

# Constraint Equations in Cadastral Modelling

## **Abstract**

*Two methods of maintaining or constraining straight lines in a Least Squares solution of cadastral boundary data are described in this paper. An example is given to demonstrate the application and effect of the constraints.*

**Keywords:** Constraint Equations, Cadastral, Least Squares Modelling

## **Bruce R. Harvey**

School of Surveying and Spatial Information Systems  
University of New South Wales  
UNSW Sydney NSW 2052  
b.harvey@unsw.edu.au

## **INTRODUCTION**

This paper investigates one of the tasks in the coordination of cadastral points using boundary dimension data from Deposited Plans (DP). It is specifically related to the New South Wales cadastre, but may have wider applications. The research presented in this paper aims to show possible least squares (LS) calculations to provide options and tools, not to suggest which boundary definition practices to adopt or how to create or upgrade a DCDB. Boundary survey definition questions and many Digital Cadastral Database (DCDB) matters are beyond the scope of this research, but a few issues are mentioned.

Coordination of a cadastre and DCDB are matters have been studied and debated, often passionately, for many years. Software for implementing the coordination of cadastres includes: CAD with surveying modules, LS network adjustment, and specialist cadastral modelling software within GIS or as standalone software. Anecdotally, many surveyors calculate their cadastral boundary definition surveys with coordinates and have done so for many years. However coordinates of all cadastral points and related marks are not currently publicly recorded in NSW on DPs. Some surveyors do maintain their observations and coordinates in files for later use with future nearby surveys and thus over time they build a useful data set of coordinated cadastral points and marks that is not always available to other surveyors.

It is also beyond the scope of this paper to thoroughly investigate all the topics of coordination of cadastres or to expound significantly on them. However it is important to place the technical LS aspects of this paper in the broader context of coordinated cadastres. So briefly, some questions and points of concern are listed here, without an attempt to give good answers or to suggest best solutions.

What is the purpose of the coordination of the cadastral points and what accuracy is required? Is its purpose boundary definition, or GIS, or mapping? One application might be to generate coordinates that are suitable for finding cadastral survey marks by GNSS or traversing, as part of a surveyor's search and preparatory investigations prior to survey at the site. Another application might be to generate coordinates and plans suitable for planning new infrastructure. Do we want mm accuracy, or coordinates accurate to a few cm (e.g. lines that lay within the material of a fence), or an accuracy guided by the diameter of a hole that we might dig to find a buried survey mark, optic fibre cable or

gas line, etc., or an accuracy depending on the scale of a mapping product? Is the purpose of the coordination to upgrade a DCDB, and if so what are the consequences on other layers such as utilities that might be tied to a DCDB? The answers to the questions on application and accuracy could influence the method chosen for data analysis.

Suppose a straight road boundary was created with several lots fronting it, thus several corners lie along a straight line. Further some of the original corner marks may not be found by subsequent surveys of some of these lots. These later surveys may place cadastral reference marks (RM) along the line are found. The addition of information from new DPs in an area, which create new boundaries or perhaps change the dimensions of existing boundaries may influence the coordinate calculations. Now when data from all the DPs of this road are combined, should we keep the line with a number of corner points on it straight, that was the original surveyor's intention, or allow small bends at each corner along the road frontage? Of course the answers partly depend on how far 'off line' the intermediate points are.

Another consideration: if for example, a straight road shown on a DP as being 66 feet wide should we maintain the road width by constraining the solution so that both road frontage boundaries are parallel and 66 feet apart? Coordinate calculations could similarly allow for curved boundaries, so that radial and tangential boundary lines be constrained to their original intentions.

Experienced Registered Surveyors do not always agree about a particular boundary's definition. For example, "When redefining lot boundaries, never connect across roads" (Azimuth, 2007a) and "Stick to your side of the road – use marks on the other side of the road when all the marks on your side of the road are gone ... and heaven forbid as a last resort use marks on the other side of the road around an angle!!!" (Azimuth, 2007b). These views are different to those who would argue to maintain the original plan's intentions which might include straight lines, original width roads etc. The views also imply some expected difficulty with road frontages. For boundary definition purposes we also need to consider the hierarchy of evidence that prefers monuments to measurements and other matters.

Further related questions include: Should we include data from all plans of the site or just the latest plans? How can we best manage the storage and transfer of data and results? How should we manage the possibility that coordinates of a cadastral point may change with time?

