

## ATTACHMENT 1 – SUBMISSION AND OFFICER RESPONSE

### Summary of Submissions for the proposed Road Management Plan

Submitters Details	Submission Summary	Officer Response	Actions
David Nicholls	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Noted that the revisions signal overall reduction of standards on Defect Intervention Levels, response times and collector road inspection frequency. The increases are described as "minor" but this is often not the case</li> <li>2. Plan revisions seem to be founded on reduction of required standards to meet latest assessments by management on "affordability" and reduction of legal risk relating to Public Liability.</li> <li>3. Downgrades are justified by comparison with bench marks in other shires.</li> <li>4. No attempt is made to justify downgrades in terms of road safety as an engineering concept.</li> <li>5. Cyclist safety will be most compromised by increase of pothole depth and size and this concern is greatest on the sealed roads preferred by road cyclists. We have had experience of near fatal accidents caused by large potholes. Has the consideration of risk management at item 46 included the ability of thin road cycling wheels to maintain control and traction over deeper potholes, including sub-seal gravel dispersed from the pothole? At Risk Code R041 the consequences of vehicle hitting a pothole at speed are correctly described as "medium" for a car but would be "high" for a cyclist.</li> <li>6. Pothole maintenance is also reduced on unsealed roads but this is of less concern as these are not generally used by cyclists and motorists can reduce speed to negotiate potholes. (Residents generally favour lower speeds for safety and reduced dust.) To negotiate potholes will frequently entail driving on the rhs of the road.</li> <li>7. Reference is required to maintenance of bicycle lanes. Loose gravel washed over the lane from driveways is a severe hazard to cyclists.</li> <li>8. At 2.5, Duty of Road User, should extend to roads other than "highways".</li> <li>9. At 7.7 Notice of Incidents, the 14 day allowance for</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Your comment of the use of the word 'minor' has been noted. The word minor has been used to describe amendments which will result in no net change to Council's on ground response to hazards and defects. The minor changes are an exercise in aligning performance with the documented levels of service. The exception to this is in describing the change of inspection frequency for sealed collector roads from six to 12 months. The basis for changing the inspection frequency is the reduction in the rate of defects observed for this road category. Nevertheless, the proposed 12 month frequency fits within the range set by the five benchmarked Councils.</li> <li>2. The Plan was prepared in response to the Road Management Act 2004 legislation which requires road management authorities to be responsible for the safety standards of their roads and footpaths. The intention of the Plan is to provide a level of service that meets the community's reasonable expectation for inspection, intervention and response taking into consideration affordability, available resources and management of risks. This again is an exercise in aligning on the ground performance and current resources with documented levels of service. The outcome being managing Council's exposure to litigation relating from public liability claims.</li> <li>3. Benchmarking is used to test the reasonableness of the proposed levels of service. This is considered to be the acceptable method of testing whether a level of service is reasonable or not.</li> <li>4. The intervention levels set within the Plan are an engineering specification for hazard and defect management on roads and footpaths. The intervention levels within Nillumbik's Plan are generally at the more favourable end of the the range when comparing with the benchmarked municipalities. Furthermore, the number of public liability claims Council receives has remained low which is an indicator of the favourable intervention set within the Plan.</li> <li>5. Appendix F refers to a Council risk management document which</li> </ol>	<p>Remove Appendix F: Risk Register Report. This document no longer exists.</p> <p>Provide a definition for a 'public highway' to clarify Section 2.5 Duty of Road Users.</p>

