



**Chairman**  
**National Committee**  
C/- 23 Scoular Street  
Maryhill  
**DUNEDIN 9011**

5 February 2010

Rachel Mahony  
Standards New Zealand  
Private Bag 2439  
WELLINGTON 6140

Dear Rachel

**IPENZ Transportation Group Submission on Draft New Zealand Standard DZ 4404 Land Development and Subdivision**

The IPENZ Transportation Group ("IPENZ TG") welcomes the opportunity to provide a submission on Draft New Zealand Standard DZ 4404 Land Development and Subdivision. The IPENZ TG consists of over 1,000 transportation and traffic engineering and planning professionals working in central government, local government, academia, and the private sector. The IPENZ TG represents a segment of considerable expertise in the fields of traffic and transportation and has a significant interest in managing the effects of transportation on society. This submission has been prepared by the National Committee of the IPENZ TG and recognises that this submission may not necessarily represent the position of every member of the Group or their views given the diversity of members.

There are a number of comments we wish to make and these are covered in the attached submission.

The IPENZ Transportation Group is happy to discuss any of the comments contained in the submission and any queries can be directed to the Chairman of the IPENZ Transportation Group, Bruce Conaghan, Senior Traffic Engineer, Dunedin City Council (C (03) 474 3706 / E-mail [bruce.conaghan@dcc.govt.nz](mailto:bruce.conaghan@dcc.govt.nz)).

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads 'B Conaghan'.

Bruce Conaghan  
**Chairman**  
**National Committee**  
**IPENZ Transportation Group**

## RECOMMENDED CHANGES TO DRAFT STANDARD

<p>To: Rachel Mahony Standards New Zealand Private Bag 2439 WELLINGTON</p> <p>Fax: +64 4 498 5994 Email: <a href="mailto:Rachel.Mahony@standards.co.nz">Rachel.Mahony@standards.co.nz</a></p>	<p>From: Bruce Conaghan Chair IPENZ Transportation Group C/- 23 Scoular Street Maryhill DUNEDIN 9011</p>				
	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%; text-align: center; padding: 5px;">Closing date for comment</td> <td style="width: 50%; text-align: center; padding: 5px;">Date of your comments</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="width: 50%; text-align: center; padding: 5px;">5 February 2010</td> <td style="width: 50%; text-align: center; padding: 5px;">5 February 2010</td> </tr> </table>	Closing date for comment	Date of your comments	5 February 2010	5 February 2010
Closing date for comment	Date of your comments				
5 February 2010	5 February 2010				
<p>DR DZ 4404 <span style="float: right;">Committee: P4404</span></p> <p>Title: Land development and subdivision</p>					

Comment is preferred in electronic format using Microsoft Word 97 or above, following the layout below. Electronic drafts are available from Standards New Zealand web site at <http://www.standards.co.nz>.

*The following form is for comments to be submitted electronically. Please email your comments to [Rachel.Mahony@standards.co.nz](mailto:Rachel.Mahony@standards.co.nz)*

### GENERAL COMMENT

*Type your general comments in the box. The comment box will automatically expand to accommodate comments of any length.*

<p>Roads - Design philosophy</p> <p>The revision has no doubt been brought about by a number of deficiencies identified in the current version and it is recognised that there is a need for a review. However a revised standard with significant improvements is only going to be effective if practitioners apply those standards correctly and in accordance with the principles associated with good subdivision design. Many of the issues that have arisen in the past are a result of less than adequate planning rules and/or a lack of understanding within the necessary professions associated with designing and developing subdivisions and TAs in issuing compliance. As a result, we are seeing :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ribbon development</li> <li>• overuse of cul-de-sacs</li> <li>• 'local' roads being installed parallel to 'arterials' and then being used as short cuts.</li> <li>• lack of consideration of public transport</li> <li>• installing roads that do not encourage safe speeds for those users resulting in TAs having to install traffic calming.</li> <li>• little thought of future maintenance costs by the lack of a whole of life cost approach</li> <li>• etc</li> </ul>
---

