



# AIDA

JULY 2012 NEWSLETTER



## Milestones in Victorian Coastal Planning and Management

Dr Geoffrey Wescott, Associate Professor at Deakin University's School of Life and Environmental Sciences, addressed AIDA's AGM on the important issue of Victoria's coastal planning and management. He told us that the Great Ocean Road is a top global tourist destination for two main reasons – the beauty and diversity of its geological and biological forms and the comparatively good management, historically, of the designated coastal zone. The lush vegetation occurring east of Cape Otway results from the fact that the predominant ocean swell comes from the south-west and hence runs parallel to the coast rather than striking it full on, so that salt-laden spray does not damage vegetation or restrict it from reaching the land's edge. However, climate change in the form of increased extreme events, slow sea level rise and rising ocean acidity will occur over the coming years necessitating active planning and management to preserve these precious coastal resources.

Dr Wescott outlined significant milestones in Victoria's coastal management history as a way of considering the challenges that lie ahead.

In contrast to the legacy of the traditional owners and long-term guardians of the coast over 60,000 years, early photos of areas denuded of trees show the white settlers' European approach to land management. However, from 1879, committees of management that emphasised Victoria's commitment to open space, parks for people and public ownership demonstrated foresight in the establishment of foreshore reservations. The nineteenth-century colonial *Land Act* reserved a zone along the coastline as public land. This buffer zone has provided protection to private landowners and access for all to a unique coastal zone, but climate change and unplanned and poorly managed development may severely reduce, and in some places eliminate, this critical buffer. He reflected on whether this great Victorian legacy has produced complacency in decision makers in Victoria in recent times.

In 1901 the Australian Constitution left control of land planning and management to the states, so from 1901 to 1970 Victorian Coastal Planning and Management devolved responsibility for recreational and other 'useful' areas other than foreshores to over 100 separate

committees of management, local councils, etc.

Internationally the concept of Integrated Coastal Zone Management (ICZM) was born in 1992 during the Earth Summit of Rio de Janeiro to promote sustainable management of coastal zones. In Australia, 1992 saw a focus on a system of arrangements that linked the key elements of coastal planning and management across coastal land and coastal waters, that is the so-called coastal zone. This provided an opportunity for integration of scientific knowledge with management practice, horizontal land and sea integration and the vertical integration of governance arrangements between national, state and local governments.

Victoria enacted its *Coastal Management Act* in 1995, giving the task of developing a state coastal plan to a statutory committee, the Victorian Coastal Council, which included representatives from all levels of the community, and in 1997 published the first of three Victorian Coastal Strategies. However, the potential of Coastal Action Plans (CAPs) initiated under the Act as a link between the strategic direction of the Victorian Coastal Strategy and Management and Planning Schemes has yet to be realised.

From 1975 to 2002 there was a substantial expansion of state and national parks along the coast. This brought increased funding and awareness of the need for preservation of the unique flora and fauna of the area. Parks Victoria is now the primary manager of the coastal zone. The declaration in 2002 of marine national parks and marine sanctuaries (so called 'no take' reserves), a world first then, was another major step forward. Recently, the addition of further local coastal marine reserves will protect ocean ecology.

The emergence in 2003–04 of coastal development as an issue in the Victorian public's mind is only fairly recent. Every local issue appears unique, but the issues are repeated over and over. The real aim of the *Coastal Management Act*, Victorian Coastal Strategy and CAPs is to draw power and experience from the past, to avoid the tyranny of small decisions, and avoid repeating the same mistakes. Victoria is acknowledged internationally and nationally as a world leader in integrated coastal zone management, but just as the price of freedom is eternal vigilance, the price of a well-managed and protected coastline is eternal vigilance by the community.

Dr Wescott closed his address by telling AIDA members that Australian Coastal Society (ACS) membership may be a good place to start if they are interested in following through on coastal conservation.