Submitters Details	Submission Summary	Officer Response	Actions
	<p>inspection should be shorter than the hazard correction time limits expressed at 7.8</p> <p>10. On page 25 at "Rural Access Road" the target speed limit is 50 to 70 km/h. Many unsealed rural access roads are windy, hilly and narrow with many sharp and blind corners. In many cases they are used as footpaths and wildlife is a frequent hazard. The maximum speed target is excessive.</p>	<p>no longer exists. The purpose that this document served is inherent in the framework of the Plan. The definition of a vehicle within the Road Safety Act 1986 includes a bicycle and therefore the standards for potholes and other hazards on roads have this consideration in place. The proposed intervention depth of 50mm sits within the range set by the five benchmarked Councils of between 30 and 100mm depth. Similarly, the proposed intervention diameter of 300mm is consistent with the five other bench marked Councils. Where gravel on a road represents a hazard to road users this will be dealt with reactively following the notification of such hazards. The response time for these hazards is 4 hours with the exception of force majeure (see Section 4 of the Plan). Appendix F is therefore proposed to be removed.</p> <p>6. Your comments have been noted.</p> <p>7. The road space is shared by both vehicles and bicycles unless it is otherwise line marked or signed accordingly. There are very few number of designated on-road bicycle lanes on Nillumbik managed roads. The large majority of designated bike lanes are on Arterial roads managed by VicRoads. The proposal is to have a consistent level of service relating to the road pavement, which are inclusive of designated on-road bike lanes. The levels of service set are considered adequate for this defect type (please see point 5 for further information). Where materials washing out from driveways onto the traffic lane represent a hazard to road users, Council has the power under the Local Government Act 1989 and under its Amenity Local Law to require the property owner to remove the hazard and prevent its recurrence. If there are specific locations where you know this to be the case please let Council know. Similarly to point 5, where the gravel represents a hazard to road users, Council will be deal with this reactively.</p> <p>8. This section is a direct extract from the Road Safety Act 1986. A highway is defined as a "road or road related area" by the Road Safety Act 1986. A definition is proposed to be included in the updated document.</p> <p>9. The inspection undertaken following a "Notice of Incident" (generally issued by a member of Victorian Police) runs independent of the hazard inspection and repair process. This</p>	

Submitters Details	Submission Summary	Officer Response	Actions
		<p>does not postpone the hazard rectification process which the Plan puts in place.</p> <p>10. This relates to a desirable speed, when designing rural access roads and is set by engineering industry standards. It is well understood that this design speed is not always achievable given various factors, most of which you have mentioned.</p> <p>Council's Road Management Plan is put in place to address its statutory duty under the Road Management Act 2004 to act 'reasonably' by inspecting and maintaining assets to protect the traveling public. The plans seeks to balance the economic, social, safety and environmental expectations of the community while considering the affordability, available resources and management of risks. The outcome being responsible road and footpath asset management and an ability to limit the public liability exposure for the overall community.</p> <p>David has been invited to speak to Council at the Future Nillumbik Committee meeting.</p>	
Joshua Branelly	Drainage needs to be improved/properly maintained on Diamond Creek Road northbound opposite the Caltex service station just before Yan Yean Road intersection, the roadway there always seems to flood and takes too long to drain creating a dangerous hazard as you have cars slowing to turn into Aqueduct Road, cars leaving the petrol station and cars reacting (sometimes late) to the large puddle which at times occupies the entire right hand lane.	<p>Drainage concern has been referred to VicRoads.</p> <p>Joshua has been invited to speak to Council at the Future Nillumbik Committee meeting.</p>	<p>No proposed changes to the Road Management Plan.</p> <p>Referred to VicRoads</p>
Adam Klan	I was surprised to see the recommendations to alter the intervention depth and diameter to larger and deeper. From a car drivers perspective this may seem just a slightly larger bump in the road to deal with but no great consequence. However, with the Nillumbic Shire being picturesque, it has a huge appeal with the cycling community. The depths and diameter increases to	<p>Adam was provided the following information in response to his submission</p> <p>Council's Road Management Plan is put in place to address Councils statutory duty under the Road Management Act 2004 to act 'reasonably' by inspecting and maintaining assets to protect the</p>	<p>No proposed changes to the Road Management Plan.</p>

