



REFERENCE NUMBER: 17464

OCTOBER 1999

REPORT PREPARED FOR:
WHANGAREI DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT PREPARED BY:
TONKIN & TAYLOR LTD

DISTRIBUTION:
WHANGAREI DISTRICT COUNCIL 2 COPIES
TONKIN & TAYLOR LTD (FILE) 1 COPY

CONTENTS

	Page No.
1.0 Introduction	1
2.0 Background	1
3.0 Statutory Responsibilities in Relation to Mine Subsidence Hazard	4
3.1 Resource Management Act 1991	4
3.2 Building Act 1991	5
3.3 Community Expectations	6
3.4 Development Controls in Mine Subsidence Hazard Areas	7
4.0 Mine Hazard Subsidence Assessment	10
4.1 Mine Subsidence Hazard Zones	10
4.2 Risk	10
4.3 Consequences of Mine Subsidence	12
5.0 Discussion	14
6.0 Conclusions	16
7.0 Recommendations	16
8.0 References	19
Appendix A Policy for Building and Subdivision in Mining Zones Adopted by Council 1 st December 1982	
Appendix B Building Control Policy for Building in the Kamo Mine Zones, December 1995.	
Appendix C Property Inspection Sheets	



1.0 Introduction

Whangarei District Council (WDC) engaged Tonkin & Taylor Ltd (T&T) to undertake a re-assessment of the subsidence hazard resulting from the underground mining of coal in the Kamo area, Whangarei. The scope of work is set out in T&T's proposal dated 23 August 1999, and authority to proceed with the re-assessment was given by Ms Alison Geddes on 30 August 1999.

The purpose of this report is to provide Council with a basis for the preparation of an updated and revised policy on development within the areas in Kamo identified as being subject to possible mine subsidence.

2.0 Background

Following the discovery of coal in 1865, underground mining was undertaken beneath the Kamo area from 1876 until 1955. The coal was extracted by room and pillar method, and the mining history is summarised in Tonkin & Taylor Ltd (1984).

Room and pillar methods of coal extraction rely on the coal pillars being left to support the overburden. Such methods typically extract about 20% of the coal resource. However, it was common practice to further work the coal pillars after the initial extraction, leading to either collapse of the mine roof or the punching of the pillars into the mine floor. Collapse of the mine roof can lead to the development of crown hole subsidence, whereas punching failure or collapse of the pillars can lead to the development of trough subsidence, as shown on Figure 1.

In 1977 a crown-hole occurred at 14 Wakelin Street, and in 1980 a large trough subsidence occurred in the general vicinity of the intersection of Grant and Boswell Streets.

Figure 1: Types of subsidence: a) crown-hole and b) trough subsidence
(After Van Besien and Rockaway, 1988)



As a result of these incidents, and the requirements of the Town and Country Planning Act 1977, and 1979 and 1981 Amendments to the Local Government Act 1974 (refer Section 3), WDC engaged John St George (a mining engineer now with the University of Auckland, Department of Resource and Civil Engineering) to undertake an assessment of the mine subsidence hazard, and his findings are summarised in J.D. St. George (1981), 1982(a), (b), (c), (d), (e) and (f). This work was reviewed by a U.S. expert in coal mine subsidence Professor Nolan Aughenbaugh. As a result of the work undertaken by John St George, and a DSIR geologist G.D. Mansergh (1982), the Kamo area was subdivided into three (3) zones of relative mine hazard. In December 1982, WDC adopted a policy for building and subdivision in the mine zones, and this is set out in Appendix A. That policy put significant restrictions on development in Zone 1, and any development was generally subject to Section 641(a) of the Local Government Act (refer Section 3).

In 1983, WDC engaged T&T to undertake a review of the mine subsidence hazard, and the findings of that review are summarised in T&T report dated January 1984. In addition to Dr Laurie Wesley of T&T, the review team included Mr Richard Gray, another U.S. expert in coal mine subsidence.