## **LEAST SQUARES MODELLING**

Least Squares is a mathematical method suitable for adjusting observations containing random errors. Using boundary dimension data, which is derived from measurements that are then processed and often rounded, and implied data from many plans in an area in a single coordination adjustment usually gives sufficient data redundancy to provide data quality indicators and might help resolve inconsistencies and errors. If there is only a limited amount of redundant data in an area it is quite difficult to locate errors. Thus it is useful to include data from many plans of surveys in the project area. It is also important to include appropriate weighting (input standard deviations) considering the accuracy standards of the era when the survey was done and other evidence.

The main LS topic for this paper is the analysis of data sets where cadastral boundary lines that contain several points initially intended to be on a straight line. However, when all the cadastral data in that region is adjusted the points do not remain on line, i.e. bends are introduced. A simple example is described later. There are at least four approaches. Firstly, do nothing and let the lines bend. Secondly, add additional "observations" of  $0^\circ$  or  $180^\circ$  angles with large weighting that force the lines to remain straight. Thirdly, introduce constraint equations to the LS model. The second and

third of these methods are discussed in this paper. A fourth method is to determine a line of best fit for points intended to stay “online”. This latter method is described in Merritt (2006).

Once straight lines are dealt with appropriately we may then consider parallel straight line constraints e.g. road frontages.

### EXAMPLE

The purpose of the following simple example is to demonstrate some aspects of the problem of LS estimation of cadastral point coordinates. It does not aim to prove, or support a method, nor does it represent the complexity of the often very large DCDB projects. This example uses data from NSW cadastral plan DP 255841, surveyed in 1977.




Figure 1. Part of Cadastral Plan DP 255841 (obtained from NSW Dept. of Lands)

Figure 1 shows the subdivision of land north of Quebec Street. The lots in this plan were sold and houses were built. However front fences were not built on most of the lots and 30 years later some of the original corner pegs placed by the survey for this DP still exist as do most of the reference marks. This is a somewhat rare occurrence. Incidentally, the marks existing in 2006 of the entire area in figure 1 were surveyed and connected into a MGA (Map Grid of Australia) control network but this paper does not require or use those results.

Some of the data in this plan is redrawn in figure 2 and is used for example calculations in this paper.




Figure 2. Data from part of DP 255841

The DP created lots 31 to 33 but the road boundary of Quebec St was created as a straight line in an earlier plan. Thus the intention was a straight line from point 1 to point 10 as labelled in figure 2.

### LEAST SQUARES CALCULATION EXAMPLE

Consider lots 31, 32, and 33 in Figure 2. At this stage we don't consider the adjoining lot boundaries, reference marks, MGA or subsequent surveys of marks found. Standard deviations of the input data, for the purposes of these examples, have been set at about 0.3 times the least count of the rounded data on the plan. The lengths of the lines have not been considered when assigning the standard deviations of the bearings. So, we set the standard deviation of distances to  $\pm 2$  mm and bearings to  $\pm 7''$ . The data all comes from one DP and is self consistent. The loop miscloses are smaller than 5 mm in each lot.

A standard LS adjustment of the data for the above three lots does not yield significant bends in either the front or rear lines of the lots. Point 1 only, was held fixed at arbitrary coordinates. If we treat the bearings as sets of direction observations from each point and solve for an orientation parameter at each corner the results are not significantly different to those above.

Hypothetically, say another surveyor in a later plan for the lot to the east of lot 33, shows the distance from point 5 to point 6 (as labelled in figure 2) to be 30.9m i.e. 0.1m less than shown above, but with the same angles at the corners. The second surveyor's determination might be based on marks found or for other reasons. Differences like this are not uncommon, but a large discrepancy was selected here to highlight the effects. A least squares solution using data from both plans with a minimally constrained solution (point 1 is held fixed but not point 10), did cause a bend at point 5, as follows. Compared to the previous solution, point 4 moves 3 mm north, point 5 moves 7 mm north, point 10 moves 7 mm north, point 6 moves 22 mm south, points 7, 8 and 9 moves south by smaller amounts. An exaggerated view of the shifts is shown in figure 3 below. Of course, some outliers are flagged in the solution but these are not dealt with here.




Figure 3. Effect of two plans with different dimensions for line 5 to 6. Not to scale. Blue dashed lines represent an exaggerated view of the position of the adjusted boundaries.