## **GORCC Surveys: Preserve Coastal Environment**

The Great Ocean Road Coast Committee (GORCC) recently released its draft coastal management plan. AIDA committee member Gary Johnson served on the community reference group, which provided community input during preparation of the draft plan, and other AIDA committee members are providing feedback during the community consultation period that finishes on 29 June 2012.

AIDA was very pleased to learn from the draft document that community consultations and surveys performed by GORCC during development of the plan yielded findings that mirrored those of previous surveys over past decades by AIDA and the Surf Coast Shire (notably the Aireys Inlet to Eastern View Neighbourhood Character Study of 2004) in overwhelmingly supporting preservation of our natural environment.

Of the 183 community members involved in GORCC's current study, ~60 per cent were permanent residents of the GORCC-managed coastal region (from Point Impossible west of Torquay to Cumberland River south of Lorne), while the remainder listed permanent addresses predominantly in Melbourne or Geelong and their respective surrounding suburbs. Here are the responses to four of the questions.

### **What do you value about the coast?**

A large number of respondents nominated various aspects of the natural environment, including its visual beauty, native wildlife and the seclusion and escape it offers. Opportunities for recreational activities such as walking, surfing, swimming and fishing were also highly valued, as was the lack of or limited amount of development along the coastline, and the sense of being part of a connected community.

### **What is your vision for the coast?**

Most respondents described their perfect coast as not significantly different from today – clean, accessible, undeveloped with natural values protected and advanced. Other lesser, but still popular, themes that emerged were necessary infrastructure being sensitively built, of high quality and low impact to the environment, and coastal users being more aware of environmental issues and helping to care for the coast.

### **What areas of management are most important to you?**

When respondents were given tokens to be allocated across various options, the 'natural environment'

received by far the highest number of tokens. 'Access', 'infrastructure' and 'community involvement' received moderate numbers of tokens, while 'caravan parks', 'cultural heritage' and 'commercial activities' received the smallest numbers of tokens.

### What would you like to see happen on the coast?

Respondents were asked to nominate 'actions' under each of the management options listed above. The option attracting the highest number of nominated actions was 'access'. The types of actions nominated were diverse, the most popular relating to maintenance of existing facilities, and use of natural materials and protection of the natural environment when building access facilities. 'Community action' received the second highest number of nominated actions, with the majority suggesting either that GORCC should increase consultation opportunities and community involvement in general, or that the community should be better educated in order to promote better coastal behaviour. 'Infrastructure' came next, with the most popular types of suggested actions being either that infrastructure should be limited or reduced on the coast, or that some additional infrastructure should be provided, such as toilets or bins. Finally, although 'Natural environment' received only the fourth highest number of nominated actions, the strongest degree of community consensus was achieved in this area. The majority of suggested actions were in support of protection of the natural environment, with more of these types of actions recorded than any other type of action under any other area of coastal management.

*Mary-Jane Gething*

### Where Do I Find It?

A member recently asked how she could best keep up with what is happening in the shire. A modified version of AIDA's reply follows.

There are a number of ways of keeping informed. The main one is to monitor the shire's website, a great source of information about our community. This isn't too time consuming but it does require you to check it at intervals. Members without internet access will have more difficulty but meetings can be attended and plans viewed at shire offices.

1. Planning applications on exhibition. This page shows the plans and associated documents of each new planning proposal being exhibited by the shire. It does not take long to pick out the local ones if you screen by suburb or address – and then all the

information is readily available to you. See: [http://www.surfcoast.vic.gov.au/My\\_Property/Building\\_Planning/Planning/Applications\\_On\\_Public\\_Exhibition](http://www.surfcoast.vic.gov.au/My_Property/Building_Planning/Planning/Applications_On_Public_Exhibition)