As a result of the 1983 review, the mine hazard zoning was refined but the mine hazard zones in the Proposed Whangarei District Plan (1998) are essentially those developed by John St George in 1982.

In December 1995, WDC updated the policy for building in the Kamo mine zones, and this is set out in Appendix B. This update was necessary as Section 36(2) of the Building Act 1991 (BAct) had superseded Section 641(a) of the Local Government Act 1974.

In June 1999, WDC undertook a review of the virtual blanket use of Section 36(2) of the BAct in the Kamo mine zones and decided to commission T&T to revisit the study with a view to re-assessing the hazard and the WDC policy on development.

3.0 Statutory Responsibilities in Relation to Mine

Subsidence Hazard

There are two primary pieces of legislation which define the responsibilities of WDC for the management of land hazards including subsidence. These are the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) and the Building Act 1991 (BA).

3.1 Resource Management Act 1991

The overall purpose of the RMA is to promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and WDC has responsibilities under the Act for the avoidance and mitigation of natural hazards.

The specific functions of WDC are defined under Section 31 of the RMA, and include the avoidance and mitigation of natural hazards through the control of land use and subdivision.

Section 31(b) states that every District Council has, as a function:

The control of any actual or potential effects of the use, development, or protection of land, including for the purpose of the avoidance or mitigation of natural hazards

To carry out these functions, WDC must produce a District Plan which describes how resource management issues will be managed to achieve the sustainable management of natural and physical resources. Section 74 of the Act requires that the District Plan be consistent with the relevant Regional Plan and Regional Policy Statement, thereby ensuring the integrated management of the natural and physical resources of the region and district.

With respect to the subdivision and use of land, WDC has requirements relevant to the avoidance or mitigation of natural hazards. Section 106 (g) specifies that a consent authority shall not grant a subdivision consent for:

- “(a) Any land or any structure on that land (which) is or is likely to be subject to material damage by erosion, falling debris, subsidence, slippage, or inundation from any source; or
- (b) any subsequent use that is likely to be made of the land (that) is likely to accelerate, worsen, or result in material damage to that land, other land, or structure, by erosion, falling debris, subsidence, slippage, or inundation from any source.”

unless the consent authority is satisfied the effects of the proposed subdivision will be avoided, remedied or mitigated.

It is generally impractical to remedy or mitigate the hazard which undermining presents and hence one approach to address the hazard is to avoid it by preventing development.

3.2 Building Act 1991

The purpose of the BAct is to provide the necessary controls over building works, use and safety. Under this Act the obligations for managing building works in relation to natural hazards are solely the responsibility of the District Council.

The BAct requires WDC to refuse the granting of a consent to undertake building works where:

Section 36(1)

“The land on which the building work is to take place is subject to, or is likely to be subject to, erosion, avulsion, alluvion, falling debris, subsidence, inundation, or slippage; or

The building work itself is likely to accelerate, worsen or result in erosion, avulsion, alluvion, falling debris, subsidence, inundation, or slippage of that land or any other property”

unless the District Council is satisfied that adequate provisions have been made to protect or restore the land, building work or other property. If the building work itself would not exacerbate any natural hazard, but the land itself is prone to such a hazard, the Council is able to approve an application for a building consent under Section 36(2), but only if it notifies the District Land Registrar. The District Land Registrar must make an entry on the certificate of title to the effect that a building consent has been issued in respect of a building on land which is susceptible to the natural hazards identified above.

It is generally impractical to protect or restore the land, building work or other property against subsidence, although with appropriate design it is possible to reduce the damage to buildings arising from mine subsidence.

3.3 Community Expectations

Prior to the RMAct and the BAct, subdivision and building in potentially hazardous areas was controlled by the Town and Country Planning Act 1977 and the Local Government Act 1974.

The Abbotsford landslip disaster and subsequent commission of enquiry highlighted the very much greater expectation the public has of local authorities, and the demand for councils to put more effort into their land subdivision and building permit control. Parliament, anxious to protect property owners from the considerable loss that could result if land disappeared underneath them, obliged with Sections 274 and 641 of the Local Government Amendment Act in 1979. That Act made it difficult, if not impossible, for local authorities to allow subdivision or to issue building permits on land that was likely to be subject to, amongst other hazards, subsidence.

