

Road Management Plan 2025

Community Engagement Summary Report



22 April 2025

Bayside City Council
Corporate Centre
76 Royal Avenue
SANDRINGHAM VIC 3191

T (03) 9899 4444

F (03) 9598 4474

www.bayside.vic.gov.au



1 Background

This document provides a summary of stakeholder and community feedback on the 2025 review of the Bayside Road Management Plan (RMP).

The RMP defines Council's Road Management processes and maintenance standards and is a key document used in the processing of public liability claims against Council. While roads are the focus, the RMP also defines processes related to footpaths, kerb and channel, bridges, and other road management infrastructure.

The Road Management Plan is required to be reviewed every four years in accordance with the *Road Management Act 2004*, including a period of engagement with the community.

2 Consultation process

2.1 Consultation purpose

The *Road Management Act 2004* requires a period of engagement with the community where there has been a reduction in the service levels of the RMP. While no service level reductions have been proposed, the Bayside community has previously expressed interest in the management of local roads, and it was felt that an opportunity for the community to provide feedback would be appreciated.

Engagement was conducted to understand the level of community support for proposed changes to the Road Management Plan. A copy of the plan was made available to the community, with three targeted questions and space to raise related issues.

The consultation was designed to provide stakeholders and the broader community with the opportunity to provide a submission on a service that impacts many people directly. As a legal requirement with a maintenance and public liability focus, the RMP can be difficult to interpret. However, as footpaths and roads are services which impact everyone in Bayside, it was felt that there was opportunity for significant community input.

2.2 Consultation methodology

In the 'Consultation' phase, the draft RMP was made available for comment from the wider community. The primary engagement tool used to present the RMP and collect submissions was Council's 'Have Your Say' page, although users were also given options to send a letter, email the contact officer, or request a meeting with the contact officer.

The following activities were undertaken:

Details	Activity
January 2025	Internal stakeholder meeting This meeting was attended by key personnel from the City Assets and Presentation department, specifically the Maintenance Services and City Assets teams. The review process included several check-in meetings with internal stakeholders.
March 2025	March Council meeting The draft RMP was presented to the Council for review at its March meeting, including details of planned community engagement between 20 March and 17 April 2025.

20 March 2025	Announcement of RMP review and community engagement Submissions were invited from the Bayside community and any other interested parties. Direct email invites were made to the following parties: • Traders association groups (12 recipients) • Bayside Tourism Network (14 recipients) • HYS subscribers to relevant areas of interest ○ Traffic and transport (1,611 recipients) ○ Local Businesses and Shopping Districts (1,645 recipients) ○ Council Budget and Strategic Plans (1,429 recipients) The submission process was advertised in the Government Gazette, The Age and via all Council communication channels (website, E-newsletter, social media and Have Your Say platform). 'The weekly e-newsletter 'This Week in Bayside' has over 11,000 subscribers.
25 submissions DOC/25/108245 590 visitors 28 submissions	Have Your Say The draft RMP was made available for community engagement between 20 March and 17 April 2025. Members of the community were encouraged to review the draft RMP on Bayside's 'Have Your Say' page. Users were able to make a submission via 'Have Your Say', letter, email, request a meeting with the project officer, or ask a question on the forum. There Council received a total of 28 submissions, including 21 via HYS, 6 emails to the project officer, and one question asked on the public forum.
April 2024 DOC/25/17938	Equity Impact Assessment A new requirement in the development of Council policies, plans, strategies, and projects is the completion of an EIA. This requires new documentation to consider how it may impact people from a diverse range of backgrounds and experience including (but not limited to) disability, gender, and age. The EIA was completed by the City Assets team, with assistance from the Policy and Development Coordinator.
20 May 2025	May Council meeting The draft RMP is planned to be presented to Council for adoption at the May Council meeting.

3 Participant profile

Community engagement on the RMP received a total of 27 submissions, including 21 via Have Your Say page, 1 question, and 6 email submissions. The volume of submissions made during engagement was similar to the previous planned review in 2021 (18 submissions) but far less than the targeted review in 2023 (95 submissions).

	Demographic	Bayside 2021 Census	Participants (%)
Gender	Male	47.8%	60.7%
	Female	52.2%	28.5%
	Unknown	-	10.8%
	Other identity	-	-
Age	Under 18	-	-
	19-29	-	-
	30-49	-	33.3%
	50-64	-	14.3%
	65-79	-	52.4%
	80 and over	-	-
	Undisclosed	-	-
	Bayside residents	-	95.2%

Respondents were well distributed by male and female gender and across varying age ranges, and over 95% reporting to live in Bayside. Most respondents found the RMP straightforward to interpret with 76.2% reporting that information was easy or mostly easy to find and understand.

