

DRAFT COMMUNITY LOCAL LAW NO.2

Draft Engagement Report

September 2020

Document control

Document information

Document name	Draft Community Local Law No.2 Engagement Report
----------------------	--

Reference

Document owner	Kristin Favaloro
-----------------------	------------------

Contents

- 1. Introduction 4**
- 2. The Engagement Approach..... 4**
- 2.1. Information provided to the community..... 5
- 3. Participants 5**
- 4. What our community told us..... 6**
- 6. Evaluation..... 10**

1. Introduction

Strathbogie Shire Council Draft Community Local Law No.2 provides for the administration, management and protection of amenity and safety throughout the shire.

Upon adoption of a new Community Local Law No.2 - the Strathbogie Shire Council Community Local Law No. 6 (2010) would be repealed.

Council officers reviewed the current local law, complaint enquiries received, previous permits issued under the local law, along with reviews of similar laws of adjoining and/or similarly sized Councils to ensure consistency across municipal boundaries.

The draft local law was also been reviewed by the Local Law Project Group consisting of Councillors, officers and community representatives and endorsed by Council at its ordinary meeting in July with further input added.

The proposed changes included in the draft local law include:

- New provisions intended to improve regulation around uses or activities which may impact on amenity of surrounding land owners, occupants or our wider community
- Consolidation or deletion of some previous requirements
- Updated layout to reflect where the activity occurs – private or public land or a topic – animals and infrastructure
- Permit considerations have been included for all permit required activities. This is intended to provide transparency to our applicants and the wider community in the decision making process of the Compliance

2. The Engagement Approach

To ensure community input into the Draft Community Local Law No.2, Strathbogie Shire Council created an engagement plan that aimed to:

- ensure the community was informed about the review
- ensure the community understood how it could provide feedback
- provide clear and informative communications materials, and
- provide different engagement opportunities to ensure the community could learn and provide feedback in the method that best suited their needs.

Members of the public were encouraged to provide feedback for a four-week period through written submissions until Thursday, September 3, 2020.

This could be done through:

- Sending an email to info@strathbogie.vic.gov.au
- Writing to Strathbogie Shire Council, PO Box 177, Euroa 3666.

We also created two-way engagement opportunities to create more meaningful engagement.

Two online feedback sessions provided participants with the opportunity to ask questions and provide their feedback in a more informal setting. The online session also ensured we were meeting the social distancing requirements of the coronavirus (COVID-19).

More importantly the online sessions were held about half-way through the public engagement process. They allowed us to test our thinking, based on what we were hearing from the community.

Council’s engagement stretched along the IAP2 Engagement Spectrum from ‘inform’ to ‘consult’ and ‘involve’.

Table 1: Engagement methods used based on the level of impact

Inform	Consult	Involve
<p>General Communication</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Media releases • Website • Social media • Advertising 	<p>Direct and Interactive Engagement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Written submission period 	<p>Feedback forums</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Online feedback sessions • Councillor workshop

2.1. Information provided to the community

During our engagement activities information provided to the community was detailed.

Table 2: Links to all the information provided.

What	Topic
Draft Document	Draft Community Local Law No.2
Presentation	Online feedback sessions
Website content	Have your say
Media release	Have your say on protecting amenity in Strathbogrie Shire
Advertisement	Published in all local newspapers
Social media	Seeking community input
Social media	Register for online feedback session
Video	Provide your thoughts and advice

3. Participants

Participants of the Draft Community Local Law No.2 community engagement program consisted of:

- 66 written submissions
- About 80 one-on-one meetings/phone calls
- 20 people attended online feedback sessions

4. What our community told us

The themes from our one on one discussions, written submissions and online engagement forums are outlined below.

Stock on roads: We heard the proposed requirement for farmers requiring a permit to move stock within the Shire was not needed. Our community said it was an additional expense, generated more paperwork and above all seemed like it punished those who are doing the right thing.

Animal excrement: Our community told us this requirement was impossible to manage or enforce. We heard farmers simply did not have the ability to abide by this requirement.

