

MAV Insurance (MAVI) developed a template for all its members to ensure each council that has a plan that is reasonable, compliant, and comparable to other councils.

The new template:

- Contains all the crucial information and necessary wording to keep it in line with current best practices and legal advice.
- Includes clear, measurable standards, to monitor compliance – and demonstrate that compliance through records of relevant activities.
- Is realistic, thereby allowing resources to be reallocated to higher-risk areas, achieving increased efficiencies and cost savings.
- Is practical and usable for Council's asset managers.

Council's draft Road Management Plan (RMP) 2025 is based on the new template. The draft RMP 2025 includes standards that can be met within existing allocated resources.

The following is an explanation where the draft RMP 2025 has a notable difference to the MAVI template:

1. Proactive Inspection Frequencies

1.1 - Lowest category footpaths – Category 3

MAVI Template	Draft RMP 2025	Explanation
Suggested range 12-24 months	3 years (Same as RMP 2015)	An inspection frequency of 3 years is considered appropriate considering the typically good ground conditions under the footpaths. Typically, defects are due to damage not deterioration. 3 years or even 12 months is too long if there is damage. Damage can be due to tree roots, authority works, or heavy vehicles. Damage is typically picked up in a reactive request. The timeframes for reactive requests are within the MAVI range. In Whitehorse there is one employee who undertakes inspections of all footpaths, and this is a full-time role at the current inspection frequencies. There are over 1,200 kilometres of footpaths with the majority being Category 3. If the frequency was changed to be more often, a new

		employee is needed or funding for a contracted service.
--	--	---

1.2 - Lowest category roads – Category 3

MAVI Template	Draft RMP 2025	Explanation
Suggested range 12-24 months	3 years (Same as RMP 2015)	An inspection frequency of 3 years is considered appropriate considering the high quality of roads in Whitehorse based on typically good ground conditions under the roads. The roads are low speed roads (60 km/hr or less) so a lower risk than some councils. In some councils where the ground under the road is not stable, like in a sandy area, or where the ground conditions expand and contract, the roads may deteriorate quickly. A pothole in a road is typically reported by customers or Council staff, and attended to as a reactive request, within the recommended MAVI timeframes.

1.3 - Laneways – Category 4

MAVI Template	Draft RMP 2025	Explanation
Suggested range 12-24 months	Laneways are only inspected for condition following a reactive request and not proactive (Same as RMP 2015)	Laneways are secondary access to properties. There are over 40 kilometres of constructed laneways, and many more unconstructed laneways. The priority for funding needs to be the roads and footpaths that are the primary access to properties. Any concerns with laneways are attended to as a reactive request, within the recommended MAVI timeframes.

1.4 – Night Inspections

MAVI Template	Draft RMP 2025	Explanation
Inspection undertaken in accordance with a formal	No night inspections	This is included predominately for rural councils where there may be high speed roads, without street lights, and reflective

programmed inspection schedule to assess the reflectivity of road signage, cat's eyes and roadside guideposts, and the visibility of line marking at night.	(Same as RMP 2015)	signs guideposts, and linemarking are an important road safety measure. In Whitehorse, the roads are low speed (60 km/hr or less) and typically all have street lighting. The reflectivity of signs and guide posts remains important but not as important as some rural roads. Any concerns raised with be investigated as a reactive request, within the recommended MAVI timeframes. If night inspections are included, this will require additional resources, either by an additional employee or funding for a contracted service.
---	--------------------	--

2. Defect Intervention Levels and Repair Timeframes

2.1 - Lowest category footpaths – Category 3

MAVI Template	Draft RMP 2025	Explanation
Suggested range 2 weeks to 3 months	12 months (Same as RMP 2015)	It is not feasible for Whitehorse to comply with the suggested range without a significant investment in employees and funding. Proactive inspections are done in work areas that may have around 50 kilometres of footpaths. When an area is complete, the data from the inspections is processed, defects are grouped together, work packages are prepared for contractors. The contractor needs time to receive the work, allocate the resources, complete the work, invoice the work, provide evidence of completed work. Council needs to receive notice of completed works, close the defects, and make the payment before the request is closed. The defects must be grouped into sizable work packages so the works can be done at a reasonable cost. 12 months is considered a reasonable time to complete this process, given the

		steps involved, and maximising the allocated funding. Where Whitehorse differs from other councils is that the timeframe for all repairs may be longer, but we have a tiered response that is based on risk mitigation. We have a standard that all vertical displacements greater than 40mm are repaired within 5 working days. This is significantly quicker than most other councils. This is a commitment to get to the high-risk hazards quickly and have a cost-effective method to attend to other smaller defects.
--	--	---

2.2 - Highest category footpaths – Category 1

MAVI Template	Draft RMP 2025	Explanation
Suggested range 2 weeks to 1 month	6 months (12 months in RMP 2015)	It is not feasible for Whitehorse to comply with the suggested range without a significant investment in employees and funding. See notes in table 2.1. A change is proposed to reduce the current timeframes from 12 months to 6 months. 6 months is the minimum timeframe that can be committed to with current employees and funding.

3. Vegetation Clearance

3.1 - Vegetation clearance for roads

MAVI Template	Draft RMP 2025	Explanation
Suggested defect intervention level – Vegetation intruding into the road envelope: - <4.9 m clearance	Not included in the RMP (Same as RMP 2015)	Trees are highly valued in Whitehorse and managed in accordance with Council's Urban Forest Strategy and Tree Management Policy. Council trees are managed through Council's Tree Management Policy and

over the trafficable portion of Arterial roads - <4.5 m over the trafficable portion of Cat 3 & 4 roads - <4.0 m over the trafficable portion of Cat 1 & 2 roads Suggested repair timeframe: - Cat 1 - 1 W - Cat 2 – 2 W - Cat 3 – 4 W - Cat 4 – 8 W		private trees are managed through Council's Community Local Law 2024 – see extract: 3.6. Trees and Vegetation <i>The owner or occupier of land must not allow vegetation on that land to:</i> <i>(a) overhang onto the footpath, road or Council land at a height of not less than 2.5 metres from the surface of the adjacent footpath or nature strip;</i> <i>(b) obstruct or impair the vision or clear passage of a vehicle using the adjacent road;</i> <i>(c) obstruct or interfere with the safe and accessible use of the footpath or road adjacent to or near the land;</i> <i>(d) encroach upon any adjacent road or Council land; or</i> <i>(e) obscure streetlights or traffic control items.</i> Including this in Council's RMP is not required, considering this issue is managed with Council processes for the best community outcome. This is a low risk. There are few claims to Council about this. It is typically the waste collection vehicles or the street sweepers that report low overhanging vegetation.
--	--	---

3.2 - Vegetation clearance for footpaths

MAVI Template	Draft RMP 2025	Explanation
Suggested defect intervention level – Vegetation intruding into the footpath envelope: - <2.5 m over footpath surface Suggested repair timeframe:	Not included in the RMP (Same as RMP 2015)	See notes table 3.1. When Council's inspector is inspecting footpaths, overhanging vegetation is noted and passed on to Council's Local Laws team to follow up with the property owner. The action is to be taken by the property owner, The timing is dependent on a process involving a contact and response from a property owner. For example, it may be significant hedge that is obstructing the footpath and issues like this need to resolve, involving

Summary of proposed amendments to Road Management Plan 2025

Comparison to MAVI template

- Cat 1 - 2 W - Cat 2 – 4 W - Cat 3 – 8 W		considerable engagement with all relevant stakeholders. Including this in Council's RMP is not required, considering this issue is managed with Council processes for the best community outcome.
---	--	---