

## BOURCHIERS ROAD SPECIAL CHARGE SCHEME – SUBMISSION AND FEEDBACK SUMMARY

NO.	SUBMISSION / FEEDBACK (Brief Summary)	COUNCIL OFFICER RESPONSE
<b>Submission in Response to Intention to Declare dated 4 July 2024</b>		
1	<p><u>Submission of Support (from interested person)</u>            Submission supports the scheme because the proposed works will improve access to the river for firefighting appliances to refill.</p>	Support noted.
2	<p><u>Submission of Support (from community group)</u>            Submission indicates that several property owners along Bouchiers Road and in the broader Shire support the scheme.            The group supports the sealing of Bouchiers Road to facilitate access to and use of the river.</p>	The Council contribution has been increased to \$86,775.14 to reflect the benefits of the proposed works to users of the Crown land (river front) at 110 Bouchiers Road and the Council reserve at 120 Bouchiers Road.
3	<p><u>Objection (from abutting property)</u>            Property owner objects to the scheme because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The road is narrow and unsafe and the sealing will increase speeding and unsafe driving.</li> <li>• An unsealed road is more consistent with the character of the Green Wedge environment.</li> <li>• The cost apportionment is unfair and Council should contribute more for the use of the river by non-residents.</li> </ul>	<p>The design has been developed considering relevant Australian standards and guidelines, including CFA access requirements for vehicle passing and turn around. The design includes localised road widening at five locations and tree removal to improve safety.            Roads in the Green Wedge that are similar to Bouchiers Road are sealed or unsealed.            The cost apportionment detailed in the report for the Council meeting on 25 March 2025 has been based on the Special Rate and Special Charge Policy and Guidelines (June 2024).            The Council contribution has been increased to \$86,775.14 to reflect the traffic data obtained in January 2025 for the use of the river land.</p>

NO.	SUBMISSION / FEEDBACK (Brief Summary)	COUNCIL OFFICER RESPONSE
4	<p><u>Objection (from abutting property)</u></p> <p>The submission raises many of the same issues as Submission 3, which have not been repeated here. Additional issues include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The extent of tree removal is unknown.</li> <li>• Funding should have been sought from the State Government for the use of the river.</li> <li>• The Bouchiers Road/Menzies Road intersection should be rectified prior to the sealing of Bouchiers Road.</li> </ul>	<p>Refer to response under Submission 3.</p> <p>The extent of tree removal will be determined as part of design finalisation. An arborist assessment will be undertaken and a planning permit sought. Only trees that provide a substantive safety risk will be considered for removal.</p> <p>Council officers sought funding from the State Government for the Crown land. However, the State Government advised that funding was not available and it is exempt from payment of a special charge in accordance with the Local Government Act 1989.</p> <p>The proposal does not include any upgrade to the Bouchiers Road/Menzies Road intersection. Such works can be considered for future funding by Council and do not need to be undertaken prior to the sealing of Bouchiers Road.</p>
5	<p><u>Objection (from two abutting properties)</u></p> <p>Submission objects to the scheme on behalf of two properties because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The works are unnecessary and for which there are suitable lower cost alternatives, such as dust suppressant spray.</li> <li>• The cost apportionment has been based on Council's 2018 policy, even though Council adopted a new policy in June 2024.</li> <li>• The cost appointment does not sufficiently consider the role of Bouchiers Road in providing access to the Yarra River.</li> <li>• The property at 20 Bouchiers Road (now known as 185 Menzies Road) has its main access via Menzies Road not Bouchiers Road, which affects the cost apportionment.</li> </ul>	<p>Road sealing is proposed consistent with the initial property owner petition for the scheme and the views of the majority of property owners. Dust suppressant is a temporary treatment that requires ongoing regular application. Council does not use dust suppressant on its roads due to environmental concerns and budget constraints. Dust suppressant does not provide the same benefits as road sealing, which is a more permanent solution.</p> <p>The cost apportionment detailed in the report for the Council meeting on 25 March 2025 has been based on the Special Rate and Special Charge Policy and Guidelines (June 2024).</p> <p>The Council contribution has been increased to \$86,775.14 to reflect the traffic data obtained in January 2025 for the use of the river land.</p> <p>The contribution for 185 Menzies Road has been decreased to reflect that the property has a side abuttal (not frontage) to Bouchiers Road.</p>

