

# Planning, Building & Fire CRC Work Group Minutes – 14 July 2016

DELWP Offices – 8 Nicholson Street  
Thursday, 10am – 12pm

Teleconference details:

Number: 1800 766 715

Conference code: 355 751 7622

Invitees		
<b>Chair:</b>	Ian Angus	Chair
	Andrew Morrow	DELWP
	Roger Gribbel	
	John Ginivan	DELWP
	Doug McNeill	COS (by conference phone)
	Peter Galvin	DELWP
	Tegan Brown	DELWP
	Erin Letovsky	DELWP
<b>Apologies:</b>	Andy van Gemert	
	Di Sisely	
	Denis Morrissy	

	Agenda Item	
1	<p>Actions List</p> <p>LEGISLATIVE ABILITIES OF COS TO ENFORCE BUSHFIRE PREPAREDNESS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Erin contacted JM to manage veg on private property. Outlined COS abilities to issue FPN under CFA Act. Also to manage flammable materials on their properties.</li> <li>DMcN - fire prevention team have been down in Wye River. Riverside Rd and north had a lot of blackberry and flammable veg, generally not the kind of veg addressed through fire prevention notices.</li> <li>Ian – residents routinely receive a letter / alert to encourage</li> </ul>	Chair

	<p>people to clean up their properties, FPN are more prescriptive. Important to differentiate that this is different to a normal clean up notice.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• AM – Surf Coast Shire woody weeds program might be a good one to investigate for COS, it's very effective.</li> <li>• Discussion around clean-up notices for Dunlevy Estate. Prohibitively expensive to ask them to manage, we need to go through the APZ process first.</li> </ul>	
2	<p>Ratify Minutes from 23/6</p> <p>Ian Angus thanked Di Sisley for chairing the previous meetings of the PBF Work Group in his absence overseas.</p> <p>Move to ratify by John Ginivan. No objections. Motion passed.</p> <p>DISCUSSION ON LAST MEETING'S MINUTES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Work of expert panel helpful but there was no information on the specifications for walls, doors etc. Could COS coordinate generic information or link to a website?</li> <li>• DMcN – this is the role of the VBA and meeting one on one. Group accepted that there is difficulty in coordinating one website for all this information.</li> <li>• JG – had raised this with the Housing Industry Association to find a way to build up source information.</li> <li>• Roger – this is the role of a designer, their job to know these things and bring the best range of products to the client.</li> </ul>	Chair
3	<p>PBF TOR AND WORK GROUP PRIORITIES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• RG –the Work Group is not a decision making body, therefore more of a conduit to / from the community. Focus should be on getting the right outcomes and ensuring that Government and other agencies are focusing on issues that community care about.</li> <li>• AM – the role of this group is to understand how we best engage with community on PBF issues, not to provide technical advice.</li> <li>• JG - not technical experts. We want to be facilitating a conversation</li> </ul>	Tegan / Erin

	<p>about what is best for everyone. For example, language - does it resonate with the community? What is community anticipating that Government might not be thinking about yet?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• RG - community want to make rebuilding their own individual properties as simple as possible. Better information, not solving all the problems.</li> </ul> <p>WORK GROUP PRIORITIES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CRC meeting with Deb Jeppsom EMV. Landslip monitoring is underway but reports will not be made available to individual property owners. Landslip monitoring cannot really be reported on at the allotment level.</li> <li>• Emergency management information needs to be available to community.</li> <li>• Key message is that EMV are actively managing landslip risk.</li> <li>• JG - we are nearing the end of 'make safe' part of Government involvement. Make it safe to the point of property owners being able to get on with things. Enabler - we need to be alert to things such as water for building and making the process easier for people to get on with rebuilding.</li> </ul>	
4	<p>APZ PROJECT</p> <p>CLUSTER MEETINGS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No attendance at first cluster meeting for Riverside Drive. Good turnout for all the others. Expect 50-60 people across the whole program.</li> <li>• People are really keen to use products made available to support them in their decision-making, people used those different tools and placed high value on opportunity.</li> <li>• We need to be able to communicate this information in a way that resonates with people, and cluster meetings seem to be doing that.</li> <li>• RG: General Attitude? PG: Only a small number of people came along with a really strong view. Most people acknowledged that they wanted / needed to know more about APZs.</li> <li>• Large amount of information to digest depending on what you want to know more about. Some people wanting to go away and</li> </ul>	Peter

	<p>digest information over slightly longer timeframe.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• IA- APZs are not the magic silver bullet. Not going to make communities fire proof in the future alone. Need to include a variety of measures.</li> <li>• This coming weekend. Good RSVP so far. Weather should be nice.</li> <li>• Might rethink the bus to ensure that we are not exposing people to under risk.</li> <li>• IA- structure and format of the presentation was really good.</li> </ul> <p>NEXT STEPS FOR APZ</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A few things coming up. Most residents engaged so far are people that have a strong stake in this. Need broader community sentiment. Therefore develop short, simple online survey online by the end of next week, open for 10 days.</li> <li>• RG: General DELWP attitude to APZ leaving community commentary out of the question?</li> <li>• AM - have put them along the surf coast before to deliver a range of outcomes. Some features make them sustainable (impact on houses, flame contact, radiant heat, firefighters able to get in there for planned burning or back burning during firefight). Part of a comprehensive, strategic approach. Understanding where we can reduce risk and where we can't. These things are still being considered.</li> </ul>	
5	<p>STRATEGIC BUSHFIRE MANAGEMENT PLANNING</p> <p>Peter showed the group a Phoenix RapidFire bushfire modelling simulation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use Phoenix to test scenarios for management and also to use as a communication tool.</li> <li>• We can overlay fire history to understand how fuel management and historical bushfires might affect future fire behaviour and risk.</li> <li>• Images of Wye River 'bushfire catchment'. This is a large area for Wye River because of the connectivity of fuels I the landscape.</li> <li>• IA - We were told that part of the problem was there hadn't been a significant fire or planned burning in the landscape, meaning firefighters couldn't get in on the ground?</li> </ul>	Peter