2. Planning Committee. Agenda papers are posted on the shire's website the Friday before the Committee's meeting. Generally two meetings are held per month. The first is on a Monday early in the month, with the second late in the month. From the agenda you can determine the planning officer's recommendation (often fully documented), the list of objectors and other relevant information. A few days later, the decision of the Planning Committee is posted. See: [http://www.surfcoast.vic.gov.au/My\\_Council/Agendas\\_Minutes/Planning\\_Committee](http://www.surfcoast.vic.gov.au/My_Council/Agendas_Minutes/Planning_Committee)
3. Council meetings. Agenda papers and minutes are available on this webpage from January 2010 until the present date. Council meetings are held on a Wednesday, generally the fourth in the month. The agenda papers are complete except for material to be considered in camera. The minutes containing decisions are posted a few days later. See: [http://www.surfcoast.vic.gov.au/My\\_Council/Agendas\\_Minutes/Council\\_Agendas\\_Minutes](http://www.surfcoast.vic.gov.au/My_Council/Agendas_Minutes/Council_Agendas_Minutes)
4. Councillors. Don't forget that we have three councillors who are very sensitive to and knowledgeable about community issues and are effective on our behalf. It is likely that at least two will retire at the 27 October elections, so who knows what the future holds.
5. AIDA. And we hasten to add that AIDA keeps members informed with our newsletters and increasingly with emails about important breaking news. Our members often give the organisation an early warning.
6. Other community organisations. Our sister organisations like Angair and Red Cross are also wonderful sources of community information.

*Gary Johnson*

## Local Government Electoral Boundaries

The minister for local government has advised the Surf Coast Shire that she has accepted the Victorian Electoral Commission recommendation that the shire be subdivided into four wards with a total of nine councillors. These changes will be in effect at the 27 October election.

The Lorne Ward, electing one councillor, will encompass Moggs Creek, Eastern View, Deans Marsh and Lorne. The Anglesea Ward, with two councillors, will include Aireys Inlet, Fairhaven and Anglesea.

A detailed map of the ward boundaries can be obtained from: [http://www.surfcoast.vic.gov.au/News\\_Directory/Ward\\_Boundaries\\_-\\_Surf\\_Coast\\_Shire](http://www.surfcoast.vic.gov.au/News_Directory/Ward_Boundaries_-_Surf_Coast_Shire)

Gary Johnson

## Precinct 2 Special Charge Scheme

Due to a majority of property owners objecting to the proposed roads, drainage and pathways special charge scheme in Precinct 2, Aireys Inlet, council unanimously decided at its meeting on 23 May to:

- '1. Not declare the Aireys Inlet Precinct 2 Special Charge Scheme in acknowledgement of the requirement stated at Section 163B sub-sections 6 and 7 of the Local Government Act 1989; and*
- '2. Advise all affected property owners of Council's decision.'*

This result was a great relief to most Precinct 2 residents, even though many felt that there were aspects of the scheme that were of value. Although the shire's infrastructure department failed to report the number of objections it received, or the grounds the objections were based on, most opposition seems to have centred around unwanted footpaths and road sealing – together with their high cost. The overwhelming rejection of the scheme was conveyed by owners under the formal consultation process laid down in the *Local Government Act* – and Council was therefore obliged under the Act to withdraw the scheme.

This is an historic decision, as it is the first time that a special charge scheme has ever been rejected in the Surf Coast Shire, and it is already leading to major changes in council policy.

At its 28 March meeting, after the rejection was known, council unanimously resolved that it:

*'Endorse for all future infrastructure solutions in sensitive coastal areas a design approach in sympathy with the local neighbourhood character and request that engagement with impacted communities occurs prior to the commencement of design work to ensure communities contribute to proposed infrastructure solutions.'*

AIDA sees this as a key decision, and hopes to be able to work with council to establish the framework for its implementation.

## New Special Charge Scheme Policy

On 1 June council's revised 'Infrastructure Rate or Charge Scheme Policy' was mailed to all Precinct 2 owners, along with formal advice that the proposed scheme had been abandoned. This new policy introduces special provisions, which have been designed to address many of the objections raised as a result of the proposed design, financing and management of the Precinct 2 special charge scheme.

