

Community consultation feedback

The **Draft Road Management Plan 2025** was open for community consultation from the 27th August to the 24th September 2025.

The following methods for feedback were available:

- In-person at community links – Monbulk / Lilydale/ Yarra Junction/Healesville and Upwey
- Via email @ mail@yarraranges.vic.gov.au
- Via telephone 1300 368 333
- Via the Shaping Page
- Comments were made via social media and responded to on the various platforms.

The following table provides a summary of feedback received and response to address the feedback.

ITEM IN DRAFT & Source	Feedback	Management Comments
Topic: Ayres Rd and footpath works Not applicable to RMP Shaping Page	Please also pave the road going to Ayres road, there are potholes and the gravel goes to the garage, a lot of people also walk that no through road since it has a nice view of the sunset at the end of the cul de sac, a foot path may also be needed especially when they are walking the dog and stroller	Ayres Road is a sealed road, the surrounding roads such as Marna Rd & Smith Street off Ayres Road are sealed. The statement 'please pave the road going to Ayres Rd' is not enough information to investigate location. It is noted that paving of an unsealed road would be addressed under the Special Rate and Charge Scheme policy and processes, more information is available on Council's website. An assessment of missing footpath links across the municipality has recently been completed by the Traffic and Transport team. Council considers footpath construction upgrades as part of future budget planning, in alignment with adopted policy and prioritisation frameworks.

ITEM IN DRAFT & Source	Feedback	Management Comments
Topic: Unsealed road repair timeframes Unsealed road intervention timeframes page 35 of RMP Shaping Page	Looking at the timelines for repairs on unsealed roads, it is basically implying that no repairs will be done as the timelines are of such a length (e.g. 2 months) that the next scheduled grading would take place by the time the repair would have to occur. Potholes normally take at least a month to reoccur after the road has been graded; by the time a resident has got annoyed enough to report the issue the next scheduled grading would be within two months. It seems that residents are expected to just put up with potholes. Why even imply that potholes will be repaired?	Unsealed roads are graded at varying frequencies, 3,4 or 6 times per annum. Based on this, the timeframe between a pothole request being lodged and the repair timeframe vs a grader attendance will vary immensely. When a request is lodged for a pothole repair, this is inspected within 10 working days and repairs are programmed. Collector roads are 1 month timeframe and local roads are 2 months. Considering that some roads may only be graded every 4 months, targeted pothole repairs remain a worthwhile and necessary part of maintaining road safety and usability between grading cycles. It is also important to note that drivers are expected to drive to the conditions, particularly on unsealed roads, which are more susceptible to weather and traffic impacts.
ITEM IN DRAFT & Source	Feedback	Management Comments
Topic: Maintenance of Department of Transport responsibility roads Not applicable to RMP Shaping Page	My concern is that Roads which Council are responsible for upkeep & repairs such as Maroondah hwy between Dorset rd and Lilydale are needing repair from rain damage and wear and tear from the large amount of traffic users are remaining damaged and uneven surfaces need to be repaired as soon as possible. Your draft states repair at a reasonable time frame is nit specific enough you need to give a indication of time frame e.g. within 2 weeks to 4 weeks. The above example of this stretch if Maroondah Hwy has been uneven and dangerous and top layer if road gone in certain spots. Also the road from Yarra Glen to Yea has also dangerous worn deteriorated rds. My suggestion in your draft which I haven't seen mentioned is the dodgy repairs you have organised over the last year. The dpot repair of hopes. These holes are patched with tar and I have seen your	The two roads mentioned in this submission are the responsibility of Department of Transport DTP (formerly VicRoads) – Maroondah Hwy and Melba Hwy. We have referred your comments on to DTP via email. Service requests received by Council for roads that are the responsibility of Department of Transport (formerly VicRoads) are forwarded for action. For roads that Council is the Responsible Authority pothole repairs may be carried out using temporary or permanent methods depending on urgency and available resources.

