relevant dot point of Clause 3.4 to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “the nature, scale and location of WSUD quality treatment facilities have been identified”</li> </ul>
22	Felicia Davis Land Urban Consulting	Clause 3.4 states “suitable building envelopes, at or above peak flood levels, have been identified”  At the Development Plan stage lots, and therefore building envelopes, are not required to be shown. Too much detail for a Development Plan. However, lots (and potentially building envelopes) need to be shown on a Planning Permit plan.	Correct to exclude this requirement from Development Plans.	3.4	Agree to change

Issue Number	Submitter	Description of Issue	Requested Change	Clause or SD Number	LGIDA Board Recommendations to Technical Committee
23	Felicia Davis Land Urban Consulting	Clause 5.7 states “Unless otherwise agreed by Council, service alignments in Developments should comply with the requirements of the "Code of Practice - Management of Infrastructure in Road Reserves and other relevant regulations or codes established pursuant to the Road Management Act.”	We request Wodonga City Council to invite consultation with the stakeholders (service authorities, Consultants, Contractors and Developers) for the purpose of agreeing on service alignments offsets. At the moment, the service authorities’ standard offsets and the required 1.5m (and 2.0m) wide footpath create conflicts, and are handled on a case-by-case basis resulting in adhoc offsets across the subdivisions.	5.6	<p>The offsets have been agreed at state level which included representatives from all service authorities, land development industry and local government.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> No change.</p>
24	Felicia Davis Land Urban Consulting	<p>Clause 5.8.1 states “Car-parking layout plan in accordance with the requirements of this Manual and the Planning Scheme with the Manual taking precedence where there is a conflict between the requirements of these documents.”</p> <p>The Planning Scheme (and State Legislation) take precedence over this manual, not the other way around.</p>	Correction required.	5.8.1	<p>It should be noted that The IDM is an alternative design standard in accordance with the provisions of the Planning Scheme.</p> <p>The Board agreed to reword Clause 5.8.1 as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Car-parking layout plan in accordance with the requirements of this</li> </ul>

Issue Number	Submitter	Description of Issue	Requested Change	Clause or SD Number	LGIDA Board Recommendations to Technical Committee
					<p align="center"><b>Manual</b> and the Planning Scheme.</p>
25	Felicia Davis Land Urban Consulting	<p>Clause 5.8.1 states “Detailed design contour lines to AHD.” Design contours are not usually available at a Drainage Strategy stage, they are only available at a detailed design stage, which usually comes after the Drainage Strategy.</p>	Remove this requirement	5.8.1	Agree to change.
26	Felicia Davis Land Urban Consulting	<p>Clause 5.8.1 states “Details of WSUD sizing and layout.” Conceptual sizing and layout only, as at a Drainage Strategy stage design is still conceptual.</p>	Say "Approximate details for the WSUD features"	5.8.1	<p>The Board agrees that the WSUD design at this stage is conceptual only and therefore recommends the clause to be amended as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Details of the conceptual <b>WSUD</b> sizing and layout.</li> </ul>
27	Felicia Davis Land Urban Consulting	<p>Clause 6.3.2 states “Development Plans should generally be submitted on A1 sheets at scale of 1:1000” A1 plans are normally required when a lot of detail/information needs to be shown, such as on a civil design. Development Plans need to be kept simple and conceptual, as strategic planning documents, not engineering plans. A3 size would be more suitable for a Development Plan, considering the fact that they are usually attached</p>	Re-word to say "Development Plans should generally be submitted on A3 sheets"	6.3.2	<p>Reword Clause 6.3.2 to state “Development Plans should be submitted on A3 sheets as a minimum. Councils may require Development Plans to be submitted on A1 sheets at scale of 1:1000.”</p>