With the advent of the Local Government Amendment Act (1979), councils found administering subdivisional and building permit applications in terms of Sections 274 and 641 a bitter pill to swallow. Local authorities were suddenly faced with refusing building permits on land where they had earlier allowed subdivision to proceed, and developers and land owners saw potential profits threatened and brought pressure to bear. The public who found themselves restricted in hazard prone areas resented the loss of land value and loss of “freedom” to do what they wanted.

Accordingly, despite the clear conclusions and recommendations of the Commission of Enquiry into the Abbotsford Landslip Disaster which reported in November 1980, less than a year later the Local Government Amendment Act was yet again amended with Section 641(a) (now Section 36(2) of the BAct) which allows a local authority to issue a building permit where the land is subject to erosion, subsidence, slippage or inundation and not be under any civil liability (Rogers and Taylor 1986).

No amount of controls on development can produce zero risk in the urban areas of Whangarei District, and we do not believe that the community expects that to be achieved.

What the community can rightly expect, however, is that the actual and potential hazards are properly identified, and that the potential consequences are clearly explained. We believe the 1998 proposed plan and 1995 policy appropriately fulfill this expectation.

3.4 Development Controls in Mine Subsidence Hazard Areas

The need to deal with the control of development in hazard-prone areas is recognised and district plans are required to identify areas at risk, to state how the land is to be used, and to set down the ground rules indicating what an owner or occupier can or cannot do with property in hazard-prone areas.

WDC recognise (Section 6.2 of the Proposed Plan) that “subdivision and development are closely related as subdivision generally enables further development of a particular area of land to occur. Subdivision is therefore a key factor in determining future landuse patterns and is linked to the landuse expectations of land owners. Most people who buy a vacant site do so with an expectation to be able to build a house or other building on the site.” WDC also recognise that natural hazard identification, potentially affecting site suitability for anticipated land uses, is also linked to the subdivision process.

Under Section 6.4.6 (Natural Hazards) of the Proposed Plan “subdivision and development should be avoided in areas where natural hazards including erosion, falling debris, subsidence, slippage, inundation, flooding and sea level rise may occur, unless adverse effects can be avoided, remedied or mitigated.”

Explanation and Reasons: “Many areas within the District may be subject to natural hazard, should human activity occur. Major risks include erosion, flooding and inundation from the sea. The Regional Policy Statement requires both the Northland Regional Council and the Whangarei District Council to provide information on areas which have known natural hazard related problems.”

“The Regional Policy Statement also requires the Regional Council to undertake monitoring of coastal hazards and area of possible flooding. The policy also reflects the requirements of Section 106 of the Act.”

Mine subsidence, although clearly caused solely by people, is included under the Natural Hazards section of the Proposed Plan. Section 50.6 sets out activities and rules for mining subsidence.

Permitted	Discretionary	Discretion restricted to
<p>50.6 Mining subsidence</p> <p>Construction or alteration of a building or earthworks in a Mining Hazard Area is permitted if:</p> <p>a) A geotechnical survey of the ground under and in the immediate vicinity of the site is undertaken.</p> <p>b) A report or certificate from a soils engineer approved by the Council is provided to the council which indicates that:</p> <p>i) The site is suitable for the activity or structure</p> <p>ii) The structure is of an appropriate design and the building materials are appropriate in the circumstances.</p> <p>c) The risk of subsidence is not increased by the construction or alteration of a structure or excavation.</p>	<p>Any activity that does not comply with a condition for a permitted activity is a restricted discretionary activity.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • construction standards • health and safety

Section 50.8 sets out reasons for the rules:

Mining Subsidence

“The areas subject to possible mining subsidence are identified on the Planning Maps. A network of tunnels exist in the residential areas of Kamo and Hikurangi. The risk to properties situated above these old coal mining tunnels and to human life can be minimised by ensuring that any earthworks or structure is suitable and does not increase the likelihood of subsidence. This can be achieved by controlling the design and building materials of structures that are built in these areas.”