Submitters Details	Submission Summary	Officer Response	Actions
	<p>intervention drastically increase the likelihood of injury or death to cyclists as an impact with such potholes with a tyre that is only 23 mm in diameter (a typical road bike tyre) has a much greater effect on the rider and are far more fragile. Not sure if you have noticed the number of cyclists but from 6am till midday there are hundreds of cyclists that you will be putting at greater risk.</p>	<p>traveling public. The plans seeks to balance the economic, social, safety and environmental expectations of the community while considering the affordability, available resources and management of risks. The outcome being responsible road and footpath asset management and an ability to limit the public liability exposure for Council and the overall community.</p> <p>Your comments about larger and deeper potholes increasing risk are noted. The following factors have been considered in proposing the change to intervention levels for potholes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed intervention depth of 50mm sits within the range set by the five benchmarked Councils of between 30 and 100mm depth. Similarly, the proposed intervention diameter of 300mm is consistent with the five other benchmarked Councils.</li> <li>• An overall reduction in the rate of defects has been observed for certain road categories over the past four years.</li> <li>• The number of public liability claims Council receives has remained low. Furthermore, Council has received no claims relating to cyclists hitting potholes on roads it is responsible to manage.</li> </ul> <p>The proposal to amend the advertised level of service from 30 to 50mm depth and from 150 to 300mm diameter is based on the above factors.</p> <p>Adam has been invited to speak to Council at the Future Nillumbik Committee meeting.</p>	
Kerryn Pilkington	<p>The residents of Wattle Glen would love it if the path in Heidelberg - Kinglake Rd from Silvan Rd to Mannish Rd were to be extended to Kangaroo Ground road.</p>	<p>The request to have the footpath extended has been referred to infrastructure Development for consideration and response.</p> <p>Kerryn has been provided with the VicRoads reference has been invited to speak to Council at the Future Nillumbik Committee meeting.</p>	<p>No proposed changes to the Road Management Plan.</p> <p>Referred to Infrastructure Department</p>
Taimi	<p>Progress Road - Wattletree Road intersection: I wrote the</p>	<p>The concerns regarding pedestrian safety along the two routes</p>	<p>No proposed</p>

<b>Submitters Details</b>	<b>Submission Summary</b>	<b>Officer Response</b>	<b>Actions</b>
Buchan	<p>attached letter almost two years ago to the council. I emailed it and sent it via post and never heard any word that it had been received. I am a member of the School Council at Eltham North Primary School and, though our council, this letter was resubmitted late 2016. Nillumbik responded by trimming some greenery to enhance visibility for both pedestrians and drivers at the bottom of Progress Road, however it still remains a huge hazard. I have personally almost been hit by a car on several occasions despite the most cautious efforts in pedestrian road safety and the recent action taken (removal of greenery). Please address the safety of school children trying to walk to and from school. The footpath from Progress Road to Short Road needs safety fencing and greenery removed as the path is very narrow. Please do something before an horrendous accident occurs.</p>	<p>identified in the submission have been referred to Council's Infrastructure Department for assessment and response.</p> <p>Taimi has been invited to speak to Council at the Future Nillumbik Committee meeting.</p>	<p>changes to the Road Management Plan.</p> <p>Referred to Infrastructure Department</p>
Adrienne Brodie	<p>Please stop spraying our roadsides with herbicides. I have seen a contractor spraying while driving with a nozzle sticking out of the passenger side window - no care or concern for reptiles or echidnas that may be in the grass being sprayed. Please go back to just mowing and brushcutting. It is better for the environment and for us. Why hasn't Nillumbik started using Weedsteamers. This is also very disappointing and not a good look for council when herbicide sprayers are seen spraying busy places such as the Research shops during early hours of the day when high numbers of school children are catching buses to school. Weedsteamers uses water. We live in the Green Wedge - Herbicides like Round Up are being banned in other parts of the world. Why is Nillumbik not doing more to control weeds on our roadsides using more natural methods - herbicides are made using derivatives from petrochemicals...how is this good for the environment? I'm also concerned about the recent instalment of barriers on roads that I use alot. The height of the barriers is scary to say the least. Before, the kangaroos were visible on the roadsides....and if the hop out in front...they hop out...now if they decide to cross the roads in these sections, they have to jump over. So roos will likely land in car bonnets from now on with less warning to us drivers. A better solution to that would have been to use a daytime speed limit and a night time limit as done in school zones.</p>	<p>The concern regarding use of herbicide on road sides was directed to Council's Environment and Open Space Unit for consideration and response.</p> <p>Further information regarding the road barriers has been requested from the submitter.</p> <p>Adrienne has been invited to speak to Council at the Future Nillumbik Committee meeting.</p>	<p>No proposed changes to the Road Management Plan.</p> <p>Referred to Council's Environment and Open Space Unit</p>