The RMP received a high number of visits implying that Council's community engagement processes worked well and attracted interest, but did not result in a high number of submissions. This may be due to the technical and liability-focused nature of the document, which is critical to defining Council's maintenance standards but may be less engaging to the broader community with more tangible outcomes such as service improvement action plans or capital works programs.

4 Consultation findings

The following section summarises the key themes which arose in community feedback on review of the Road Management Plan. In the interest of stakeholder and community privacy, individual quotes have not been included within this public document. Where there was more than one mention of a topic or item, the number of mentions has been specified in brackets and italics.

4.1 Support for actions

With only 28 submissions, there was not significant data to support an overall theme. While some topics received several mentions, submissions sometimes conflicted with each other while others were not within the scope of the Road Management Plan.

Most submissions were neutral to the plan with some recommendations provided. Respondents reported that the information was well presented and easy to understand, however for the broader community the technical nature of the document may have been a barrier.

Overall, the major themes identified were related to proactive inspection of road and footpath infrastructure, and the timely repair of identified defects.

Outside of the scope of the RMP, issues were related primarily to local and strategic traffic management and the maintenance of main arterial roads.

4.2 Item-specific feedback

Respondents were directly asked for feedback on proactive inspection frequency, intervention levels, and response times. These three measures form the core of the Road Management Plan and Council's road management system, defining how and when road infrastructure is inspected and repaired on Bayside's local roads.

4.2.1 Proactive Inspection Frequency

No changes were proposed to how frequently Council inspects its roads and footpaths for defects. However, inspection frequency is a core aspect of the RMP and feedback on this was sought.

Topic	Community feedback
Should inspect more frequently	5 mentions
Inspection frequency is appropriate	1 mention
Should inspect less frequently	1 mention
Concern Council doesn't comply with intervention levels	1 mention

4.2.2 Intervention Levels

A change to footpath intervention level was a key change proposed in the draft RMP. Despite a heavy focus on this change, engagement received limited direct feedback.

A range of specific concerns were raised during the consultation regarding this item:

Topic	Community feedback
Lower intervention levels	5 mentions

Lower intervention levels for footpaths	2 mentions
---	------------

Lower intervention levels for bicycle lanes and paths	2 mentions
---	------------

4.2.3 Response Times

A change to footpath repair response time was a key change proposed in the draft RMP. Several respondents flagged that response times for roads and footpaths should be faster, or that repairs to more critical roads or footpaths should be completed more quickly.

Topic	Community feedback
-------	--------------------

Faster response times	6 mentions
-----------------------	------------

Faster response times for critical roads and footpaths	2 mentions
--	------------

4.2.4 Other topics

Several other topics relevant to the RMP were also raised during the consultation, which were mentioned multiple times.

Topic	Community feedback
-------	--------------------

Better maintenance of bicycle lanes and paths	4 mentions
---	------------

Contractor management	3 mentions
-----------------------	------------

Vegetation management over roads and paths	2 mentions
--	------------

4.2.5 Out of scope

A range of specific concerns were raised during the consultation that were out of scope of the RMP, relating to the design of roads, local and strategic traffic issues, and the maintenance of main arterial roads which are the responsibility of the Department of Transport and Planning.

‘Local and strategic traffic issues’ was the most regular category of feedback, with 6 mentions. Responses related to requests for implementation of traffic controls, road safety, review of parking conditions, or new traffic links such as overpasses.

Topic	Community feedback
-------	--------------------

Local Area Traffic Management	6 mentions
-------------------------------	------------

Management of main arterial roads (DTP responsibility)	3 mentions
--	------------

4.3 Project Evaluation

The review of the Road Management Plan can be considered successful, reaching a broad audience with 590 visitors. The engagement was well designed to reach members of the community with an interest in transport and roads.

However, of the 590 visits only 28 users (4.7%) provided a submission either through the HYS portal or via email. The volume of submissions is consistent with previous 'regular' reviews of the Road Management Plan, except for the unplanned 2023 review which received more attention due to the highly specific questions asked.

Respondents were well-represented across age groups and gender, with only slightly less women making a submission than men. 95% of submissions were from Bayside residents, with nearly 5% reporting they owned a local business and/or were employed within Bayside.

It is noted that as a technical document related to road and footpath maintenance and defending Council in public liability claims, the benefits of community engagement are limited. Regular respondents may be more familiar with engagement where the results may be more tangible (i.e. a new sporting pavilion or playground) or where there is a targeted improvement or action plan for a service.

Overall, the engagement was consistent with previous 'regular' reviews of the Road Management Plan and can be considered successful although limited.