When point 10 is held fixed as well as point 1, there is still a bend of the front and rear lot lines. The magnitudes of the shifts are similar to those above.

In this particular example some lines have cardinal bearings; the bearing of line 1 to 10 is exactly  $90^\circ$ . So a simple solution for this particular data would hold fixed the Northing coordinate of points 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 10. Solving for the Easting only would hold all points on line. But that is a special case, not applicable to all surveys. This “Easting only” solution for this data set left the street frontage, 1 to 10, as a straight line and moved points 9 to 6 south by 10 to 26 mm.

The discrepancies from straight lines shown in this example might or might not be significant depending on the application of the coordinates. Again, this paper does not suggest whether the lines should be constrained to be straight or not. This paper merely explains the technical aspects and leaves the decisions to the surveyor.

### ANGLE CONSTRAINTS

Another way to hold lines straight is to add fictitious observations of  $180^\circ$  angles at certain points and to give these “observations” very small standard deviations (s) e.g.  $\pm 0.01''$ , thus causing these observations in practical terms to be fixed. Their residuals (v) and v/s will be close enough to zero. We do not set  $s = 0$ , i.e. perfectly held fixed, because that would cause divide by zero errors in the LS calculations.

With the data in figures 2 and 3, a  $180^\circ$  constraint angle was added only at point 5 (i.e.  $\angle 1-5-10$ ) then points 1, 5 and 10 did stay on line but points 2, 3 and 4 were not on this line, they had offsets of a few millimetres. An alternative to applying a  $180^\circ$  angle e.g.  $\angle 1-5-10$  is to apply a  $0^\circ$  angle e.g.  $\angle 5-1-10$ .

If there are more than three points on line e.g. points 1-2-3-4-5, one option is to add an angle at each intermediate point e.g.  $\angle 1-2-3 = 180^\circ$ ,  $\angle 2-3-4 = 180^\circ$ ,  $\angle 3-4-5 = 180^\circ$ , or  $\angle 1-2-5 = 180^\circ$ ,  $\angle 1-3-5 = 180^\circ$ , and  $\angle 1-4-5 = 180^\circ$ . With the data in figures 2 and 3 the points 2, 3, 4, and 5 were given fixed  $180^\circ$  angles and the line did stay straight from 1 through to 10. The back (northern) corners of the lots did, of course, shift.

Next we constrain the rear lot boundaries too. The points 2, 3, 4, 5, 7 and 8 were given  $180^\circ \pm 0.01''$  angles. The solution for this data can be compared with the first solutions’s adjusted coordinates as shown in figure 4. If the data in DP 255841 relevant to the lots north of ‘our’ lots 31, 32, and 33 was included then the line from 6 to 9 would include 8 points.




Figure 4. Effect of two plans with different dimensions for line 5 to 6 with 180° constraint angles at points 2, 3, 4, 5, 7 and 8. Blue dashed lines represent an exaggerated view of the position of the adjusted boundaries.

### Effect of constraints on VF

What effect does adding these extra observations have on the estimated Variance Factor (VF), residuals, outliers, degrees of freedom and other aspects of LS? In the above context constraint angles are not derived from direction observations and are thus not correlated, and none of the other bearing or distance ‘observations’ from the DPs are assumed to be correlated. So

$$VF = \frac{\sum (v/s)^2}{n - u} \quad (1)$$

If we add “fixed” angles their v/s is virtually zero, however the residuals and v/s of other observations will generally be different to the values if fixed angles had not been included. So adding fixed angles does contribute to the numerator in equation 1. If the fixed angles are counted as observations then n-u increases (n-u = the degrees of freedom = number of observations – number of unknown parameters). Here we add the number of pseudo “fixed” observations to the actual number of real observations. If n-u is large, as in a large data set, with a small percentage of fixed angles constraints, then a small error will not have significant consequences on VF in practice. However, care should be taken when interpreting VF when there are many constraint angles in a smaller adjustment.

Another consequence of including many constraints is that it will probably cause the magnitude of the residuals of other observations to increase because including constraint angles on many lines may create some tension in the network. In some cases this will cause more outliers to appear.

### PARALLEL LINE CONSTRAINTS

How do we constrain lines to be parallel? For example, how do we constrain both sides of Quebec St to be parallel, or the front and rear boundaries of lots 31 to 33 to be parallel? With hindsight solutions not originally apparent often seem logical, or simple, or better than initial ideas (de Bono, 1992). This paper proposes a solution is to add another line to the plan, add a new pedal point and add some ‘fixed’ 90° angles.