Issue Number	Submitter	Description of Issue	Requested Change	Clause or SD Number	LGIDA Board Recommendations to Technical Committee
		to a Development Plan Application report.			
28	Felicia Davis Land Urban Consulting	<p>Clause 6.3.3 states “Unless otherwise agreed by Council, levels should be related to Australian Height Datum (AHD). Plans should nominate a minimum of two (2) permanent survey marks (PSM’s) and their respective numbers/identification, and any temporary benchmarks (TBM’s) relevant to the works. Where it is not possible to nominate two survey marks, Council may agree to accept the use of only one survey mark.”</p> <p>This information is usually provided by the surveyors. Suggest removing the requirement for this information to be shown as part of a civil design set, as the engineers cannot take responsibility for this.</p>	Remove requirement, or reword to request as a separate document.	6.3.3	<p>The Developer has the responsibility for these actions and there is a close working relationship between surveyors and engineers. This is not onerous and the information is required.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> No change.</p>
29	Felicia Davis Land Urban Consulting	<p>Clause 8.4 states “In the event that damage to infrastructure occurs during the defects period, and the contractor can prove, to the satisfaction of Council, that this is not the result of defective workmanship, Council will be responsible for the carrying out the repairs at its costs and for recovering the cost from those who caused the damage.</p>	Re-word to say: "In the event that damage to infrastructure occurs during the defects period, and if Council can satisfactorily prove that a damage is the result of defective workmanship, the Developer is responsible to make provision for	8.4	<p>The issue is that the Contractor is responsible for the whole of the work site and therefore has a responsibility to protect all the infrastructure and assets within that worksite.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> No change.</p>

Issue Number	Submitter	Description of Issue	Requested Change	Clause or SD Number	LGIDA Board Recommendations to Technical Committee
		This requests a proof for a negative consequence (proof that something has not taken place).	the rectification of the damage".		
30	Felicia Davis Land Urban Consulting	Clause 12.3.2 states "No separate cycle provision except for LDRZ(S) see Note 8" The fact the LDRZ(S) is listed here, it implies that LDRZ road design requirements are covered by this section (urban roads design). This is confusing as the LDRZ road design requirements seem to be covered also by "12.4 Rural Roads".	Definitions required for LDRZ and LDRZ(S). Clarification required as to if the LDRZ road design fits under the urban roads design or under the rural roads design.		See recommendation for Issue 6.
31	Felicia Davis Land Urban Consulting	Clause 12.3.9 states "footpath alignments should be offset by no more than 300mm from the property boundary in existing Developments and by at least 50mm from the property boundary in new Developments." This causes issues with electrical pits as the electrical auditors require the pit either entirely outside a path or surrounded by concrete by at least 150mm. We request Wodonga City Council to invite consultation with the stakeholders (service authorities, Consultants, Contractors and Developers)	Request action from Wodonga City Council.	12.3.9	This is a standard practice across Victoria. No consultation is required. It should be noted that the 300mm offset only applies where there is existing development on either side of the development where the existing offset is 300mm.  <b>Recommendation</b> No change.



Issue Number	Submitter	Description of Issue	Requested Change	Clause or SD Number	LGIDA Board Recommendations to Technical Committee
32	Felicia Davis Land Urban Consulting	Clause 12.4 states “The following requirements generally apply to new roads and upgrading of existing roads affected by Rural or Rural Living Developments or by Low-Density Residential Developments that are located in rural settings or that do not fall within the definition of LDRZ(S).” There is no definition in the manual for LDRZ(S). Therefore, it is not clear what these Low-Density Residential Developments are. How are the LDRZ different from LDRZ(S)?	Definitions required for LDRZ and LDRZ(S). Clarification required as to if the LDRZ road design fits under the urban roads design or under the rural roads design.	12.4	See recommendation for Issue 6.
33	Felicia Davis Land Urban Consulting	Clause 12.4.7 states “Council will expect all roads in Rural Living and relevant Low-Density Residential Developments to provide for two lanes of traffic.” There are some situations, where roads are required to be provided at interface between development and Reserves, where the road may not be necessary for traffic.	Suggest saying: "Council will expect all roads in Rural Living and relevant Low-Density Residential Developments to provide for two lanes of traffic, unless otherwise agreed by Council."	12.4.7	Where roads are provided in Rural Living and Low Density Residential Development they are required to provide for two lanes of traffic.  The particular reference is not clear.  <b>Recommendation</b> No change.
34	Felicia Davis Land Urban Consulting	Clause 13.3 states “The minimum footpath width should be 1.5m in residential areas and 2.0m in commercial areas.”	Request Wodonga Council to organise a consultation meeting with stakeholders (service authorities, consultants and developers) to discuss appropriate footpath	13.3	The provision of services within verges with 1.5m and 2.5m wide footpaths has been extensively discussed with service authorities and the other stakeholders. These have been used to prepare the amendments to the recently released Code of Practice -