In the application of this rule, further urbanisation of the Kamo Mine Zones areas is occurring and significant areas have recently been subdivided.

4.0 Mine Hazard Subsidence Assessment

4.1 Mine Subsidence Hazard Zones

From a review of the mine hazard work undertaken by John St George, Nolan Aughenbaugh, Graham Mansergh, Laurie Wesley and Richard Gray from 1981 to 1984, it is evident that the work was very thorough and in addition to extensive secondary data (maps, photos, plans and reports) utilised primary sources of data (particularly miners who worked in the Kamo coal mines) which are no longer available. From a review of the available data we have not identified any new information which would lead us to alter the current hazard zonations.

Accordingly, we consider that the zones as currently delineated on the planning maps, adequately reflect the potential hazard and should remain unchanged.

4.2 Risk

The issue of risk needs very careful consideration in its application to the Kamo mine area. The risks associated with the undermining beneath Kamo also needs to be considered in the context of other risks associated with natural hazards, in both the Kamo area and in the wider District.

All living involves risk taking and from an aspect of natural hazards, Whangarei is a relatively risky place to live. Hillslope properties are potentially subject to landslip, and low lying properties are actually or potentially subject to flooding. Erosion threatens many coastal properties.

In the Kamo area, properties are at risk of subsidence as a result of undermining (extraction of coal). The fact that the subsidence hazard in Kamo is due to coal extraction and hence not a 'natural' hazard (Act of God) is only relevant with respect to insurance considerations.

The test which WDC is required to meet in terms of its statutory obligations under both the RMA Act and the BAct, is whether or not subsidence is likely to occur to a particular area of land or building site.

Risk is defined as the probability of a hazard (in this case mine subsidence) occurring multiplied by the consequences (in this case damage to buildings and other property). Accordingly, the more the Kamo area is urbanised, the greater the risk will be of damage to buildings.

In Zone 1 which covers an area of 13 hectares (ha), a risk of crown-hole development clearly exists due to the close proximity of the undermined areas to the ground surface. Several isolated properties have been subject to crown-hole subsidence events, and hence the risk is not just theoretical. However, even in Zone 1 there is no evidence to suggest that any particular property is likely to be subject to subsidence, unless it has been so in the past, or is located close to shafts or drives. The number of crown-holes appears to be less than 20, and the area of land involved is probably less than 2,000 m² (0.2 ha).

In Zone 2, which covers an area of 105 ha, a risk of trough subsidence development also clearly exists, and many properties were subject to subsidence as a result of a single event in 1980. The number of trough subsidence events is unknown, but the 1980 event alone affected nearly 3ha. In Zone 2 there is no evidence to suggest that any particular property is likely to be subject to subsidence, unless it has been so in the past.

In Zone 3, which covers an area of 139 ha, trough subsidence is possible but unlikely to result in significant surface deformation. Accordingly, even in the event of subsidence occurring, this is unlikely to result in significant damage to structures on the ground surface.

Collapse of shafts and drives pose specific localised risks to nearby structures and these need to be identified and managed on a case by case basis. These

areas of specific risk are already addressed under the 1995 policy (refer Appendix B).

As discussed in the Tonkin & Taylor Ltd 1984 report, the factors associated with subsidence over abandoned mines mean that the timing and location of subsidence events cannot be predicted with any reliability. Also, the area involved is relatively small and the number of events is so low that it is not possible to carry out a statistical analysis and to use this as a basis for predicting likely trends in subsidence events in the future.

Since eleven (11) properties were damaged as a result of the 1980 trough subsidence in the vicinity of Grant and Boswell Streets, no subsidence events have been recorded by WDC. What we can state, however, is that where the competent rock cover is greater than 10 times the mined coal seam thickness (Zone 2) crown hole subsidence is unlikely to occur, and where the rock cover is greater than 100 m (Zone 3), trough subsidence is unlikely to be sufficiently great to cause significant damage. In Zone 3, the differential settlements arising from trough subsidence are likely to be within the tolerance limits for most structures.