Certainly, access and access controls are matters that are important in this area and while there are various rules and the like in various District Plans, there are a few transportation planning and traffic aspects that should be included in the Standard as principles e.g. Corridor Management Planning and use of Service roads, innovative intersection designs, etc and these principles should be included with urban design as considerations that should be given weight in planning. Our industry is aware of a number of instances where approvals have been given for strip subdivision onto major roads when other access options were available along with those situations where absolute minimum widths for roads are not suitable for emergency access or access for refuse trucks..

It is acknowledged that the approach to have target operating speeds as part of the subdivision design process is a good approach. However, further guidance would be required in regard to the objectives of using a target operating speed.

## SPECIFIC COMMENT

Insert the number of the clause, paragraph or figure. Do not preface the number with words (i.e. 1 not clause 1). If there is no clause number, use the section heading (e.g. Preface). Insert the page, paragraph and line number as appropriate. Use a new row for each comment.

The rows will automatically expand to accommodate comments of any length. Remove unused rows, or insert additional rows as required. To insert extra rows at the end of the table, go to the last cell and press the TAB key.

Clause/ Para/ Figure/ Table No	Page No	Recommended Changes and Reason <i>Exact wording of recommended changes should be given</i>
	7	"ROADS" is in bold capitals whereas the other section titles in the Table of Contents are not in bold capitals.
	13	REFERENCE DOCUMENTS Some further work is required here to ensure that the Standard when released has an up to date list of the documents which are referenced. An example is that a number of the Austroads documents listed on Page 14 have been superseded. An example of a list of national documents for an Asset Management Plan is attached for information.
1.8.2.4	25	One design drawing that should be included is that showing the landscaping and its location in relation to traffic signs and signals and road lighting. In the majority of designs, little consideration is given to the effects of landscaping/vegetation over time and as a result, it is not uncommon to see trees located close to streetlights of vegetation obscuring road signs.
1.8.10	27	The developer should also provide evidence of compliance with any pertinent Act or Regulations e.g. compliance with the Electrical Regulations for new traffic signal installations.
SCHEDULE 1D	32	The As-Built Plans should also show the exact location of all utilities including those not managed by the TA (power/gas/electricity) and including the depth of cover to each of the utilities. It is also recommended that the co-ordinates of all utility surface features be provided regardless of whether they are to be taken over by the TA.
Table 3.2	48-54	It is recommended that the minimum lane width in Table 3.2 be 3.0 metres except in those situations where there is no adjacent parallel parking, in which case, the minimum lane width should be 3.5m.
Table 3.2	48-49	For rural areas, the minimum sealed shoulder width should be 1 m rather than 0.5 m. Having a wider shoulder does allow for cyclists and reduces edgebreak and its associated ongoing maintenance. No portion of any shoulder should be unsealed.

Clause/ Para/ Figure/ Table No	Page No	Recommended Changes and Reason <i>Exact wording of recommended changes should be given</i>
Notes to table 3.2	55	It is recommended that the dimensions for each on –street parking area should be 2.5 m x 6 m as this allows for alighting and entering of parked vehicles. It is more important to have such a width when there is a cycle lane adjacent to the parking.
3.3.7	58	This section should have a sub-section relating to intersection controls such as traffic signals and roundabouts given that these, especially the latter, can play a key role in achieving target operating speeds.
3.3.12	60	The wording in Para 4 "...comply with the TA's current sign writing standards..." should be amended to read "...comply with the TA's current road name sign standards..."
Figures 3.6B and 3.6C	70/71	It would be important to ensure that check dams do not in themselves become a hazard for errant road users especially in those situations where the swale is located close to the carriageway. The use of a railway sleeper, given its dimensions, would certainly be a hazard for any cyclist who runs into it when forced off the road if the swale was close to the carriageway.