In our example we add point 11 on the line 9-8-7 at a position perpendicular to one of the points on the line 1-10. Here we chose point 2, as shown in figure 5, but any other point on this line could be chosen. Approximate (starting) coordinates need to be entered for the two additional parameters for point 11, as for other points in the least squares adjustment.




Figure 5. Additional constraints to force parallel lines

As part of the process in this example the points 2, 3, 4, 5, 7 and 8 would have  $180^\circ$  fixed angles to hold the line straight. Three further fixed angles and the coordinates of one extra point need to be added to the solution to keep the lines parallel. For example, angle  $\angle 1-2-11$  as  $90^\circ$ , angle  $\angle 2-11-9$  as  $90^\circ$ , and angle  $\angle 6-11-2$  as  $90^\circ$ . This will force point 11 to be on the line 9-6 and the line 9-6 to be parallel to the line 1-10. Other choices of the three additional angles are possible, e.g.  $\angle 1-2-11 = 90^\circ$ ,  $\angle 6-11-2 = 90^\circ$  and  $\angle 6-11-9 = 180^\circ$ . In this example if point 11 was chosen to be perpendicular to point 1 it would lie on an extension of the line west of point 9. Then a constraint angle such as  $\angle 9-11-6 = 0^\circ$  could be used as well as two other  $90^\circ$  fixed angles. Thus the pedal point does not have to lie on the second line it can be on an extension of the line.

In this example, the result of constraining back and front boundaries to be straight and parallel yields two lines 30.981 m apart.

It is not necessary to include a distance observation for the line 2-11. However if the two parallel lines are also required to be a constrained distance apart as might be desired for both sides of a road, then a 'fixed' distance for the pedal line could also be included. Distances can be held "fixed" by giving them a very small standard deviation.

As stated earlier, this constraining approach is optional and it might be used in boundary definition calculations for a new DP, or for setting up a DCDB. A surveyor doing boundary definition calculations for a new DP could investigate various aspects of the matter and consider the consequences of each constraint added. It might be wise to clearly distinguish in the input and output files which data are real observations and which are the constraint observations. On the other hand if constraints are part of a large DCDB then this process may need to be automated; that is beyond the scope of this paper.

### CONSTRAINT EQUATIONS

The angle observation constraint method described above requires one extra observation to keep three points on line, for each additional point on that line an extra observation is required. Alternatively, it is possible to extend the standard parametric LS method by adding constraint equations between parameters. Constraint equations in LS allow a physical law relating parameters to each other to be incorporated and to strengthen a solution by forcing some parameters to obey a rule or model. For example, the heights of all points on the edge of a lake could be constrained so that they equal each other. Another example is adjusting orthometric levelling, GPS ellipsoidal height differences and geoid separations in such a way that corrects loop miscloses and constrains  $h = H + N$  at each site as in Ahmed (1993).

## Constraint equations for points on a line




Figure 6.

Consider points A, B, and C in figure 6 to be on-line. Using the properties of similar triangles:

$$\frac{E_B - E_C}{N_B - N_C} - \frac{E_A - E_C}{N_A - N_C} = 0 \quad (2)$$

This is similar to the equation for bearings, but does not need the  $\tan^{-1}$  function. However if  $\Delta N = 0$  or near zero (nearly EW lines) there is a divide by zero or near zero problem. An alternative form is  $\frac{N_B - N_C}{E_B - E_C} - \frac{N_A - N_C}{E_A - E_C} = 0$  but that is weak for nearly NS lines. So we rearrange terms to remove divisions:

$$(E_B - E_C) \times (N_A - N_C) - (E_A - E_C) \times (N_B - N_C) = 0 \quad (3)$$

This constraint that A, B and C are on line has a similar effect to an angle  $\angle A B C$  constrained to be  $180^\circ$  however it does not add observations. The standard model equations for distance, bearing and angle observations and their partial derivatives are given in Harvey (2006) and elsewhere. The partial derivatives of this constraint equation (equation 3) for each of the parameters are simple, for example:  $\frac{\partial f}{\partial E_A} = N_C - N_B$ . A practical consideration for the LS solution is the units of the terms. If coordinates are in metres, then a 'constant term' of equation 3 is in  $m^2$  and the derivatives are in m, whilst a 'constant term' of equation 2 would be unitless.