NO.	SUBMISSION / FEEDBACK (Brief Summary)	COUNCIL OFFICER RESPONSE
6	<p><u>Submission of Support (from six abutting properties)</u></p> <p>Submission supports the scheme on behalf of six properties because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The existing road is in poor condition, dusty or slippery depending on the weather, dangerous around the bends, and steep in parts.</li> <li>• The sealing will support and encourage positive use of the road and river as a family friendly environmental space.</li> <li>• The sealing will improve access to the river land for emergency services.</li> <li>• The sealing will not negatively impact the character of the area.</li> </ul>	<p>It is recommended that the scheme be declared because six of ten (60%) property owners support the scheme.</p>
<b>Feedback in Response to Planning and Consultation Committee Meeting on 13 August 2024</b>		
7	<p><u>Further Objection (from abutting property)</u></p> <p>Email from a previous objector considers that the design does not include measures to mitigate safety risks.</p>	<p>The design plans, as publicly displayed with the Intention to Declare, include road widening and centreline marking at five bends/locations to accommodate two-way traffic flow and improve safety. Some tree removal is proposed, as shown on the plans, to improve safety.</p>
8	<p><u>Further Information (from two abutting properties)</u></p> <p>Letter and follow-up email from previous objectors proposes a polymer sealant product as a low cost alternative to road sealing.</p>	<p>Refer response to Submission 5.</p> <p>Council officers investigated the product. It has not been used by any Councils in Victoria. The manufacturer was unable to provide information to satisfactorily demonstrate that the product would be effective and have no environmental impact.</p>
<b>Feedback in Response to Revised Cost Apportionment dated 5 December 2024</b>		
9	<p><u>Feedback Against Scheme (from one abutting property)</u></p> <p>Email from previous objector maintains their objection to the scheme for reasons previously advised.</p>	<p>Objection noted.</p>

NO.	SUBMISSION / FEEDBACK (Brief Summary)	COUNCIL OFFICER RESPONSE
10	<p><u>Feedback Against Scheme (from two abutting properties)</u>            Letter from previous objectors maintains their objection to the scheme for reasons previously advised.</p>	Objection noted.
11	<p><u>Feedback in Support (from one abutting property)</u>            Email from previous supporter indicates support for the scheme and revised cost apportionment.</p>	Support noted.
12	<p><u>Feedback in Support (from six abutting properties including above property)</u>            Letter on behalf of six properties maintains support for the scheme and indicates acceptance of the revised cost apportionment.</p>	It is recommended that the scheme be declared because six of ten (60%) property owners support the scheme.
13	<p><u>Further Information (from above six properties in support)</u>            Feedback includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Request for improvements to the river front post development of the scheme, to support a family friendly community space and discourage the current undesirable behaviour that occurs such as nude bathing.</li> <li>• Photographs showing the use of the car park near the river to support Council's assessment.</li> </ul>	The Council contribution has been increased to \$86,775.14 to reflect the traffic data obtained in January 2025 for the use of the river land. The traffic assessment considered the data provided by the property owners.
14	<p><u>Feedback (from one abutting property, but not one of the above six supporters)</u>            Letter indicates that the property owner is "broadly in favour of the principle of sealing" subject to the cost apportionment being revised to allocate a much higher cost to Council.</p>	<p>The property owner's support is conditional. The property owner is not one of the above six supporters of the scheme.</p> <p>The Council contribution has been increased to \$86,775.14 to reflect the traffic data obtained in January 2025 for the use of the river land.</p>