

**Consultation Report to submissions received from Gippsland Council Consultation and Strathbogrie Council consultation.**

**Issue 1 Co-ordination of Street Works Code of Practice cannot be accessed**

**Comments Received**

Vemtech

Clause 5.6 of IDM makes reference to this code of practice but it cannot be found on the web.

**Working Group Assessment**

Acknowledged

**Action**

Matter is being addressed by the Infrastructures Standards Committee with the aim to have this Code of Practice be reviewed and possibly be issued as a Code of Practice under the Road Management Act.

**Issue 2 Reference to PowerCor and PowerCor Technical Standards – not only utility.**

**Comments Received**

Vemtech

PowerCor is not the only service provider – should use generic term.

**Working Group Assessment**

Acknowledged

**Action**

The IDM is being changed to reflect a more generic service provider.

**Issue 3 Permit may be required from CMA for certain works.**

**Comments Received**

West Gippsland CMA

**Working Group Assessment**

Acknowledged

**Action**

The IDM is being changed to reflect requirement that in certain circumstances a separate permit from the CMA might be required.

#### **Issue 4 Weed identification and management on construction sites**

##### **Comments Received**

IPWEA

I have been speaking with Melissa Semken, Partnership Officer at Department of Primary Industries, regarding the manual and we are unable to find any reference to weed management within the earthworks sections of the specification or in the check lists.

##### **Working Group Assessment**

Acknowledged

##### **Action**

Have corresponded directly with DPI and have included their recommendations into the IDM.

#### **Issue 5 Minimum size of pipes under a road**

##### **Comments Received**

Lindsay Love Consultant

The minimum size of pipe under roads is stated as a 300. In working in local government (shire of bass) for 10 years the policy at that time was for a minimum of 225 pipe. We installed a lot of pipe at that size in San Remo, Coronet Bay, Grantville and Corinella. It did not appear to result in any significant blockage problems. There does not appear to be any valid reason for such an increase in minimum size which only adds to the cost.

##### **Working Group Assessment**

The group discussed the matter and believed that the standard should not be changed.

##### **Action**

No change

#### **Issue 6 Individuals to seek a review of manual contents, cost of implementation**

##### **Comments Received**

Lindsay Love Consultant

There does not appear to be a satisfactory mechanism for individuals to seek a review of manual contents.

There does not appear to have been any critical review of the proposed standards and the cost they impose - has anyone asked whether the standard can be reduced and hence costs reduced?

Is there a regular review procedure for the Manual?

### **Working Group Assessment**

Individuals get the opportunity to comment on the contents on the manual through the consultation process prior to the manual being adopted and when it is reviewed annually.

Individuals also have the opportunity to raise issues with their local Council and they can raise the issue with the group as a whole.

Another method is to email the group and put forward their request – email address available on the website.

Cost reduction will be considered by Council's as they review the sustainability of maintaining the assets they are responsible for and consider what affordable levels of service are.

### **Action**

Provide better opportunities on the website for individuals to request review of specific items in the IDM.

### **Issue 7 The Title of the IDM**

#### **Comments Received**

Lindsay Love Consultant

The term "design manual" pushes the use of the manual to a status of an Australian Standard with a rigid adherence and little chance to promote a design which suits the circumstances. The term "Guidelines" would be better as it means people need to think a little bit about the process and what is best for the situation without a strict adherence.

#### **Working Group Assessment**

The group acknowledges that the title accurately reflects what it is trying to achieve. The term guidelines is too flexible and Council have a right to specify the standard of Infrastructure in its municipality.

#### **Action**

No change

### **Issue 8 Permeable Pavements and stifling innovation solutions**

#### **Comments Received**

Lindsay Love Consultant

I think there was a guideline for a road formation which suggested that permeable pavements could not be used. Permeable pavements on sand dune type soils appear to work satisfactorily and limit the need for street drainage and help contain costs. I think this manual would limit this sort of design. The Concrete Masonry Association has design software and manuals to help guide the use of permeable pavements. In this era of sustainable design it appears we are closing off a design solution which may be appropriate in some situations.

I support the general thrust of the manual but I am concerned that it will lead to a stifling of innovative design solutions.

#### **Working Group Assessment**

The Group does not believe that the manual restricts design solutions. Any design solution has to be backed up with sufficient design data and information for Council's to assess the appropriateness of the design solution.

#### **Action**

No action.

#### **Issue 9 Review of maximum grades**

##### **Comments Received**

Lindsay Love Consultant

The setting of maximum street grades needs to be more flexible for steep terrain.

##### **Working Group Assessment**

Acknowledged

##### **Action**

Changes have been incorporated into the IDM

#### **Issue 10 CFA Requirements and Publications**

##### **Comments Received**

CFA

Currently CFA has in place the guideline "*Requirements for water supplies and access for subdivisions in residential 1 and 2 and township zones*" which specifies our requirements when developing land that fits within the specified zones. This publication is available at [http://www.cfa.vic.gov.au/documents/subdivision\\_reqs\\_water.pdf](http://www.cfa.vic.gov.au/documents/subdivision_reqs_water.pdf).

In addition to this guideline the Victorian Fire Services have produced "*Fire Service guidelines for the Identification of street hydrants for firefighting purposes*". This publication is available at [http://www.cfa.vic.gov.au/documents/id\\_streethydrants.pdf](http://www.cfa.vic.gov.au/documents/id_streethydrants.pdf).

CFA's interim position would be the inclusion of these documents into the Infrastructure Design Manual.

### **Working Group Assessment**

The group decided that whilst it is important for developers to know about these documents it was felt that if we did this for all organisations that the IDM would become unwieldy and difficult to ensure that the documents referred to are the latest.

### **Action**

No change

### **Issue 11 Duplication and relation to other specifications**

#### **Comments Received**

Alex Van Loggerenberg, GHD consultants

In reference to the development of the proposed infrastructure design manual, herewith my comments. I have also submitted my comments per letter.

- Will the manual duplicate what's already written in other specifications and manuals like Austroads, WASA, National Urban Sensitive Design Manuals etc.?
- Will the manual automatically update itself when other specifications and manuals update - like Austroads automatically updates, will these follow through in the infrastructure manual?
- Will the manual account for WSUD and ESD initiatives and any updates to these?
- Will the manual be region specific since conditions differ between regions?

### **Working Group Assessment**

The manual has been prepared for Councils and does not seek to duplicate National standards etc.

Where there are specific references to other standards the manual will need to ensure that these are the latest versions.

The manual will be reviewed annually and where there are changes to practices in the industry these will be incorporated into the IDM

The IDM does include options for different practices and different topography and regional differences.

### **Action**

No action

### **Issue 12 Strathbogie Council submissions**

## **Comments Received**

Submissions from Dawn Davis and John Larkin and from Bronwyn Starkey were received in relation to numerous matters which in bulk referred to environmental sustainability issues and planning issues. One of the submissions also mentioned that one size does not fit all for all municipalities.

## **Working Group Assessment**

In relation to the one size does comment not fit all comment the group believes that there is sufficient flexibility built into the IDM to cater for differing terrain and geographical features.

Predominately the matters raised related more to planning schemes and not to the IDM.

Both submissions whilst making worthy points do not fully grasp that the design manual is limited to those areas that relate to infrastructure that the Council will be responsible for in the future or where developments will have an impact on Council infrastructure.

The IDM is not meant to have standards that relate to other statutory authorities e.g. the comments on dams etc.

The IDM is not meant to control housing construction as this is covered by the Building Control Act and associated legislation.

## **Action**

No action