To constrain three points to a straight line there is one constraint equation or one fixed angle. For each additional point on this line we require one additional fixed angle or constraint equation. If for example there are five points on a line say points A, B, C, D, and E (arranged in that order) then fixed angles could be applied at B, C and D. Alternatively, a constraint equation for each point B, C, and D to be on the line AE could be:

$$\begin{aligned} (E_A - E_E) * (N_B - N_E) - (E_B - E_E) * (N_A - N_E) &= 0 \\ (E_A - E_E) * (N_C - N_E) - (E_C - E_E) * (N_A - N_E) &= 0 \\ (E_A - E_E) * (N_D - N_E) - (E_D - E_E) * (N_A - N_E) &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

If it is possible to combine these equations to have one constraint equation for all five point then that would be advantageous for the software programmers, but the author has not yet found such a solution.

An example of a parallel line constraint equation, for the line 9 to 6 to be parallel to the line 1 to 5 in our example data, is:

$$(E_6 - E_9) \times (N_5 - N_1) - (E_5 - E_1) \times (N_6 - N_9) = 0 \quad (4)$$

Additional constraint equations could be used to keep other points on these two lines.

### Combined LS method

The parametric LS model is based on  $F(X) - L = 0$  with one equation for each observation, but the constraint equation above has no observations in it. So we consider a combined LS solution to this problem (some authors call this the mixed model). The combined LS model is  $F(L,X) = 0$  and there are two partial derivatives matrices (see e.g. Harvey, 2006).

The main terms and equations in a combined LS solution are:

'Miscloses' vector	$b = -F(\ell, x_a)$
A is a matrix of partial derivatives with respect to parameters, $n_e$ by $u$	
B is a matrix of partial derivatives with respect to observations, $n_e$ by $n$	
Solution of Parameters	$X = x_a + \Delta x$ where $\Delta x = [A^T (BQB^T)^{-1} A]^{-1} A^T (BQB^T)^{-1} b$
Quality of parameters	$Q_x = [A^T (BQB^T)^{-1} A]^{-1}$
Estimated Variance Factor	$VF = v^T P v / (n_e - u)$

If we list the model equations with all the usual observations first then the first  $n$  rows of the A matrix are the same as for a parametric LS solution. We can then add rows for the constraint equations. The number of columns in A equals the number of parameters, thus A is  $n_e \times u$ . The B matrix is dimensioned  $n_e \times n$ . The upper left  $n \times n$  corner of B is  $-I$  (negative identity matrix), the remaining terms in B are all zero since there are no observations in the constraint equations that relate parameters. Q matrix is  $n \times n$ . If the observations are assumed to be not correlated then the Q matrix is composed of the variances of the observations along the diagonal until the  $n$ th term.

Let  $A_p$  be the A matrix in an equivalent parametric LS solution (without fixed angle observations or constraint equations). Let D be the partial derivatives for the parameter constraint equations. Q is the variance matrix of the parametric solution's observations. In block matrix form:

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} A_p \\ D \end{pmatrix} \quad B = \begin{pmatrix} -I \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{so } BQB^T = \begin{pmatrix} Q & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

However, LS software for these solutions rarely store the A matrix, or  $A_p$  in this case. Also, it is difficult to determine  $(BQB^T)^{-1}$  as special solution techniques are required though Vanicek and Krakiwsky (1986) suggest a solution. Given these difficulties we leave the combined LS method and attempt a constrained method, as follows.

### Sequential LS method with Constraint Equations

The equations for a parametric LS solution with parameter constraint equations applied sequentially are given below. See Vanicek and Krakiwsky (1986) and elsewhere, for derivations and note that some authors call our constraints conditions on the parameters.