The new provisions are important improvements in the shire's approach to such schemes, and will go a long way towards satisfying local disquiet in future major infrastructure projects. The provisions are:

- '• Construction standard – A reduced construction standard through the use of gravel instead of crushed rock will be applied for low volume rural / coastal roads.*
- '• Council contribution – With the following exceptions, Council contribution to all special charge schemes will be based on the community benefit calculated in accordance with the Special Rates and Charges Ministerial Guidelines.*
  - 'For pathway schemes based on a precinct approach, Council will contribute 50% of the project cost.*
  - 'For Road construction schemes, Council will contribute equivalent of the cost of a 100mm gravel re-sheet. Council will also contribute all costs associated with the traffic management works included in the scheme.*
- '• Community engagement – A community based Reference Panel will be appointed for all schemes involving over 100 properties.*
- '• Objections to the scheme (Section 163 B of the Local Government Act 1989) – With the exception of schemes prepared in accordance with Section 163 B (2) of the Local Government Act, Council will discontinue a scheme if more than 40% objections are received in instances where Council is seeking to raise over two thirds of the total project cost through the special charge.*
- '• Properties with subdivision potential – Properties which demonstrate subdivision potential will be included in the scheme in accordance with the relevant zoning provisions. Property owners will have the option to defer the special charge on the additional lots (lots created after subdivision) until such time the subdivision is released (Statement of Compliance). A Section 173 Agreement will be required to enable deferment of the additional special charge.*

- *Payment terms – Property owners liable for scheme contributions over \$5,000 will have the option to pay the charge over a period of 10 years. The applicable borrowing interest rate will be applied to the unpaid special charge.*

AIDA is pleased to have contributed to the criticisms driving a number of these changes, but full credit must go to our local councillors for specifying their scope and detail, and full credit also, to all of the objectors of Precinct 2 for providing the political underpinning for such a change.

*Ian Godfrey*

## Back to the Oval Again

Council received an offer of land at 23 to 79 Bambra Rd (also known collectively as the John Allen land) for use as a recreation reserve, including an oval. The land offered is in a flood zone and not the council's preferred site. Councillors considered the offer in camera and rejected it, but made an alternative offer for a site referred to as lot 3 (or option C in the report linked below, see photo from this report) at the same address. Mr Allen was given 60 days to consider the offer after which it would be withdrawn. The offer was not accepted.



So where to from here? In the Aireys Inlet Recreation Infrastructure Strategy 2008, (see: <http://www.surfcoast.vic.gov.au/Search?keyword=aireys+inlet+recreation+infrastructure+strategy>) a reserve at Boundary Rd and Gilbert St was recommended as a recreation site. At the 22 February meeting, councillors recommended that this site be considered, in conjunction with DSE, for tourism / passive recreation. Development of two loop trails and a management plan were mentioned in the recommendations.

*Gary Johnson*

## Ministerial Changes to Aireys Commercial Areas Guidelines

The shire's amendment C55 to the Surf Coast Planning Scheme was designed to introduce a Design and Development Overlay, providing urban design guidelines for future developments in Aireys Inlet's commercial areas. The Design and Development Overlay was the result of several years' work by council and the community, starting with the *Pride of Place* project in 2005, followed by a review of whether the existing business zones are adequate for future needs, then the development of the Aireys Inlet Commercial Areas Urban Design Guidelines, and finally the preparation of Amendment C55 itself. Throughout each of these stages there was well advertised and extensive consultation, in which AIDA and many other members of the community participated.

However, after the amendment was submitted to the planning minister's office by the shire for approval in April 2011, no word had been heard from the state government on its progress, despite a number of enquiries by the shire.

Without these guidelines, inappropriate developments such as the recent proposal to construct an oversized supermarket at the bottom shops cannot be properly controlled. Perhaps this is best illustrated by the reaction of the lawyers for the unsuccessful supermarket developer, during the VCAT hearing last year. They argued strongly at VCAT against the new guidelines, and, extraordinarily, tabled at the hearing their own private application to the planning minister, criticising the development of Amendment C55 itself, and urging him to refuse its approval.