	contractors shovelling warm tar and stamping down with their work boot. A few weeks later the said hole repairs have sunk and become dangerous again to road users especially motorbikes. Please have these dodgy repairers be made to repair a wide section of road repair which will not sink in a few weeks. Not seeing anything in your draft policy which holds your repairers to be responsible to come back and do a proper repair of holes in bitumen. I feel you are wasting ratepayers rate money by allowing this breach in quality road repairing. The contractors you are now using do a dodgy job knowing they will be called back in a few months to redo/ patch their faulty jobs. Wasting more money.	Cold mix asphalt is often used for immediate repairs as it is readily available and can be applied quickly. Permanent repairs involve cutting out the damaged section and replacing it with hot mix asphalt. This material must be sourced from an asphalt plant, and the process requires traffic management due to the longer time crews need to work on the road surface. As a result, these repairs take longer to organise and schedule. Temporary repairs are often used to maintain safety while permanent works are being arranged. Contract supervision and quality monitoring are essential to ensuring repairs are effective and long-lasting. Compliance with the Road Management Plan (RMP) is a requirement within Council's service contracts, and contractor performance is regularly reviewed to ensure standards are met.
ITEM IN DRAFT & Source	Feedback	Management Comments
Topic: Footpaths/ Walking paths Not applicable to RMP Shaping Page	I think this is necessary, but I think we need more money in improving street walkability in Ferny creek, as a resident of Ferny creek I feel that our suburb has been overlooked in road improvements, especially in factors like walkability, so I do think some roads need repairs, I think that there is bigger worries on the topic of roads.	Where rural roads have no formal constructed footpaths, intervention levels are focused on hazards and defects that affect the road shoulders and edges, rather than pedestrian paths. Any reported hazards will be inspected and actioned in relation to safety, condition and functionality (usage considerations). The RMP does not state a different standard solely for pedestrians on rural roads without footpaths. The primary function of the rural road is to serve vehicular traffic and maybe used by pedestrians where no alternative is available.

		An assessment of missing footpath links across the municipality has recently been completed by the Traffic and Transport team, and Ferny Creek has been identified as one of the areas with gaps in pedestrian infrastructure. While specific locations within Ferny Creek have not been included in the current program, Council will consider these upgrades as part of future budget planning, in alignment with adopted policy and prioritisation frameworks. Council remains committed to improving accessibility and safety across all communities and appreciates the input provided to help guide future investment.
ITEM IN DRAFT & Source	Feedback	Management Comments
Topic: Dust suppressant and sealing roads Not applicable to RMP Shaping Page	I welcome the updates in the Draft Road Management Plan 2025, particularly the clearer inspection standards and stronger emergency response protocols. These are positive steps for residents living on unsealed roads. However, I'd like to raise two important issues that directly affect those of us on unsealed roads: 1. Dust Suppression Dust is a major problem in summer. I have previously paid for Council's dust suppression program. While the original product used was effective, in the second year a different product was applied and it was far less effective, making the program poor value for money. Although Council has since returned to the original product, the process undermined community confidence and resulted in wasted time and money. I would like to see: • A commitment to use only proven, effective dust suppression products. • Greater accountability and consistency in how dust suppression programs are delivered.	The feedback on the updates to the Plan including inspections and emergency responses is appreciated. <u>Dust suppressant:</u> It is acknowledged that the dust suppressant trial product used in 2023 did not perform as effectively as hoped. This product was trialled on a single year's program and its limitations were communicated to residents at the time. In 2024, Council trialled a different product called <i>Masterdust</i>, which demonstrated strong performance. <i>Masterdust</i> is a Magnesium Chloride Brine - a natural by-product from the solar salt production process, sourced from Adelaide Salt Manufacturers. The product has been enhanced with additives to ensure it is non-corrosive, as confirmed by testing. Based on its effectiveness, this product will be used again in 2025. While not all trials yield the desired outcomes, trialling innovative products is an important part of ensuring

	2. Road Sealing Affordability I support Council's use of special charge schemes for sealing roads, but the costs remain very high and there is significant red tape. This makes it difficult for many residents to realistically pursue sealing. I believe sealing could be made more affordable if: • Projects were coordinated with the existing grading schedule to reduce duplication of effort and costs. • The process was streamlined with less administrative overhead. • Residents were given the opportunity to contribute more directly, whether through labour, local contractors, or materials, to lower project costs. • Council explored ways to subsidise or co-fund sealing in high-impact areas (for example, heavily used or steep roads). Sealing even short sections of unsealed roads would reduce long-term maintenance costs, improve liveability, and significantly cut down on dust issues. In summary: I ask Council to ensure dust suppression programs are consistent and effective, and to review how sealing projects can be made more affordable and efficient—potentially by linking them with grading schedules and enabling greater resident involvement	ratepayer funds are used effectively. These trials help Council stay up to date with available technologies and ensure value for money. <u>Road Sealing and Grading Coordination:</u> Comments regarding the sealing of roads are noted and will be passed on to the team that administer the Special Rate and Charge Scheme process and design the sealing of roads. The suggestion to coordinate the grading schedule to assist in the preparation of roads to be sealed is noted and we advise that this process is undertaken whenever possible to support the sealing process.
--	---	--