Observation equations:	$F(X) - L = 0$
Partials of observation equations:	$A = \partial F / \partial x$
OMC terms	$b = - (F(x_a) - \ell)$
First step parameters:	$X' = x_a + \Delta x'$ where $\Delta x' = [A^T P A]^{-1} A^T P b = N^{-1} t$
Parameter constraint equations:	$F_c(X) = 0$
Partials of constraint equations:	$D = \partial F_c / \partial x$
Constraint 'miscloses':	$b_c = -F_c(x_a)$
Adjusted Parameters:	$X'' = X' - N^{-1} D^T (D N^{-1} D^T)^{-1} (b_c + D \Delta x')$

Quality (VCV Matrix) of parameters:  $Q_x = N^{-1} - N^{-1} D^T (DN^{-1} D^T)^{-1} DN^{-1}$   
 Residuals: calculated observations from adj parameters – observations  
 VF:  $v^T P v / (\text{num. obs} + \text{num. constraint eqns} - \text{num. parameters})$

These equations use approximate values of coordinates ( $x_a$ ), and linearised partial derivatives in A. An iterative solution for non linear problems is performed as follows. The first iteration calculates  $\Delta x'$  as in a standard adjustment, then calculates  $X''$  by applying the constraints. The next iteration then uses  $X''$  as the starting coordinates to determine a new  $\Delta x'$  then constraints are applied again. It is recommended that good starting coordinates are used so that fewer iterations are required. It is expected that in our application the sequential constraint equations to maintain straight lines will not usually have a large effect on the solution and the iterative process.

The equations for  $X''$  look computationally intensive but the  $(DN^{-1} D^T)^{-1}$  matrix is square and has only as many rows as there are constraint equations. For one constraint equation then  $(DN^{-1} D^T)^{-1}$  is a single number.  $N^{-1} D^T (DN^{-1} D^T)^{-1} (b_c + D \Delta x')$  is a vector as long as the number of parameters. The  $N^{-1}$  matrix is usually available because it is needed for the  $Q_x$  of the parameters, but rarely the A matrix. Similarly  $\Delta x$  is available. The D matrix is usually relatively small compared to the A matrix. A practical consideration for the LS solution is the units of the terms in  $b_c$  and in D, they need to be consistent with the units of  $\Delta x'$ . If coordinates and  $\Delta x'$  are in metres, then a  $b_c$  term for a constraint like equation 3 is in  $m^2$ , and the derivatives in D are in metres.

Note that the degrees of freedom of this solution is the number of observations plus the number of constraint equations minus the number of parameters. This is the same as the fixed angle approach that adds the number of fixed angles to the number of observations when determining the degrees of freedom previously.

As an example, the data in Figure 3 and one constraint equation that the points 1, 5 and 10 are on line was solved using the above described process. The results of the solution with the parameter constraint equation (equation 2 above) were equivalent to those obtained by adding a 'fixed'  $180^\circ$  angle  $\angle 1-5-10$  as discussed above.

An analyst can subjectively force a solution towards a desired outcome by using constraints, whether by angles or by parameter equations. Similar things can happen in Bayesian LS with prior weighted parameters or in Kalman Filtering. Be careful not to overdo this and end up with a solution that is not so dependent on the data. Perhaps the constraints should be loosened sometimes to see where the data 'wants to go'. Sequentially applying constraints, as described above, allows an analyst to see the resultant coordinates, residuals, outliers etc in a solution without constraints and then another solution with the constraints. These solutions could be compared, though with very large data sets there maybe some reluctance to do so. In our example with two different values for the distance from point 5 to point 6 perhaps one of the distances was an error? In such a case a strongly constrained solution may make an error less obvious. The angle method of constraining straight lines can also be done 'sequentially', by doing one solution without the fixed angles, and another solution with the fixed angles.

### FURTHER CONSIDERATIONS

There are many other considerations related to LS in a cadastral adjustment, some are listed here for further research.

What are the appropriate weightings or standard deviations of input data and what effect does this have on the results? This not only considers the quality of measurements but also the reliability of

marks and occupations measured to by different surveyors e.g. did they really measure to the same point on the same wall, was the occupation built in the correct position?

When multiple DPs are used, should the bearings from each plan include an orientation parameter? Should there be one orientation parameter per plan, or per lot, or at each point on the plan? Should a scale factor parameter be determined for each plan, or not?

Coordinated cadastral data sets often involve many thousands of points and lines. The matrix calculations for a LS solution of large cadastral data sets with constraint equations can be huge. So the stability and efficiency of the solution needs to be considered. Do we need special methods to overcome these problems, or just faster computers with more memory? But computation time is not the only problem. Round-off error, matrix singularity and stability of solution needs to be considered.