Issue Number	Submitter	Description of Issue	Requested Change	Clause or SD Number	LGIDA Board Recommendations to Technical Committee
			widths and offsets for services (as at the moment, the request for 1.5m wide footpaths results in conflicts with services and this creates a variety of offsets being used across the municipality.		Management of Infrastructure in Road Reserves. <b>Recommendation</b> No change.
35	Felicia Davis Land Urban Consulting	Clause 13.3 states “Council will expect the Design Engineer to provide details of service pits to be located within the footpath or pedestrian areas to Council’s Engineering Department when requesting acceptance of the detailed design.” The location of service authorities' pits (in particular telecomm) are not known accurately at the civil design stage, and only once the civil design has been prepared, that the service authorities can commence their design (they require the civil design as a 'base' for their design). Also, even if the service pits were known, it is no guarantee that they will be installed as such.	Suggest to remove the paragraph	13.3	As a result of the discussions in formulating the amended Code of Practice Management of Infrastructure in Road Reserves It was agreed that there was a need to have a Master Services Plan approved as part of the design plans. This will ensure that street trees and services pits are located in appropriate places and that conflict is minimised. <b>Recommendation</b> No change.
36	Felicia Davis Land Urban Consulting	Clause 16.10.33 states “Ribbed Polypropylene or High Density Polyethylene Stormwater Pipes, as specified in Clause 16.10.1, should:	Remove.	16.10.33	The LGIDA has received credible advice from members within the industry that the manufacturer’s technical specifications may not

Issue Number	Submitter	Description of Issue	Requested Change	Clause or SD Number	LGIDA Board Recommendations to Technical Committee
		<p>when installed behind mountable or semi-mountable kerb, have a cover of at least 750mm; and when installed in easements should have a cover of at least 600mm.”</p> <p>These are over the technical specifications by manufacturer.</p>			<p>always fully reflect the requirements of the relevant standards This matter is currently under review by Standards Australia and therefore these provisions have been retained in the IDM.</p> <p><b>Recommendation.</b> No change.</p>
37	Felicia Davis Land Urban Consulting	<p>Clause 16.12 states “Council will expect the Design Engineer to provide acceptable litter collection pits towards the end of any drainage line that discharges to a watercourse and/or drainage basin, located so that comfortable access by maintenance vehicles is achieved. Where the pit is located in a road reserve, drainage reserve or other area with public access, all vehicle travel should be in a forward-only direction.”</p> <p>What are the technical specifications for such litter bins?</p>	Provide Standard Drawing or more information.	16.12	<p>Gross Pollutant Traps which include litter traps are designed on a case by case basis to suit the flow and load at a particular location.</p> <p>The design requirements for GPT’s can be found in Clause 20.3.2</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> Clause 16.12 be amended by changing “litter collection pits” to “gross pollutant traps”</p>
38	Felicia Davis Land Urban Consulting	<p>Clause 19.3.4</p> <p>There are no values in Table 14</p>	Provide values	19.3.4	<p>Due to the fact that no Councils have indicated they wish to be included in this table it will be deleted.</p>
39	Felicia Davis Land Urban Consulting	<p>Clause 24.3.1 states “The submitted landscape plan shall address the following:</p>	Suggest to remove the Comments	24.3.1	<p>The provisions of this clause come from such documents as “<i>Safer Design Guidelines</i> and <i>Active by Design</i>”</p>

Issue Number	Submitter	Description of Issue	Requested Change	Clause or SD Number	LGIDA Board Recommendations to Technical Committee
		<p>Land parcels to be at least 2000m<sup>2</sup> in size unless linked to existing open space</p> <p>Linear reserves to be at least 10m wide</p> <p>Setting a minimum size requirement is onerous in situations where the developable land is less than 4Ha.</p> <p>Setting a minimum width requirement for linear reserves is onerous in situations where it is not justified.</p>			<p>These provisions have widespread industry acceptance.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No change.</p>
40	Felicia Davis Land Urban Consulting	<p>Clause 24.3.4 states “Local parks should be located within 400 metres safe walking distance of at least 95% of all dwellings. Where not designed to include active open space, local parks should be generally 1 hectare in area and be suitably dimensioned and designed to provide for their intended use and to allow easy adaption in response to changing community preferences.”</p> <p>This needs to be in accordance with the Planning Scheme.</p>	Suggest to remove the Comments	24.3.1	The Board believes that these are in accordance with the provision of the Planning Scheme.
41	John Bryce Greater Geelong City Council	Forwarding selection table choices as well as requesting changes to the description of the Council	Insert selection choices		Agree to request
42	John Bryce Greater Geelong City Council	Table name needs to be changed and grammar fixed up.	Suggestions - - Table 14 be renamed Selection Table 19.4(b)	19.4	See recommendation for Issue 38