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ AM - capacity to burn in those forests is limited. Early autumn is really the only window, and in most years may only last for 1-2 weeks (if at all). Burning around Wye Sep carries high risk. Often we are looking to burn in this area when fires are still occurring across the state – this makes decision making and risk management difficult.</li> <li>● IA- does a lowered ability for continuous management (i.e. planned burning program) push DELWP more towards an APZ? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ PG - not necessarily, they deliver different things.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● RG - does that mean that DELWP don't plan burns [in the Wye River Sep Ck area] because you can't rely on it? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ We still plan them in a long-term strategic sense, however are limited in an operational / implementation sense, because of the very limited seasonal window (Feb/March).</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Using Phoenix we can model how we have reduced bushfire risk over time. Large, landscape scale bushfires reduce risk significantly. However, there is always going to be residual risk in the landscape because planned burning will never be 100% effective. Best we can do for risk reduction (using planned burning) in WRSC is getting it down to 53%. This is modelled and probably not achievable in reality (due to operational constraints / suitable weather opportunities). Always going to be a high level of residual risk for WRSC - move to community preparedness and fuels in township, other avenues of risk reduction. More likely to be able to get to 76% residual risk (which is where it was in 2016). We were essentially operating at lowest residual risk. APZ not going to change the risk reduction too much. However, planned burning potentially becomes less risky to deliver, potential fire-fighting benefits. APZ not going to change the level of overall exposure over time.</li> <li>● IA - consistent message (above) over the whole process. Individual perspectives become more important here.</li> </ul> <p>*For those reading these minutes online – please contact Peter Galvin (03 5233 5537) or <a href="mailto:barwon.otway@delwp.vic.gov.au">barwon.otway@delwp.vic.gov.au</a> if you would like further information on Phoenix Rapidfire or landscape bushfire management.</p>	
--	--	--

6	<p>Drainage, erosion and emergency management for landslip</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agencies have met in Wye last week to find some drainage management systems. Procurement process this week and will appoint a consultant next week. COS drainage team working in there now to manage water and stop it from ponding. DELWP crew also assisting.</li> <li>• AM - are COS in control of the whole road network? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ No, GROCON still control. Sep Ck - letter sent to GROCON to repair some roads before COS resume responsibility. GROCON still responsible for majority of roads in Wye River.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• DMcN – COS are ignoring land tenure, and assess risk across the whole site. Have conversations with landholders where necessary.</li> <li>• Landslip monitoring is being undertaken.</li> <li>• RG - will there be recommendations made for putting in retaining walls? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ JG - COS has a tender process for an erosion and sediment plan, measures are put in place in the short term and over the next few years. Need to get some communications out to the community so that people know that there are works going on.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Emergency Management - Set up at the moment and led by VicPol (supported by SES, EMV, DELWP) to develop some protocols for risk management over the next couple of wet months. Door-knocking occurred previously to ensure that people were aware of the risks. Still working on guidance to understand trigger points.</li> </ul>	Doug / John / Andrew
9	<p>OTHER BUSINESS</p> <p>PLANNING APPLICATIONS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 11 applications have now been lodged. 2 are for previously vacant properties. Access is now easier for residents and consultants. Only one to date with design concerns (not consistent with township character). Expect to receive a few more in the coming weeks.</li> <li>• Need to be on the front foot in regards to ‘township hardening’ as residents are now beginning to rebuild and re-landscape.</li> <li>• Construction standard of the house is something that is considered more in the building surveyor level, not the planning application</li> </ul>	

	<p>stage.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>JG - as project moves forward, need something in place to know which building surveyors are responsible for each site so that we can deliver updated information to them as we get it.</li> </ul>	
<i>Next meeting:</i>		

<b>Action:</b>	<b>By whom:</b>	<b>By when:</b>	<b>Complete?</b>
Send documentation to group in regards to the legislative abilities of COS to enforce bushfire preparedness	John Mealia	Next meeting	JM provided information to DELWP from a DELWP / Agency perspective. Doug to follow up with JM if required from a COS perspective.
Follow up on communication in regards to landslip risk and how this is being managed by the agencies with a particular focus on Wallace Ave.	Doug McNeill	ASAP	Complete
Forward the 'determining our future' outcomes to the PBF group and Peter Galvin so that he can use this information to inform the consequence table for APZ discussions.	Di Sisely	ASAP	CRC have not finalised report yet. Clare Malone will forward to Tegan when finalised.
Di to liaise with John Mealia about the best representative from PBF work group to attend a field visit with John Mealia on a community refuge project that Craig	Di Sisely	ASAP	COMPLETE

Lapsley has commissioned.			
Stewart Anderson (COS) to attend the next PBF Work Group meeting to discuss vegetation enforcement.	Doug McNeill to invite Stewart Anderson	Before next meeting	
Get cluster feedback sheet and circulate to the group	Tegan Brown	Before next meeting	
Presenting Phoenix, risk and APZ information in an easy-to-digest take-away format. For discussion within DELWP BRL team.	Pete Galvin / Tegan Brown to assist	ASAP	
Roger to send information on fire rated paint to Doug.	Roger	ASAP	