Since almost all lines on a DP have a bearing and a distance we might consider the adjustment of further pseudo observations for each line. Exceptions to this are offset distances and road widths, which can usually be assumed to be at a bearing perpendicular to a line, and bearings without an accompanying observed distance to (usually distant) survey control marks which could be treated as a special case. One possible method, based on Gründig (1985) and Harvey (2006, section 8.5.3), follows. For most lines combine the bearing and distance observations to create two new pseudo observations of  $\Delta E$  and  $\Delta N$ ,  $\Delta E (=d \sin\beta)$  and  $\Delta N (=d \cos\beta)$ . The partial derivatives for these observation equations are simply -1, 0 or 1. This problem is linear and thus reduces the need for iteration in the LS solution. However the stochastic model needs consideration. For simplicity we might adopt the same standard deviation for both  $\Delta E$  and  $\Delta N$  for a line and assume that  $\Delta E$  and  $\Delta N$  are not correlated, but the appropriateness of that assumption depends on the equipment and techniques used in the survey. The choice of orientation parameter or not, or how many orientation parameters is beyond the scope of this paper. The addition of parameter constraint equations to this method is not difficult, but is not detailed in this paper.

This paper has investigated straight and parallel line constraints. Constraints for curved boundaries can be based around the knowledge that a circular curve is defined by its radius and centre. One way to constrain the radius is to treat it as a fixed, very small standard deviation, distance.

## CONCLUSIONS

This paper has investigated the LS process and equations for constraining points to stay on a straight line by using fixed angle observations and by using parameter constraint equations. This was extended to multiple points on line, and to parallel line constraints. Another constraint might be to constrain boundary points to lie on a circular arc, where appropriate, in some subdivisions.

Even if LS is a small part of a complete DCDB or boundary coordination software package, the practicality of programming the algorithm or method needs to be considered. It is easy to add a few more observations (e.g. 180° angles for straight lines) but adding constraint equations or line of best fit takes programming effort including perhaps redesign of the solution algorithms, and thus it is harder to implement initially.

The fixed angle method is probably easier to implement in existing software and does not give different results to the parameter constraint equations method (of course, assuming both methods are correctly applied). The parameter constraint equations method does give intermediate results that allow analysts to interpret the effects of the constraints. A similar analysis can be done with the fixed angle method if two separate solutions, one with fixed angles and one without, are compared.

DCDB projects and upgrades have consequences for the cadastre, for infrastructure and land development projects, and utilities layers in GIS. Once coordinates have been determined and the cadastral data evaluated then they are many applications. Often it is now easier to reliably measure the coordinates of a point than in the past when we measured lines and calculated coordinates.

Cadastral modelling is a means of evaluating all the cadastral data in an area. Surveyors can decide whether the application of the constraints, as presented in this paper, is useful for their survey area or not. Also, surveyors can decide whether the constraints in LS solutions of boundary data are applied in the field investigation stage or final stages of boundary definition.

## REFERENCES

- Ahmad, Z., Kearsley, A.H.W. and Harvey, B.R. (1993) *Optimising GPS, Geoid and Tide Gauge Heights in Vertical Control Networks*, p 127 - 209, in Contributions to Geoid Evaluations and GPS Heighting, Ed. A.H.W. Kearsley. Unisurv S-43, School of Surveying, UNSW.
- Azimuth (2007a) Azimuth: The NSW Surveyors Monthly Magazine, Surveyor's Tip of the Month, August 2007, Published by The Institution of Surveyors NSW Inc.
- Azimuth (2007b) Azimuth: The NSW Surveyors Monthly Magazine, Surveyor's Tip of the Month, September 2007, Published by The Institution of Surveyors NSW Inc.
- de Bono, E. (1992) *Serious Creativity*, Harper Collins.
- Gründig, L. (1985) *Special Adjustment Tools for Surveying Networks*, p. 19-33, in Papers for the Precise Engineering and Deformation Surveys Workshop, Ed. by W.F. Teskey and L. Gründig, University of Calgary, Publ.60004.
- Harvey, B.R. (2006) *Practical Least Squares and Statistics for Surveyors*, Monograph 13, Third Edition, School of Surveying and Spatial Information Systems, UNSW. 332 + x pp. ISBN 0-7334-2339-6
- Merritt, R. (2006) PhD Thesis titled *An Assessment of using Least Squares Adjustment to Upgrade Spatial Data in GIS*, October 2006, School of Surveying and Spatial Information Systems, UNSW.
- Vanicek, P. and Krakiwsky, E.J. (1986) *Geodesy - The Concepts*. Edition 2 Elsevier. 697pp.