

Public Question Time – answers to questions taken on notice*

Questions from Isaac Hermann:

- Q1. What has happened to council's induction process? For new councillors and staff? To assist with their familiarity of the city's repositories of knowledge, her assets and, infrastructure and services?
- Q2. How many of you been to the Emerald Hill local heritage centre, or Arts and Heritage Melbourne?
- Q3. Do you know that we have sweet water springs?
- Q4. Do you know how many piers and jetties we have lost, other than Brooke's Jetty?

Response:

The four questions above were directed at Councillors and this note will not respond to them directly.

The organisation is however interested in improving its induction practices for both staff and Councillors and will consider your noting of the importance of heritage and historical issues you have raised for future induction. Induction currently does include a historical bus tour and various physical visits to points of note in the municipality.

- Q5. Sadly, we have other local treasures that being lost; based on years of research and community consultation the Elwood Canal Master and Management Plans also seem to be buried, lost, and thoroughly ignored. Will Council review these 2 documents?

Response:

A thorough review of all of the documents that have been developed over the years is planned to occur in preparation for development of a Stormwater Management Plan. This work is slightly delayed whilst additional resources were engaged due to capacity issues within the asset management team. Officers in the Sustainability team are currently undertaking a desktop review of the 1998 Elwood Canal Masterplan and the 2003 Elwood Canal Management Plan. It is noted that the documents are largely open space and landscaping plans focused on the aesthetic treatment and management of the canal corridor. The 2003 document is noted in the 2006 Open Space Strategy as a plan to be implemented. The 2009 Open Space Strategy review notes the 2003 Plan as completed. Council would welcome specific examples from you regarding where you believe critical items may have been missed that require re-examination.

- Q6. Will council put a stay on its toxic paving plans for Tide Street, Elwood, while it decides whether to review these essential documents?

Response:

Tide St resurfacing works are underway now and will not be paused further. The items noted in the 1998 and 2003 plans relating to Tide St do not seem to preclude the sealing of the road and improvement to drainage. Most actions relate to garden and path establishment and maintenance and stream side planting.

As you know, a review was undertaken in October 2017 regarding the proposed works on Tide St and Councillors were briefed regarding all of the issues. I understand that you were provided with feedback regarding what was found in the review and the decision to continue the works. I have provided a summary of what was found through the assessment:

- *A commitment was made to undertake the upgrade to Tide Street last year. The works were delayed pending a review in response to a request from concerned residents. There has also been significant feedback from residents upset regarding the delay in works.*
- *Tide Street is subject to a high level of flooding which requires a surface reinstatement after every event. Erosion is also occurring in medium and high rainfall events. The erosion removes the fines (binding particles) in the gravel which damages the structural integrity of the surface. This silt finds its way into the Canal itself which may impact on sediment levels and capacity over time, reducing the effectiveness of the Canal. Council has provided additional drainage to control some of the erosion and direct water into the Canal's grassy bank, however high levels of maintenance are required to maintain acceptable service levels.*
- *Tide Street has no meaningful permeability in its current state as the subbase layer is a non-permeable clay material with rubble fill compacted on top. The structural integrity of the majority of Council's laneways rely on the diversion of water away from the pavement and subgrade surfaces. The diverted water can then be redirected to areas where it can penetrate safely to underground aquifers or into major drains.*
- *Councillors were briefed regarding the opportunities and constraints for Tide Street, and more broadly, on the role of laneways in increasing permeability and mitigating flooding. The feedback officers received from Councillors at the time was that they were comfortable with the information received and with officers proceeding with the sealing works to Tide Street. The works have since been scheduled to occur.*

Q7. Wouldn't using our own bluestone be a cleaner, greener, cooler option?

Response:

Your suggestion to use bluestone in preference to asphalt was considered by officers. Bluestone is used where appropriate across the municipality, and as you know has a very important heritage value in some areas of Port Phillip. It was considered an inappropriate material in this instance due to the following reasons:

- *Bluestone is not a typical material for this area and as such is inconsistent.*

- *Bluestone requires different foundations to cope with the weight of vehicles that use Tide St. This would require laying a different foundation to what the laneway currently has, which was considered too costly and not required in this instance.*
- *Significantly higher costs for labour.*

Officers also investigated different colour treatments for the surface to improve reflectivity and reduce heat absorption. The different colour treatments examined were found to be unacceptably costly and would also start to degrade visually over time as cracks would be sealed using black sealant. As a result, this option was ruled out.

- Q8. What is the state of the new Flood Management Plan and the two community consultations that were proposed for last year? - what's happening?

Response:

Melbourne Water is leading the development of a new Flood Management Plan and they have experienced significant delays. The community consultations are still going ahead. New dates for the consultations will be communicated soon.

Officers attended a working meeting recently to receive a presentation from Melbourne Water on updates to their Flood Management Plan, with possibility to incorporate this into the Elster Creek Action Plan.

- Q9. Why does council intend disposing of St Kilda's Spring and Stormwater into Albert Park when it could be used locally? The native fish that swim in the main drain underneath us seem happy enough with the water quality.

Response:

We are investigating options for a significant municipal stormwater treatment and harvesting project at Albert Park Lake which would utilise stormwater from the Shakespeare Main drain. This project is not confirmed as deliverable and is still going through feasibility assessment, including an assessment of water quality. Based on investigations to date, redirecting water from the Shakespeare Main Drain to Albert Park may provide a greater return on investment and co-benefits than storage and use more locally. Alternatives to this scheme are not, however, ruled out.

- Q10. Who in council will ensure that Bayside's Oval 2 Upgrade at Elsternwick include a St Kilda St flood barrier?

Response:

The opportunity to reduce flooding impacts to St Kilda St as part of the Bayside Oval 2 upgrade has been tabled with Bayside City Council who are managing the project. The City of Port Phillip will continue to advocate for the best outcomes for our community, and remain engaged with Bayside on this matter.

****Please note: answers to any questions in Public Question Time which were answered at the meeting are included in the minutes of that meeting.***