

**From:** Greg Rodwell  
**Sent:** Tuesday, 28 September 2021 5:04 PM  
**To:** Vass, George

**Subject:** Re: Sandeman Place

Hi George,

We received a letter from you dated 14 September 2021 re 'Notice of Statutory Process to declare part of Sandeman Place Fitzroy a Public Highway'. I was a little confused and surprise to see this given the communication we have received from you (in the email chain below) specifically where you stated on the 13th of May 2021:

*"Immediately following Council's meeting of 4 May 2021, we provided a copy of Council's resolution to Council's legal representative with an instruction to gazette the NUA land a public highway.*

*The gazettal notice was already prepared.*

*On the question of enforcing Sandeman Place a PH, I also briefed our Compliance Team of Council's declaration and sought advice as to whether Council should act on the resolution alone or wait for gazettal and it was agreed that we wait for gazettal.*

*I should have an update today re timing but it is simply an administrative but important step.*

*I have also now received a report from Council's engineers that support the importance of the 0.4 sq.m triangle that forms part of the separate statutory process that Council is ready to commence.*

*The report includes diagrams that show the position of the triangle, the 2.45 metre diagonal restriction previously highlighted and most importantly the sweep path necessary for reasonable vehicular access. The sweep path shown is for a B99 vehicle which includes an ambulance or small truck that would not be able to get through the Sandeman place restriction if the triangle is not part of Sandeman Place."*

I have spoken to Stephen Jolly about this today, he advised that Council did not follow the correct process and that is why now the process is starting again. What I am struggling to understand is why now, with no further consultation, you are listing the 0.4sq.m triangle as part of this process when you specifically stated that it would be part of a separate process? I am also struggling to understand the need for this 0.4sq.m triangle, the report you refer to doesn't identify if the B99 vehicle has sufficient width to enter 75-77 Webb St, especially considering this is the only access to Tony's home - where as a B99 can access 73 Webb and George St from Webb St and George St respectively. At the Council meeting you argued the triangle would increase access by over 2m - whereas it only increases it by 23cm. This seems really misleading.

From someone who works for Local Government I find this whole process slightly unbelievable and concerning. From our initial interaction with you where you proposed options to give the NUA land to those parties that are unlawfully staking a claim to it, to the numerous communications you have made (as evidenced by the statement above) where you provide advice and a commitment and then not follow through on this. We then find out that the process is starting again because Council did not follow the correct process, it really questions my trust in Council and the Officers undertaking this process. It almost feels like it might have been a convenient mistake...

If you could please provide clarity on my questions above and provide some sense of assurity to the process and our rights as rate paying residents that would be greatly appreciated.

Regards,  
Greg Rodwell  
75 Webb Street Fitzroy