

Attachment 2 – submissions summary and officer response

1. As part of seeking submissions the community was asked to provide feedback on the type of road defects considered to need additional expenditure. The results of the survey are shown below in **Table 1**.

Table 1

Defect Type	Number of selections
Sealed road defects (pot holes, edge breaks and trees overhanging the road).	30
Footpath defects (broken or deformed bays resulting in a trip and trees overhanging the footpath).	4
Road hazards (oil spills, road obstruction including dead animals and trees over roads, missing pit lids etc).	6
Footpath hazards (footpath obstructions and trees over footpaths).	1
None of the above.	2
Other.	27
No response.	3

2. Further insight into the 'Other' categories is provided in **Table 2** below. Some individual response contained multiple topics.

Table 2

Comment	Number of mentions	Officer response
Sealing or traffic volumes on unsealed roads.	5	Out of scope of the RMP.
Defects and increase maintenance on unsealed roads.	4	Will be considered as part of the review process.
Rural roads.	1	The RMP takes a risk based approach in determining levels of service. As an example, roads with more traffic (that are a higher category) will receive a more regular inspection frequency and faster response time to identified defects in comparison to roads with less traffic. Levels of service are developed independent of locality.

Comment	Number of mentions	Officer response
Roadside trees, roadside slashing and fire hazard.	5	Although trees overhanging into the road and footpath are a consideration of the RMP, the associated service levels are contained in Nillumbik's Tree Management Policy and Tree Management Guidelines. The levels of service relating to overhanging trees are set in collaboration with emergency management authorities in line with Council's Municipal Fire Management Plan. Roadside slashing activities are out of scope for the RMP. There is no proposal to review these levels of service as part of this review.
Trail maintenance.	2	Although trails on roadsides are a consideration of the RMP, any review of service levels will be performed as part of an update to Council's Trails Strategy. There is no proposal to review these levels of service as part of this review. This review, however will consider the levels of service associated with Council's 'high' footpath category which does include shared paths.
Bike lanes.	2	Out of scope of the RMP.
Speed and traffic flow.	2	Out of scope of the RMP.
New footpaths.	3	Out of scope of the RMP.
Widening roads.	1	Out of scope of the RMP.
Spend more on all of the categories.	5	The allocation of additional expenditure will be subject to a resolution of Council to increase any levels of service within an amended RMP.

3. A free form was also made available for submitters to provide any additional information. 46 of the 73 submissions received provided additional information, summarised in **Table 3** below with the officer response. Most individual responses contained multiple topics.

Table 3

Additional Information Provided	Number of mentions	Officer response
Update on a current special charge scheme.	1	Out of scope of the RMP. Officers have contacted the resident and provided an update on the special charge scheme status.
Satisfaction with current service levels.	1	Noted.
Bike lanes.	1	Out of scope of the RMP.

Additional Information Provided	Number of mentions	Officer response
Traffic lights, traffic flow, speed limits or general road safety.	13	Out of scope of the RMP. Where contact details were made available, officers have contacted submitters to discuss their comments and provide advice on how Council can support.
Quality of pit lids.	1	Council uses stormwater pit lids rated to the environment within which the pit lids sits according to the appropriate Australian Standard.
Stormwater drainage.	1	Out of scope of the RMP.
Additional parking.	1	Out of scope of the RMP.
Sealing unsealed roads and dust.	10	Out of scope of the RMP.
Increase the grading frequency and general unsealed roads maintenance.	11	Will be considered as part of the review process.
Leaf litter in drains.	1	Out of scope of the RMP.
New footpaths and pedestrian crossing facilities.	4	Out of scope of the RMP.
Roadside trees, roadside slashing and fire hazard.	17	Although trees overhanging into the road and footpath are a consideration of the RMP, the associated levels of service are contained in Nillumbik's Tree Management Policy and Tree Management Guidelines. The levels of service relating to overhanging trees are set in collaboration with emergency management authorities in line with Council's Municipal Fire Management Plan. Clearance requirements are nominated within Council's Tree Management Guidelines. Roadside slashing activities are out of scope for the RMP. There is no proposal to review these levels of service as part of this review.
Wildlife on roads.	3	The RMP deals with the response times associated with collecting deceased animals off the road or footpath. All other matters relating to increased wildlife volumes and crossings points are out of scope of the RMP.
Weed management.	1	Out of scope of the RMP.
Queried whether graffiti management is a RMP consideration.	1	Where graffiti impacts the legibility or visibility of signage or other delineation infrastructure it triggers a response with respect to the RMP to restore its functionality.

Additional Information Provided	Number of mentions	Officer response
Resealing of Arterial Roads.	1	Arterial roads are the responsibility of Department of Transport (DoT). This request was forwarded through to DoT for consideration.
Trail maintenance.	2	<p>Although trails on roadsides are a consideration of the RMP, any review of service levels will be performed as part of an update to Council's Trails Strategy.</p> <p>There is no proposal to review these levels of service as part of this review.</p> <p>This review, however will consider the levels of service associated with Council's 'high' footpath category which does include shared paths.</p>
Catering for and acknowledging road users other than cars and specifically horse riders within Section 2.3 and Section 3.2 of the RMP.	3	<p>The RMP does acknowledge user other than cars, including horse rides within Section 2.3 of the current document.</p> <p>The various hazards and defects identified within the RMP are to address the risks key stakeholders are likely to encounter when using the road, footpath and shared path network.</p> <p>Further consideration will be made to update Section 3.2 as part of any amendment.</p>
Updating Appendix A.	1	Appendix A addresses explicitly the function of the road. The request to include the function of 'informal paths' is not the intention of this table. This item is considered in Nillumbik's Trails Strategy and referenced in Appendix D of the RMP.
Equity of spend across the municipality.	2	<p>The RMP takes a risk based approach in determining levels of service. As an example, roads with more traffic (that are a higher category) will receive a more regular inspection frequency and faster response time to identified defects in comparison to roads with less traffic.</p> <p>Levels of service are developed independent of locality.</p> <p>Decisions relating to new or upgrade of assets are not in scope for the RMP.</p>
Minor edits to the document.	2	These items will be considered as part of the updated RMP.
Concerns with the survey details and method.	2	Noted.