Another issue which is important is the status of the flooded mine. The current 'apparent' stability of some of the undermined areas in Kamo may in part be due to the fact that the mine is flooded. It must be appreciated that should this situation change (e.g. draining parts of the mine by pumping from groundwater bores) then the stability situation could deteriorate significantly. Accordingly, if it is to permit development over the old mine workings, Council may need to instigate controls on groundwater abstraction to ensure that mine draining does not occur.

4.3 Consequences of Mine Subsidence

As set out in Tonkin & Taylor Ltd (1984), the subsidence arising from crown-hole or trough development in the Kamo area would not normally pose any threat of personal injury or loss of life, and that overseas experience has been

that cases of personal injury resulting from mining subsidence are so few as to be of almost negligible significance. Perhaps the greatest threat to people would be a crown-hole developing in the road.

Recent risk assessments undertaken for the Kamo By-Pass (Opus, International), the Fairfield By-Pass south of Dunedin (Stewart & Glassy, 1998), and the Allison No 2 mine in Huntly (Tonkin & Taylor Ltd, 1994) have emphasised the generally low probability of crown-hole and trough subsidence events in New Zealand arising from underground coal mining and the high cost for mitigation. The lithologies (rock types) overlying the Kamo coal measures are relatively strong, which should limit both the depth and extent of subsidence events. Accordingly, even if mine subsidence occurs, the subsidence at the ground surface is most likely to be relatively shallow and gradual. The most likely consequences of future mine subsidence events are therefore damage to buildings due to differential settlement.

In addition to houses and other private structures, the Kamo mine zones are partially covered by a network of public roads and services (sanitary sewer and stormwater pipes), as shown on Figure 3. These structures act as strain gauges, and sharp differential settlements arising from subsidence should be reflected in damage to kerb lines, footpaths, roads and pipelines.

Unfortunately WDC do not maintain a damage register for roads and services which may indicate subsidence. However, from discussions with WDC staff there do not appear to be any particular or persistent problems with the roads or services in the Kamo area.

Survey points have been established throughout the Kamo area since at least 1966-68. Re-surveys of these points (shown on Figures 2 & 3), in 1980 – 82 indicated up to 118 mm of settlement (at Wakelin St) had occurred over the 13 – 16 year period. However, apparent settlement of up to 68 mm of areas outside the mine zones cast considerable doubt on the accuracy of the survey data. Further survey work is recommended.

Following a walkover reconnaissance of the Kamo mine zones, nine (9) properties were shortlisted for inspection to provide some performance benchmarks. Of these, seven (7) were inspected in detail. The selection criteria included the approximate age of the building (as old as possible) and their construction (as brittle as possible), and their location with respect to drives, shafts and areas of known subsidence.

Of the seven properties inspected, four properties are in Zone 2, two are in Zone 1 and one is in Zone 3. The inspection reports, together with photographs, are presented in Appendix C. Most of the properties were in good conditions and exhibited no evidence of differential settlement due to ground subsidence. Where damage was evident, shrink-swell movement of the ground was the most likely cause of damage. Indeed, given the high plasticity and shrinkage potential of the soils in the Kamo area, soil shrinkage probably poses a significant threat to building damage.

5.0 Discussion

From a review of the available data it is clear that the development controls imposed for the various hazard zones in 1982 and 1983 were strongly influenced by:

- The subsidence events of 1977 and (in particular) 1980
- The amendments to the Local Government Act in 1979 and 1981
- The Abbotsford Landslip disaster and subsequent Commission of Enquiry
- The cautious approach of the U.S. experts, Professor Nolan Aughenbaugh and Mr Richard Gray

Based on our re-assessment of the hazard and the risks associated with mine subsidence in the Kamo area, we believe that consideration should be given to relaxing the controls on development in the area.