Submitters Details	Submission Summary	Officer Response	Actions
Max Pegram	<p>Possibly the worst section of road in The Shire... Allandale Rd. East of Ingrams Rd. towards Donaldsons Rd KG. Your Rangers drive through this section of road daily and I believe they have never reported the disgraceful condition that this piece of "road " is allowed to fall into. Recently, after many complaints, you agreed and deemed the road to be "unsafe" and had to close the road. With our Rates , some of the highest in Melb this should never be allowed to happen. The cracks in our road don't trip people they trap cars, trucks, buses, cars with caravans all directed there by Sat. Nav. devices which advise this one lane dirt laneway is the best link between the Northern suburbs and the Eastern suburbs via Warrandyte. It is barely one lane and there is "No signage " to indicate that the creek crossing can only take one vehicle and that the following steep hill is only suitable for one car at a time. The so called road needs to be upgraded and sealed or closed. Your Roads dept. have admitted it is a big headache, doing nothing or patching it occasionally is not good enough considering our 'over rated properties'. We are sick of pulling stuck vehicles out of 40cm + gutters forced into them purely because two cars need to pass each other. We don't need a Plan to Repair, we need to be listened to and respected as ratepayers now.</p>	<p>The following comments were provided to Max in response to the submission:</p> <p>Unsealed roads by nature are a challenging asset to manage. The road surface life is vulnerable to many factors none more so than weather and traffic. Council has approximately 330 kilometres of unsealed roads and our ability to manage is heavily resource dependant. Your interest in the long term management of this road is shared, however I note that the short term hazards and defects still need to be addressed.</p> <p>One of the objectives of the Road Management Plan is to detail levels of service with respect to the more immediate response to managing defects and hazards on our road network. The recent road closure referred to in your submission was due to the unforeseen accelerated deterioration of the road surface. Our preference is to keep the roads open, however when we are unable to respond promptly our last resort is to close the road until the rectification works are completed.</p> <p>To ensure your comments with respect to sealing or closing the road; satellite navigation and signage are considered, they have been referred to Council's Infrastructure Department for further investigation and response.</p> <p>Max has been invited to speak to Council at the Future Nillumbik Committee meeting.n</p>	<p>No proposed changes to the Road Management Plan.</p> <p>Referred to Infrastructure Department</p>
Pam Hoyne	<p>Dear Joseph,</p> <p>My submission is in relation to Ironbark Road Yarrambat. I reside at 458 Ironbark Road which is right in the nerve centre of Yarrambat. In the short stretch of road from Yan Yean Road to the corner of De Fredericks Road there is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A Primary School</li> <li>• A school crossing</li> <li>• A church</li> <li>• A shop</li> <li>• A Post Office</li> <li>• A café</li> </ul>	<p>Customer service requests created for removing the trip hazard, repairing the pothole and requesting the parking enforcement officer to attend to the illegal parking issues.</p> <p>All other issues have been referred to the Infrastructure Department.</p> <p>Pam has been invited to speak to Council at the Future Nillumbik Committee meeting.</p>	<p>No proposed changes to the Road Management Plan.</p> <p>Customer service requests raised for works.</p> <p>Referred to</p>