Drones: The message on a proposed permit to launch drones from Council owned land was loud, especially in the written submissions. This is creating unnecessary red tape when Civil Aviation Safety Authority (CASA) restrictions are already in place.

Shipping containers: We heard they were often used as important storage and feed sheds in farming zones. At the same time our community understood we must protect amenity – this is why we love where we live!

Embrace community spirit: Encourage creativity in our Shire. Allow busking that can enhance our wellbeing, support safe lemonade stands for kids and encourage appropriate nature strip plantings.

5. Findings

Table 3. The number of submissions relating to each theme.

Theme	Stock on roads	Animal excrement	Drones	Shipping containers	Embrace community spirit	Other
Number of submissions	30	6	15	Information gathered during online sessions and 1:1 meetings	4	11

Table 4. Feedback gathered during online session 1 (held on Monday, August 24) relating to each theme.

Theme	Feedback
Stock on roads	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • You're not targeting those doing the wrong things. • There's going to need to be some education about moving stock and what drivers should do. • I support moving away from a permit system. • We need a driver education program. Drivers have no idea what to do. • It's all about driver education. • The majority of landowners have properties on either side of the road. • I support removing the permit, I felt this was going toward penalising those who do the right things, congratulations. • I think the education aspect is a great idea. • Happy this does not affect horses being ridden down a road.
Animal excrement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I agree with the change, I did think it was an oversight from transferring urban to farming. • It's funny and non-sensical • Permits should be required to move stock into the shire, need to specify this is trucked or droving, I assume trucking does not require a permit.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Needs to be very clear.
Drones	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I agree with proposed changes. Laws already exist. Think Council needs to balance privacy and productivity. Drones are new technology and moving into the farming areas they provide a fantastic opportunity for farmers to increase productivity and improve our Shire. We've got to be careful we're not too restrictive that we stop future opportunities.
Shipping containers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This definition needs to be tidied up. Where a container is used for agricultural storage you shouldn't need a permit. I think if a container impacts amenity then guidelines need to be included to improve that amenity. It's all about amenity.
Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clause 39 needs clarification – it could mean 20 fish 40 notes vermin control. Newer working indicates every storage feed shed requires vermin proofing. On a hayshed that would mean unnecessary costs. 42 notes on keeping poultry. This is at odds with the code of practice. On recreational vehicles a definition needs to be included. On 29 the two difference requirements makes it difficult. On 28 the interpretation of events sounds like birthday parties need a permit. On 31 – I'm concerned this will means illegal dumping or burying on properties. Perhaps we need central collections points. On 46 and 47 there's no reference to working dogs, which needs to be excluded. Council needs a tool to better manage temporary vehicle crossings.

Table 5. Feedback gathered during online session 1 (held on Thursday, August 27) relating to each theme.

Theme	Feedback
Stock on roads	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Think removing the permit is appropriate and a good outcome. • Those doing the wrong thing won't get a permit anyway. • It makes more sense • Think it's a good idea to remove the requirement to have a permit • A permit is hard and costs everyone • I agree there shouldn't be a permit required. • Can I suggest there needs to be education to drivers. It's about the overall wellbeing and safety.
Animal excrement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I think dogs and cats are fine. • I think that's a sensible way to put it. • What about horses, what is fair and reasonable?
Drones	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I think a permit might be a good idea, especially if they're flying over backyards. • I don't understand how CASA works, but there is a privacy issue. •
Shipping containers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I would support excluding the farming zone and I would be happy to be painted a suitable colour. • I disagree I don't think you can given the state of some properties. I don't think it's reasonable. • Would it be more relevant to limit the amount based on the zone?
Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can we include a better definition on events. • What about entrepreneurial kids who want to have a lemonade stand on a roadside, with the trading from a roadside permit prevent this from happening?

6. Evaluation

At the end of the online feedback sessions we asked participants to rate their satisfaction with the process. *This was sent through a survey via email and the results below will continually be updated.*

Table 5. Community satisfaction ratings.

Bad	Not so good	Okay	Very good	Excellent
1*		1	1	1

*This relates to internet connection and access to technology.