With the possible exception of Zone 1, areas in Zone 2 exhibiting evidence of past subsidence, and areas close to shafts and drives, WDC should be able to grant consent for building in the hazard zones without resorting to Section 36(2) of the Building Act.

Issuing building consent under Section 36(2) implies that damage is likely to occur, which impacts negatively on property values. Under the Third Schedule of the Earthquake Commission Act 1993, the Commission may decline a claim for natural disaster damage where the building consent is granted under Section 36(2).

Should WDC decide to allow development (albeit restricted) in Zones 2 and 3 (and possibly even Zone 1), the issues of liability and insurance need to be addressed.

We believe that WDC should, however, adopt a cautious approach to allowing further subdivision in the area, particularly at green-field sites. There can be no doubt that the best way to reduce damage to buildings and minimise the distress to people is to prevent development on areas where a hazard has been identified. This is particularly so for the Kamo areas which have been undermined, as it is generally not practicable to mitigate the hazard. Evidence of past or incipient subsidence is also very difficult, if not impossible, to detect on a green-field site, given the relatively small amounts of deformation which would be expected in Zones 2 and 3. As a land use on undermined land, the Denby Golf Course appears to be particularly appropriate.

The more the Kamo hazard zones are urbanised, the greater the risk will be of property damage due to mine subsidence.

Mine subsidence is not the only hazard associated with the Kamo coal mines. Mine gas (primarily methane) and fire (due to spontaneous combustion) also pose a threat (albeit slight) to people and property in the Kamo area, and

consideration should also be given to these potential hazards in determining Councils future policy on urbanisation over undermined areas.

6.0 Conclusions

- The hazard zonations as shown on the Proposed (Whangarei District) Plan are considered appropriate and should be retained. Appropriate information should be recorded on all property files to alert current and future land owners of the potential for mine subsidence.
- With the exception of Zone 1 and areas in Zone 2 where previous subsidence has occurred, and areas close to shafts and drives, mine subsidence on any specific property is not considered likely to occur.
- The current restrictions on development in the Kamo mine area are not consistent with restrictions on other areas of similar land hazard, for example steep slopes or cliff tops.
- Subsidence events are expected to continue to occur and further urbanisation on the undermined areas will increase the risk of damage to private property.
- Dewatering of the flooded mine wall would increase the risk of subsidence.

7.0 Recommendations

- WDC should consider relaxing the current controls on development in the area, in particular removing the requirement for granting building consent under Section 36(2) of the Building Act 1991.
- A video surveillance programme should be initiated in the Kamo mine zones to check the integrity of the sanitary sewer and stormwater lines.

Should lines be ruptured due to ground subsidence, leakage could cause erosion and further undermining to occur.

- A resurvey of survey marks in the Kamo area should be undertaken to identify areas of subsidence and to provide a basis for future assessments.
- WDC should investigate options for properties to be insured against subsidence in the Kamo mine zones.
- The WDC GIS should incorporate the location of all known crown-holes, subsidence areas, drives and shafts, and the location of these features should be made available to the public.
- WDC should adopt a cautious approach on subdivision of green-field sites for urban development in areas which are undermined.
- Dewatering of the flooded mine should not be permitted unless it can be demonstrated that such dewatering will not increase the risk of subsidence.

TONKIN & TAYLOR LTD
Environmental and Engineering Consultants

Report prepared by:

Authorised for Tonkin & Taylor by:

.....
Nick Rogers

.....
C J Freer

mcs
JTYPE:\1746\4NWR191099.rp1.doc



29 January 2002



8.0 References

- Bell, D.H. (1996) “Building on Marginal Land”, NZ Geomechanics Society Symposium, February 1996.
- Blakeley, J. (1996) “Selective Listings – IPENZ Perspective”, NZ Geomechanics Society Symposium, February 1996.
- Cowper, B.I.J. (1995) “Natural Hazard Management and The Law”, Natural Hazards Management Workshop, IGNS, November 1995.
- Hill, D. (1995) “Market Approaches To Hazard Management”, Natural Management Workshop, IGNS, November 1995.
- Johnston, D. (1995) “Community Perceptions of Risk”, Natural Hazards Management Workshop, IGNS, November 1995.
- Kear, D. (1955) “Flooding at Kamo Mine”. Geological Survey Auckland Report μ 97 KN VCHS.
- Kear, D. (1956) “Kamo Mine Flooding – Second Report”. Geological Survey Auckland, Report μ 11CH.
- Kear, D. (1959) “The Geology of the Kamo Mine Area”. N.Z. Journal of Geology and Geophysics 2:541-68.
- Mansergh, G.D. (1982) “Subsidence Investigations – Kamo”
- Milne, J. (1996) “The Legal and Planning Framework – the RMA and the Building Act 1991”, NZ Geomechanics Society Symposium, February 1996.
- Rogers, N.W. (1982) “Everything You Ever Wanted to Know About Section 641A But Were Too Afraid to Ask”. (unpublished).

- Rogers, N.W. & Taylor, D.W. (1986) “As Safe As Houses”, New Zealand Engineering, Vol 41 μ 3, April 1986.
- Sinclair, M. (1991) “Geotechnical Issues in Land Development Arising from the Legal and Planning Framework”, NZ Geomechanics Society Symposium, February 1996.
- St George, J.D. (1981) Report for W.C.C. on Subsidence from Abandoned Coal Mines at Kamo.
- St George, J.D. (1982(a)) Subsidence from Abandoned Coal Mines and Its Effect on Urban Development.
- St George, J.D. (1982(b)) Prediction of Subsidence and Strains From Mining at Kamo.
- St George, J.D. (1982(c)) Information Concerning Shafts and Adits of Ruatangata, Kamo and Harrison Mines.
- St George, J.D. (1982(d)) Possible Subsidence from Old Mine Workings Beneath the 2 Proposed Development Sites, For the Marsden Point Expansion Project.
- St George, J.D. (1982(e)) Predicted Subsidence and Strain Figures for 367 Kamo Road.
- St George, J.D. (1982(f)) Results of Site Investigation Drilling on Abandoned Coal Workings, Kamo.
- Stewart, D.L. & Glassy, P.J. (1998) Mine Subsidence Hazard Assessment for Fairfield ByPass, SH1. Roothing Geotechnics '98, NZ Geotechnical Society Symposium.
- Taylor, D.K. (1996) “Geotechnical Issues in Land Development, NZ Geomechanics Society Symposium, February 1996.

Taylor D.K., Gulliver, G.P.
& Rogers, N.W. (1981)

“Geotechnical Hazards to Urban Development”,
Geomechanics in Urban Planning, NZ Geomechanics
Society Symposium, April – May 1981.

Tonkin & Taylor Ltd (1983)

Whangarei City Corporation. Old Mine Workings –
Whangarei: Subsidence Review. November 1983.

Tonkin & Taylor Ltd (1984)

Whangarei City Corporation. Old Mine Workings,
Subsidence Review. January 1984.

Tonkin & Taylor Ltd (1994)

Coalcorp (Solid Fuel) : Allison No 2 Mine Dewatering –
Sinkhole Risk Assessment and Mitigation Project,
November 1994.



APPENDIX A

POLICY FOR BUILDING AND SUBDIVISION IN MINING ZONES ADOPTED BY COUNCIL

1ST DECEMBER 1982



Appendix A

Policy for Building and Subdivision in Mining Zones Adopted by Council 1st December 1982

Rewarded to clarify the intention of the policy writer.

ZONE 1

1. All building permits are to be issued under Section 641A of the Local Government Act and are to be issued:
 - (a) For the repair or replacement if any buildings are damaged by accident.
 - (b) Generally for the extension or addition to service rooms only (as defined in NZSS 1900 Chapter 4).
 - (c) For the erection repair or extension of any out-house, garage, shed or carport (up to 50 sq.m in area).
 - (d) For the erection repair or extension of any porch or terrace, or
 - (e) For the erection repair or extension of any fence or garden wall, including retaining walls.