Submitters Details	Submission Summary	Officer Response	Actions
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A kindergarten</li> <li>• A fire station</li> <li>• A workshop for woodwork</li> <li>• A football oval, basketball and netball facilities.</li> </ul> <p>The speed limit along Ironbark Road is signed at 60kph but the majority of drivers ignore this. There is also a small section signed as a school zone of 40kph. (This speed limit is ignored by the majority of drivers and a request for automatic signs for 40 kph was denied as not being necessary.)</p> <p>When cars turn left into Ironbark Road from Yan Yean Road there isn't any signage to inform them that the speed has changed from 70kph to 60kph. Consequently cars speed down this section until they reach the sharp bend at the fire station corner.</p> <p>Parking is a major problem for the residents along this stretch of road. School parents park over footpaths and block driveways. It is extremely hard to see when exiting our property and no matter how careful we are there have been some near misses. Many school parents also like to make a dangerous u-turn in this section of Ironbark Road.</p> <p>Another major issue in regards to parking arises from the café called Tancks Corner. This café was given a permit for 35 customers but only required to provide 16 car spaces on the property. Five of these spaces are for the use of the Post Office customers from Monday to Saturday morning. On weekends there can be more than 20 cars parked along both sides of Ironbark Road blocking access and causing difficulty for residents. It would appear that Tanck's business has been granted special privileges as other cafes in this area have had to provide adequate parking off the road for their customers.</p> <p>The state of the road along the north side is very poor with large potholes on the edges. Nillumbik Council has filled them several times but the constant traffic just churns them out again.</p>		<p>Infrastructure Department</p>

<b>Submitters Details</b>	<b>Submission Summary</b>	<b>Officer Response</b>	<b>Actions</b>
	<p>The bus stop opposite our property is frequently used but is very dangerous. It hasn't been finished. The footpath is non-existent and there is a trip hazard near where passengers alight. I believe it to be a cable of some sort otherwise I would try to fix it myself. When there is rain the exposed clay makes the whole section around the bus stop very slippery.</p> <p>The footpath outside the school is used daily as a carpark for large vehicles. A small child wouldn't have any chance of being seen. It seems remarkable that parents would use this area for parking when it should be used by children and adults as a safe route to and from school.</p> <p>Thank you for this opportunity to express my concerns about this road. I am aware that when Yan Yean Road is being realigned and widened that Ironbark will carry much more traffic. If some of these problems aren't rectified before work begins in November there could be some worrying consequences.</p> <p>Yours Sincerely , Pam Hoyne.</p>		
Garth Foxwell	<p>This submission was in opposition of the proposed reduction in levels of service.</p> <p>Garth also raised a concern that the proposed plan includes bridges and major culverts and as these are expensive elements and therefore should be treated separate to the Road Management Plan.</p> <p>There was also a comment on the choice of benchmarked Councils.</p>	<p>The following information was provided to Garth in response to his submission:</p> <p>The Road Management Plan is put in place to address Nillumbik's statutory duty under the Road Management Act 2004 to act 'reasonably' by inspecting and maintaining assets to protect the traveling public. The plans seeks to balance the economic, social, safety and environmental expectations of the community while considering the affordability, available resources and management of risks. The outcome being responsible road and footpath asset management and an ability to limit the public liability exposure for Council and the overall community.</p> <p>Your comments about a reduction in the posted standards are noted, however I would like to confirm that this will result in no net change to Council's current on ground response to hazards and defects. One of the objectives of the review was to assess on ground performance</p>	No proposed changes to the Road Management Plan.



