Minutes

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Title: | Meeting 5 – 2020 Koo Wee Rup Longwarry Flood Protection District Advisory Committee |
| Meeting date: | Thursday, 23 April 2020 |
| Meeting time: | 1.00pm – 3.00pm |
| Location: | Skype meeting  |
| Chairperson: | Bruce Turner |
| Attendees: | Bruce Turner, Con Raffa, Ian Anderson, Susan Anderson, Matthew Coleman, Kevin Alexander (CSC) Teena Mathew (BBSC), Steve Hosking (MW), Tom Le Cerf (MW), Cate Shaw (MW), Georgina Downey (MW), Jason Knight (MW),  |
| Apologies: | Jo Fontana, Frank Rovers, Robert Mure, Clive Brooker (BBSC), Kevin Carlisle Stapleton (CSC), John Hobson, Cr Ray Brown (CSC), |
| Note taker: | Georgina Downey |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Agenda item | **1. Welcome & apologies and items for General Business** | Presenter | Bruce Turner |
|  | Due to the COVID-19 situation Bruce requested some updates from members about their situation and how people have been coping. Each attendee gave a brief outline of their circumstances which highlighted a range of impacts and changes brought about by the pandemic. Overall though people were remaining positive and coping despite some challenges. |
| Agenda item | **2. Actions from previous meetings** | Presenter |  |
| Discussion | **Action 2.2 -** a briefing to be arranged for Jo about drainage in the Longwarry area and about the different roles played by MW staff in the area. Update Jo to visit MW’s office for this briefing. Although visit is yet to occur, visit can be facilitated at any time **– CLOSED**  **Action 4.1**: Teena to provide a briefing on the drainage approvals at Longwarry Saleyards. Teena will provide briefing at next meeting. **ACTION OPEN** **Action 4.2:** MW to review the preferred approach where crossings of drains are required, i.e. installation of culverts vs clear spans. Tom presented some information to the meeting and advised that we will be adding to the existing guidelines to be more explicit regarding culverts in the KWR area. Will be formally documented to ensure consistency. Principles are that no culverts will be considered on carrier or major precept drains. Culverts may be considered on other drains where it is assessed that both likelihood and consequence of flooding is low. **CLOSED****Discussion:**Ian asked whether the culverts become MW assets. Steve explained that it does not generally become an MW asset but remains a private asset (or Council, VicRoads etc.).Liability for maintenance is the issue. Steve explained that if MW have approved a culvert then this would have some requirements that would need to be met. On private property, maintenance would remain the responsibility of the landowner. Compliance is always an issue and that is why MW is trying to limit culverts where they may have an impact on flooding, as it is MW’s responsibility to ensure the function of drains. Ian reiterated his concern about the particular incident/ approval that led to the action. Tom explained how that had been dealt with by MW.Matt asked whether MW could develop “Guidelines”, or did it require Departmental approval. He asked how were decision-making criteria determined to reflect the level of priority, and likelihood and consequence of flooding/ scouring impacts. Tom advised that MW is looking to simplify and making it easier for those requesting culverts to follow a clear process. Steve said MW will need to outline the objectives of what we are trying to achieve so people can frame their applications in response to these. He advised that MW Guidelines did not need Ministerial approval and could be developed and updated by MW as needed.  |
| Agenda item | **3. Works Update**  | Presenter | Tom Le Cerf and Cate Shaw |
| Discussion | **Capital Update** – Two Capital Projects aiming to remove wattles and willows between 9 Mile Road and the Railway are progressing through the planning stages and should commence later this year. The projects will see the removal of willows and wattles along a total reach of 13km.A site visit was undertaken in early March to look at access options and weed densities. Susan said she was very pleased with this.Matt asked whether willows are killed outright as they are hardy and can re-shoot. Cate explained that there were various methods used – cut and paint and drill and fill with herbicide but that the general objective is to kill the Willows. Nevertheless, crews usually have to go back a few times to ensure complete eradication.**Maintenance works update** Jason reported on the planned works: Debris removal – 2km 16 Mile DrainTrack clearing -2km 9 Mile Rd to Valley Rd.Fencing – McGregor’s DrainYallock - revegetation Deep Creek - revegetation Desilt – NW Catch Drain – 2.5km 7 Mile Rd to Fechner RdDesilt – Dalmore Rd Drain and Tooradin Station Rd Drain – 6.5kmRevegetation – 5000 shrubs on Yallock Outfall No 4 Drain – June/AugQuery re floodgate works at Island Rd – they have been entered into works program and will be completed soon.Deep Creek Catch Drain is also scheduled. |
| Agenda item | **4. Pricing Submission engagement results** | Presenter | **GD & TLC** |
| Discussion | Georgina provided a report on engagement activities and brief results of the survey noting that the overall response rate was low, despite considerable efforts (by MW and Advisory Committee members) to promote the opportunity to participate. Advised that we would have to wait and see if this would be deemed representative enough once presented to the Essential Services Commission. Georgina reported that everyone attending the drop-in sessions had particular issues they wished to discuss and were upset that the sessions weren’t public meetings. She said meetings could be organised in collaboration with Councils in the future.Of all respondents, the highest percentage of votes was for the Flood and waterway package which had the highest cost of $274 per annum with over 36% selecting this option and the majority (71%) voting for an increase in service. Steve commented that MW didn’t want to set unrealistic expectations of how much more can be achieved with a small increase in rates. Susan wondered if the changed circumstances in people’s incomes (in the current corona virus crisis) would have to be taken into account in considering ability to pay. Steve pointed out that the new Pricing Submission would not take effect until mid-2021, so there should be good information by then about the economic impacts. A draft would be submitted to the ESC in the middle of this year.The Advisory Committee members in attendance reconfirmed the Committee’s previous advice (November 2019) that they were happy with the Flood and Waterway package, and the consequent increase in rates, and believed that this should be the option submitted to the ESC. They also agreed with the top five rating of Current Services.Matt asked whether the feedback on priorities would also be used in determining the actual works delivered. Tom indicated it would, and advised that MW would have further engagement with the Committee in confirming the priorities for action in the future.  |
| Agenda item | 5. Action Plan Review Workshop | Presenter | TLC |
|  | Tom presented a number of slides covering the Focus areas identified from the previous workshop and tabled the 3-5 year outcomes, priorities for this year and associated actions. The four focus themes were:1. Enhancing and managing the function of drains
2. Managing impacts of development on flow volumes, amenity, etc.
3. Disaster Management – climate change, extremes, contamination, fire, pollution
4. Communication roles & responsibilities