Issue Number	Submitter	Description of Issue	Requested Change	Clause or SD Number	LGIDA Board Recommendations to Technical Committee
			- In the sentence above table 14, replace “better to” with “to better”		
43	John Bryce Greater Geelong City Council	Does this table need a table no and a heading?		24.3.1	The Board agreed that headings were required for these tables.
44	John Bryce Greater Geelong City Council	Does this table need a table no and a heading?		24.3.2	See recommendation for Issue 43
45	John Bryce Greater Geelong City Council	<p>The page numbering has “Page No’ of 263. This leaves the last page reading “Page 260 of 263”. Will readers wonder if there are another 3 pages somewhere? Should the page numbering read “Page No of 260”</p> <p>And related to this is the page numbering goes from “Page xii of 263” to the next page which reads “Page 11 of 263”. Suggest you make this page number “Page 14 of 263”. This will fix up the problem above.</p>			Agree to request.
46	Barry Dyson	<p>Clause 19.2.2 states “Unless flooding problems are already evident, the basic principle should be to limit the peak outflow from any site in a 1% <b>AEP</b> rainfall event to pre-development levels.”</p> <p>This statement should not become a fundamental principle that is automatically adopted by Council</p>	Accordingly we wish to recommend that the IDM be changed to not include such an overly simplistic, all inclusive all sweeping single statement in the IDM V5 manual.	19.2.2	<p>The principle is well accepted in the industry.</p> <p>This is a matter for the local Council and the landowner to address.</p>

Issue Number	Submitter	Description of Issue	Requested Change	Clause or SD Number	LGIDA Board Recommendations to Technical Committee
		<p>instead of proper drainage engineering, especially when a complete major drainage system is closely available.</p> <p>The submitter has provided details of a specific issue with Baw Baw Council which has led to this submission.</p>	<p>The statement needs to be modified to bring back proper drainage engineering as the primary objective where and when circumstances allow, such as in our case.</p>		
47	Peter Brasier Greater Bendigo City Council	<p>A new drawing for consideration.</p> <p>A variation of SD480 for a cross culvert only.</p>	Submitted details of the proposed new drawing	SD480	Agree to the request to develop a new SD SD481.
48	John Inglis Wellington Shire Council	<p>We are currently commencing a large residential subdivision and the Developers consultant has asked me to clarify the IDM requirements for compaction, hopefully you can help shed some light.</p> <p>There seems to be a little confusion between subgrade and sub base. The requirements are the same other than for grammatical alterations.</p> <p>The compaction requirements Version 5 Clause 12.7.10 indicate that a DCP can be used to determine compaction of sub grade. I take this to mean that if the design CBR is reached no further testing is required.</p>	My thought is that there should be three para's commencing with the sub grade then moving to sub base and base courses and then to the Contractors responsibilities.	12.7	The Board requested John Inglis to put together an issues paper for the Technical Committee to consider.

Issue Number	Submitter	Description of Issue	Requested Change	Clause or SD Number	LGIDA Board Recommendations to Technical Committee
		<p>Clause 12.7.12 discusses the compaction of the sub base, then goes on to say that only fill areas require testing, that indicates that all areas in cut do not require testing to ensure 98%.</p> <p>Do you think the word sub base should in fact be sub grade?</p> <p>I would generally insist on compaction testing for subgrades in fill situations.</p> <p>Clause 12.7.14 Proof Rolling, initially discusses sub base and base requirements then moves to sub grade.</p>			
49	Steve Skinner	<p>SD 480 is the drawing that causes most confusion. The class D needs to be changed to class B to bring it in line with GAA specs for this set up. Wording the same as in version 5.0 SD 426. (Class B lightweight fibreglass lid or approved equivalent). Also requiring change on SD 480 is the wording (pit lid to be concrete type or approved equivalent must be used). The 100mm dimension should also be removed.</p>		SD 480	<p>The standard is that, for pits or grates in roadways, Class D is required and therefore there is no justification to change to Class B.</p> <p>It was agreed to remove the 100mm dimension on the lid.</p>

Issue Number	Submitter	Description of Issue	Requested Change	Clause or SD Number	LGIDA Board Recommendations to Technical Committee
50	Steve Skinner	I'm sure you are aware the drawings from SD 475, 80, 90, 95, & 520 still name opposition products.		SD 475, 80, 90, 95 and 520.	It was agreed to remove the references to manufacturer's name and replace them with them with the appropriate class lid as follows: SD 490 – Class D SD 495 – Class B SD 496 – Class D instead of heavy duty SD520 – Class B