Submitters Details	Submission Summary	Officer Response	Actions
		<p>against the posted levels of service. In doing so it was determined critical to align our posted levels of service with on ground performance. The review process applied a benchmarking test against five municipalities to determine whether the proposed level of service (and therefore our current performance) was reasonable. With respect to potholes specifically it is noted that the levels of service in the proposed Road Management Plan sit favourably in the benchmarked range.</p> <p>The one notable change in posted and on ground level of service is the inspection frequency for sealed collector roads, proposed to be changed from a frequency of six month to 12 months. The basis for changing the inspection frequency is the reduction in the rate of defects observed for this road category and the number of public liability claims Council receives has remained low. This is an indicator of the favourable intervention proposed in the Road Management Plan. Furthermore, the proposed 12 month frequency fits within the range set by the five benchmarked Councils.</p> <p>As part of the review process our current Road Management Plan was assessed by Council's solicitors to ensure it was compliant with relevant legislation. One of the recommendations of the legal review was to include bridges and major culverts as an asset subject to the Road Management Plan. Council's Road Asset Management Plan details more specific levels of service with relation to these asset types. The levels of service relevant to bridges and major culverts will therefore remain as per the Road Asset Management Plan. Defects and hazards associated with bridges will be the same as those for any footpath or road surface as specified within the Road Management Plan (for example pot holes and trip hazards).</p> <p>Council's annual road grading program includes an inspection of the road surface to determine if it requires intervention. The standards set within the proposed Road Management Plan will align with on ground performance and therefore constitute no effective change. The proposed standards have passed the test of reasonableness as they fit favourably within the benchmarked Council range. To avoid any confusion, I confirm that Ridge Road, Christmas Hills is a Nillumbik Shire Council road. Should you be referring to Ridge Road in Arthurs</p>	

Submitters Details	Submission Summary	Officer Response	Actions
		<p>Creek, I advise the City of Whittlesea maintain this road as part of our Boundary Road Agreement. I hope I haven't missed your point. Further, Beale Avenue (between O'Deas Road and the Kinglake National Park) had been earmarked for sealing for some time. One of the reasons it had been listed for sealing was the intensive demand on resources to manage ongoing maintenance.</p> <p>Garth has been invited to speak to Council at the Future Nillumbik Committee meeting.</p>	
Valerie Wake – NillumBug	<p>One of the purposes of the Nillumbug Incorporated bicycle Users group is “to campaign for more cycle paths, lanes and improved facilities” within the Shire of Nillumbik. As a committee, we regularly review any changes to cycling amenities within the Shire. The release of the Draft Road Management Plan was discussed at a recent committee meeting and the concerns raised by the committee are detailed below.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It is noted that the revisions signal overall a reduction of standards on Defect Intervention Levels, response times and collector road inspection frequency. The increases are described as “minor” but this is often not the case,</li> <li>2. Plan revisions seem to be founded on reduction of required standards to meet latest assessments by management on “affordability” and reduction of legal risk relating to Public Liability and are justified by comparison with bench marks in other shires. No attempt is made to justify downgrades in terms of road safety as an engineering concept.</li> <li>3. Cyclist safety will be most compromised by increase of pothole depth and size and this concern is greatest on the sealed roads preferred by road cyclists. We have had experience of a serious accident caused by a large pothole. Has the consideration of risk management at item 46 included the ability of narrow road cycling wheels to maintain control and traction over deeper potholes, including sub-seal gravel dispersed from the pothole? At Risk Code R041 the consequences of a vehicle hitting a pothole at speed are correctly described as “medium” for a car but would be “high” for a cyclist.</li> </ol>	<p>This to a large extent this submission was the same as that from Garth Foxwell. The information provided to Valerie in response to her submission is below.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Your comment of the use of the word ‘minor’ has been noted. The word minor has been used to describe amendments which will result in no net change to Council’s on ground response to hazards and defects. The minor changes are an exercise in aligning performance with the documented levels of service. The exception to this is in describing the change of inspection frequency for sealed collector roads from six months to 12 months. The basis for changing the inspection frequency is the reduction in the rate of defects observed for this road category. Nevertheless, the proposed 12 month frequency fits within the range set by the five benchmarked Councils.</li> <li>2. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The Plan was prepared in response to the Road Management Act 2004 legislation which requires road management authorities to be responsible for the safety standards of their roads and footpaths. The intention of the Plan is to provide a level of service that meets the community’s reasonable expectation for inspection, intervention and response taking into consideration affordability, available resources and management of risks. This again is an exercise in aligning on the ground performance and current resources with documented levels of service. The outcome being managing Council’s exposure to litigation relating from public liability claims.</li> <li>b. Benchmarking is used to test the reasonableness of the proposed levels of service. This is considered to be the acceptable method of testing whether a level of service is reasonable or not.</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	<p>Remove Appendix F: Risk Register Report. This document no longer exists.</p> <p>Provide a definition for a ‘public highway’ to clarify Section 2.5 Duty of Road Users.</p>