**Focus Area** 1 (Drain function) – Committee generally happy with the actions. Matt stated that there needed to be more explanation around what ‘continuous improvement’ actually means in practice.**Focus Area 2** (Impacts of development) – Development to be added to Agenda for meetings.Sue commented that the proposed action – inviting experts to speak with the Committee – wouldn’t in itself be effective in addressing the drainage impacts of small lot developments. She suggested that the Committee could make a recommendation to the Council Planning Depts. about these small infill developments and the need for them to be covered by planning approvals so that they manage stormwater and do not contribute to flooding. Both Teena and Kevin commented that all developments have to be assessed to ensure they meet planning requirements which include containing run-off to pre-development levels. Sue commented that smaller lot developments don’t seem to have drainage retention built in. She said she would like to see the question asked at the planning application stage about how drainage is proposed to be managed. The problem is one of cumulative impact of many small developments. Bruce suggested that it might be helpful if MW and the Councils could organise for the Committee to be briefed on how the planning process should work to address this issue with new developments as a starting point for the Committee to see whether it wished to express a view or make a recommendation.**New Action 5.1:** MW, Kevin and Teena to collaborate on preparing a presentation and discussion on this topic, involving relevant experts, for the next meeting.**Focus Area 3** (Disaster Management) – Ian indicated he felt the proposed actions were good steps forward.SES Longwarry FMP**Focus Area 4** (Roles and Responsibilities) –Suggestions were made to add litter management and planning responsibilities to the ‘one pager’ on who does what in the region. |
|  | **6. Community feedback** |
| Agenda item | Susan mentioned the illegal camping on a riverbank (off Southbank Road, near corner of Nar Nar Goon Road). Also recent fire. Request to install bollards or some other measure to prevent access.**New Action 5.2** MW to take this up with PV and/or DELWP as the land managers. |
|  |  |

**Meeting closed:** 3.00pm

**Next meeting**: Thursday 13 August 2020, 1.00pm-3.00pm

Kevin offered Council’s Cardinia Shire’s facilities in Pakenham as a larger meeting space than the Committee room in KWR.