The structure is to be designed to minimise the effects of any subsidence and/or is to be relocatable.

2. No further subdivision is allowed in Zone 1 unless such subdivision makes specific provision for the removal of the subsidence hazard.

ZONES 2 and 3

1. All building permits are to be granted for building using normal domestic type building construction in the normal manner with the proviso that the design and type of construction be certified by a Registered Engineer as being suitable to minimise the effects of any possible mining subsidence.
2. All buildings other than normal domestic buildings be the subject of special consideration and all permits are to be issued under Section 641(a) of the Local Government Act.



APPENDIX B

BUILDING CONTROL POLICY FOR BUILDING IN THE KAMO MINE ZONES

DECEMBER 1995



Appendix B

Building Control Policy for Building In The Kamo Mine Zones December 1995

Introduction

This policy has been updated to reflect the current legislation of the NZ Building Act 1991.

Background

Coal mining was a major industry in the early development of Kamo. A network of worked tunnels still exist in the depths of land covering these tunnels varies from area to area. The areas subject to possible mining subsidence are shown on Planning Map 6.

Mining was carried out by pillaring. Although the extent of workings and approximate depths are known for recorded workings, there are additional areas of unrecorded workings. The potential for subsidence depends on a number of factors, particularly the extent of the pillaring, whether subsidence has already occurred, and the depth of the workings. Present knowledge cannot discount subsidence occurring at any area underlain by mine workings.

The map shows three zones which indicate the different depths of cover. Zone 1 indicates the area where there is a possibility of crown-holing and major subsidence due to there being less than 10 t cover, where $t = \text{seam thickness}$. Zone 2 indicates (a) areas where there is up to 10 metres of cover and “medium” subsidence is possible and (b) areas where there has been 2 seam pillaring and greater than 100 metres of cover exists. Possible problems associated with this zone would be surface settlement, horizontal strains and subsidence fracturing. Zone 3 indicates areas where there is greater than 100 metres of cover. Although this is a low risk zone, it is possible for buildings to be affected by minor subsidence.

The zones indicate the best information the Council has to date. There may be land within these areas where such classification is not needed and there may be land outside these areas where special care on such factors is important or where actual problems exist. For confirmation of zone boundary positions, reference must be made to detailed maps held by the Council.

Reason For Policy

To minimise the danger to persons and damage to property due to mine subsidence.



Policy

No building work is permitted where the risk of subsidence is increased by the proposal.

All Building Consents for building work in mining zones are to be considered in terms of Section 36(2) of the Building Act.

Construction methods used are to be compatible for any possible subsidence that may occur.

RULES

Zone 1

1. Building consents are only to be issued for:
 - i) Repair of existing buildings.
 - ii) Minor extensions to existing buildings.
 - iii) Erection of single storey accessory buildings not exceeding 50m² in area (eg carports, garages etc).
 - iv) Erection of fences, walls and retaining walls.
 - v) Single storey housing that can be transported intact, constructed using light weight building materials with the proviso that buildings or part thereof, located within a 20 metre radius of air shafts and mine entrances are supported with a full geotechnical appraisal by a suitable qualified engineer.
2. Building Consents are to be issued only to the owner of the property, under Section 36(2) of the Building Act, with an entry on the Certificate of Title to the land that a building consent has been issued in respect of a building on land subject to subsidence.

Zones 2 and 3

1. In all cases construction methods adopted must allow for potential subsidence and may require specific design.
2. Proposed Building Works or part thereof located within a 20 metre radius of air shafts and mine entrances are to be supported with a full geotechnical appraisal by a suitably qualified engineer.



3. The Council may issue Building Consents to the owner of the property, under Section 36(2) of the Building Act, with an entry on the Certificate of Title to the land that a building consent has been issued in respect of a building on land subject to subsidence.

Please note that although the rules are the same for both Zones 2 and 3, it is useful to maintain these zones to indicate the different potential for damage to a property owner considering development of the land.



APPENDIX C

PROPERTY INSPECTION SHEETS