Submitters Details	Submission Summary	Officer Response	Actions
	<p>4. Reference is required to maintenance of bicycle lanes, e.g. by lane sweeping. Loose gravel washed over the lane from driveways is a severe hazard to cyclists.</p> <p>5. At 2.5, <b>Duty of Road User</b>, should extend to roads other than “highways”.</p> <p>6. <b>At 7.7 Notice of Incidents</b>, the 14 day allowance for inspection should be shorter than the hazard correction time limits expressed at 7.8</p> <p>Nillumberg is grateful for the opportunity to lodge these comments and hope they will be helpful.</p> <p>Valerie Wake Secretary and Public Officer</p>	<p>c. The intervention levels set within the Plan are an engineering specification for hazard and defect management on roads and footpaths. The intervention levels within the proposed Plan sit more so favourably within the range when comparing with the benchmarked municipalities. Furthermore, the number of public liability claims Council receives has remained low which is an indicator of the favourable intervention set within the Plan.</p> <p>3. Appendix F refers to a Council risk management document which no longer exists. The purpose that this document served is inherent in the framework of the Plan. The definition of a vehicle within the Road Safety Act 1986 includes a bicycle and therefore the standards for potholes and other hazards on roads have this consideration in place. The proposed intervention depth of 50mm sits within the range set by the five benchmarked Councils of between 30 and 100mm depth. Similarly, the proposed intervention diameter of 300mm is consistent with the five other bench marked Councils. Where gravel on a road represents a hazard to road users this will be dealt with reactively following the notification of such hazards. The response time for these hazards is 4 hours with the exception of force majeure (see Section 4 of the proposed Plan). Appendix F is therefore proposed to be removed.</p> <p>4. The road space is shared by both vehicles and bicycles unless it is otherwise line marked or signed accordingly. There are very few number of designated on-road bicycle lanes on Nillumberg managed roads. The large majority of designated bike lanes are on Arterial Roads managed by VicRoads. The proposal is to have a consistent level of service relating to the road pavement, which are inclusive of designated on-road bike lanes. The levels of service set are considered adequate for this defect type (please see point 3 for further information). Where materials washing out from driveways onto the traffic lane represent a hazard to road users, Council has the power under the Local Government Act 1989 and under its Amenity Local Law to require the property owner to remove the hazard and prevent its recurrence. If there are specific locations where you know this to be the case please let Council know. Similarly to point 3, where the gravel represents a hazard to road users, Council will be deal with this reactively.</p> <p>5. This section is a direct extract from the Road Safety Act 1986. A highway is defined as a “road or road related area” by the Road</p>	