ITEM IN DRAFT & Source	Feedback	Management Comments
Topic: New footpath request and maintenance of car park. Not applicable to RMP Shaping Page	Please look at adding footpath on Kia Ora Avenue Upwey as it is a well used pedestrian road for high school students and others accessing Upwey Main Street but has no footpaths. Also consider adding a path from Morris Road to the Glenfern Valley Bushlands to encourage more people to access the bushlands by foot. Also the entrance to the car park behind Upwey Shops needs fixing as the asphalt and crossover are breaking up and dangerous.	An assessment of missing footpath links across the municipality has recently been completed by the Traffic and Transport team. A request has been raised for a new footpath investigation for Kia Ora Avenue, reference number #RM167867 and Glenfern Road between Morris Road and Glenfern Valley Bushlands reference #RM167870 A further request has also been raised for the crossover and asphalt to be inspected behind the Upwey shops reference #RM167871

ITEM IN DRAFT & Source	Feedback	Management Comments
Topic: Speed limit increase. Not applicable to RMP Shaping Page	Restore or increase previously reduced speed limits as this will reduce journey times and reduce driver fatigue.	Speed limits are usually reduced to improve safety for road users. As there is no mention of road names or locations we cannot investigate this comment. Please contact Council to lodge an investigation request if you would like a response on 1300 368 333 or mail@yarraranges.vic.gov.au

ITEM IN DRAFT & Source	Feedback	Management Comments
Topic: Nighttime Inspection Applicable to RMP Email Submission	Congratulations on the use of the MAV Rural Template. It is very pleasing to see YRC has finally acknowledged that there are significant differences between the rural and urban areas of the shire and this difference needs to be given higher priority in decision making. It is hoped that this thinking will flow on beyond this document. Reference – Inspection Frequencies, Attachment 5, Night Inspections This is something that is long overdue and should include the reporting to Ausnet of defective street lighting. However, a 4 year frequency, you must be joking, how many lives could be lost between night inspections of warning signs and road markings, invisible in the dark. We saw the evidence of significant damage in River St. Healesville a few years ago, when a painted white line deteriorated very quickly and was virtually invisible in the dark, indicating the installation of a concrete and stone protrusion into the trafficable surface, significantly narrowing the roadway. A much more realistic inspection time frame must be made, or this is just a tick the box exercise and achieves nothing.	The night time inspection frequency of every 4 years is consistent with the MAV Insurance Road Management Plan Template (2024), which sets out reasonable standards based on benchmarking across Victorian councils and legal advice. The four-year cycle for collector roads is considered appropriate and defensible under the Road Management Act 2004, balancing safety, risk, and available resources. Night inspections are designed to identify visibility issues, including faded line markings and defective signage. Any issues found - such as faulty street lighting - are reported to SP AusNet Services or addressed through maintenance programs. Council Officer will follow up directly with SP Ausnet Services with respect to lighting inspections separate to the RMP process. In addition to scheduled inspections, the RMP includes reactive inspections triggered by community reports or internal observations, ensuring timely responses to emerging hazards. We also encourage the community to report any observed hazards so they can be rectified as soon as possible.

ITEM IN DRAFT & Source	Feedback	Management Comments
Topic: Unsealed Road Maintenance - Service Improvements and Road Maintenance Not applicable to RMP Email Submission	Reference - Fig 3 Operational Responsibility on unsealed roads This illustration showing the Council responsibility for the road surface and the roadside open drain. This photo is a perfect example showing the buildup of rock and grass on the narrow area between the road surface and the drain, preventing water runoff from the road surface entering the drain, leading to the rapid deterioration of the road surface. This has been an ongoing problem for many years due to a lack of adequate supervision by Council of the quality of work carried out by the contractors. Having said that, we hasten to point out that a significant improvement has been evident over the past 12 months, due to the oversight of the Infrastructure Services Team. The current grading operations have addressed this issue by ensuring that this barrier is removed during the grading process, leading to a much safer and longer lasting surface, during and after rain. We recommend that this issue be included in the grading contracts as it is a safety issue and therefore falls within the responsibility of the Council under the RMP.	Service improvements noted in recent grading operations are appreciated and will be considered in ongoing service planning. Contract supervision and quality monitoring remain critical to ensuring long-term road performance. Compliance with the Road Management Plan (RMP) is a core requirement of Council's service contracts. Inclusion of this requirement in grading contracts will be considered, given its relevance to safety and alignment with Council's responsibilities under the RMP.