Submitters Details	Submission Summary	Officer Response	Actions
		<p>Safety Act 1986. A definition is proposed to be included in the updated document.</p> <p>6. The inspection undertaken following a "Notice of Incident" (generally issued by a member of Victorian Police) runs independent of the hazard inspection and repair process. This does not postpone the hazard rectification process which the Plan puts in place.</p> <p>Council's Plan is put in place to address its statutory duty under the Road Management Act 2004 to act 'reasonably' by inspecting and maintaining assets to protect the traveling public. The Plan seeks to balance the economic, social, safety and environmental expectations of the community while considering the affordability, available resources and management of risks. The outcome being responsible road and footpath asset management and an ability to limit the public liability exposure for the overall community.</p> <p>Valerie has been invited to speak to Council at the Future Nillumbik Committee meeting.</p>	
Emma Schuette	Emma was following up on an email sent to Council on 29 March 2017 which she had not received a response to. The email details various road related concerns including; road sealing, traffic and road safety.	<p>Emma's concerns with respect to Allendale Road fall outside the scope of the Road Management Plan. Her questions relate to road sealing, traffic and road safety items. The email and photos have been referred to the Infrastructure Department for consideration and response. Council's response to Emma's letter was mailed on 31 May 2017.</p> <p>Emma has been invited to speak to Council at the Future Nillumbik Committee meeting.</p>	<p>No proposed changes to the Road Management Plan.</p> <p>Referred to Infrastructure Department</p>
Max Garner	<p>Max's submission has recommended the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Clarification of responsibilities within the Road Management Plan between Nillumbik Shire Council and VicRoads on Arterial Roads;</li> <li>2. Improvements to the proposed Road Management Plans content, style and expression; and</li> <li>3. Improvements to the customer experience and their interaction with Council;</li> </ol>	<p>Max's comments have been noted.</p> <p>Point 1 and 2 can be addressed as part of the document update and his recommendations will be included in presenting a final updated version of the Road Management Plan to Council at it Ordinary Meeting schedule for 27 June 2017.</p> <p>Council Officers are currently running two priority IT projects identified it the ICT Strategy 2015-2019. The first is Customer Experience and Customer Relationship Management Systems and the second is a review of our Asset Management System and Mobile Computing.</p>	<p>Update the final Road Management Plan document to include clarification of VicRoads responsibilities and improve the documents</p>

Submitters Details	Submission Summary	Officer Response	Actions
		<p>These projects cover off on Max's concerns and recommendations.</p> <p>Max has been invited to speak to Council at the Future Nillumbik Committee meeting.</p>	<p>readability.</p>
<p>Wayne and Pauline Wallis</p>	<p>After reading that Council is reviewing its Road Management Plan.</p> <p>I would like to bring to your attention the appalling condition of Old Diamond Creek Road. We were told in the year 2000, when the road was made, that footpaths and gutters would also be made. This did not happen. I discussed this with an employee of Nillumbik last year. He informed me it was earmarked for 2017. I am hoping this is the case, as winter is now upon us, it is hard to see children, and adults walking along the road at dusk, as there are no paths, they have to walk in the middle of the road. This is an accident waiting to happen or even worse.</p> <p>I would also like to take this opportunity to express my dismay, that my request for rubbish to be cleaned up on the road and nature strip on the corner of Ryan's Road and Old Diamond Creek road, has not been done.</p> <p>Please can you inform the department responsible for this, and let me know, when this will be seen too. Hoping this will get you immediate attention.</p> <p>Yours Sincerely Wayne &amp; Pauline Wallis</p>	<p>A customer service request has been created for Council to collect the material around the intersection of Old Diamond Creek Road and Ryans Road in Diamond Creek.</p> <p>The request regarding an update on the allocation of funding for the footpath along Old Diamond Creek Road, Diamond Creek has been referred to Council's Infrastructure Department for investigation and response.</p> <p>I have forwarded Wayne and Pauline's details to Environment and Open Space Unit to discuss concerns regarding roadside management responsibilities on Diamond Creek Road, Diamond Creek further.</p> <p>Wayne and Pauline have been invited to speak to Council at the Future Nillumbik Committee meeting.</p>	<p>No proposed changes to the Road Management Plan.</p> <p>Customer service requests raised for works.</p> <p>Referred to Infrastructure Department</p> <p>Referred to Council's Environment and Open Space Unit</p>