Advice was finally received from the Minister on 21 May that the amendment has now been approved – but in a form modified from that proposed by the shire. Disappointingly for the council and all members

of the local community who worked on the proposed new Design and Development Overlay over the past six years, the changes directed by the minister include a relaxation of the proposed building height controls in the two commercial areas, the watering down of a number of important planning objectives, including the relationship of the bottom shops to the Painkalac Creek, and also the removal of the supporting Urban Design Guidelines document itself as part of the new provisions.

*Ian Godfrey*

## Planning Planning Trial

At the 28 March council meeting, the Surf Coast Shire adopted a 'process improvement plan' with the intention of reducing the time taken to deal with planning applications. This six-month trial will delegate greater authority to officers. Where there are three or fewer objections, the application will be considered by a panel chaired by the manager of planning and development and the statutory planning coordinator. If there are four or more objections or if the planning officer recommended that the application be refused, the application will be considered by the planning committee.

Time will tell if this approach is both quicker and more effective. At this early stage we do not know whether it will be as transparent a process as for the planning committee. When a case is referred to the planning committee, the authorised officer assembles the relevant information in a report and argues his or her recommendation. This has been very helpful in understanding why certain applications are accepted. It is also time consuming. We do not know whether this approach will be retained in cases where three or fewer objections are received.

### 42 Great Ocean Rd – Café

You may have seen the sign beside the post office (in the former real estate office) advertising a planning application to develop part of the building into a café. While AIDA welcomed the restoration of the building, we were concerned that the applicant was requesting a parking waiver. The proposal included the removal of a shed at the back of the property and the use of that land for very limited parking. As parking is becoming increasingly difficult in the top shops precinct, AIDA could not support the waiver and hence the application. We do not know how many objections were received or the implications of the planning trial mentioned above.

*Barbara Fletcher, Gary Johnson*

## Nature Strip Guidelines

AIDA was surprised to learn recently that the shire had guidelines for the management of our nature strips. At least from the title of the document (Nature strip maintenance guidelines), you would have thought that it related to Aireys Inlet and district. After a quick glance, it was obvious that the brochure related to the suburban parts of Torquay. As found in this brochure, a nature strip consisted of lawn and one tree for each property.

We expressed our concern to Sunil Bhalla, Director of Infrastructure, who challenged AIDA to draft an alternative brochure for council to consider. The recently completed draft emphasises that nature strips are an important part of any streetscape and are critical to the enhancement and maintenance of local character. The new guidelines encourage retention of existing indigenous vegetation and establishment of indigenous plants provided they accommodate the required services and allow for pedestrian access.



Mr Bhalla reviewed the draft and replied '...that apart from some minor things, we are very comfortable with the draft you have prepared...'. He went on to say that the shire's planning department is shortly embarking on a project to develop road reserve landscaping guidelines for coastal towns and suggested that AIDA's draft be fed straight into the landscaping guidelines project. We agreed with that and the suggestion that the nature strip guidelines be finalised after the completion of the roadside reserve project. AIDA has asked to be included in the consultation for the roadside reserve project.

*Gary Johnson*

## Sealing by Stealth

The residents of Aireys Inlet and surrounding towns have fought for many years to maintain the unsealed roads in the area. Unsealed roads slow down traffic and minimise water run-off. From an aesthetic point of view, they contribute to the coastal village atmosphere of our towns. Sealed roads lead to an increase in traffic and speed, in addition, to the suburbanisation of our towns.

Over the years the shire has sealed roads, arguing that sealed roads have reduced maintenance costs. In 2009 most of Fairhaven was sealed after a long and bitter battle with the shire. Recently, Precinct 2 residents overthrew an intention to declare a special charge scheme in a first ever victory, when more than half of the residents voted against the charge to seal roads and do associated drainage works in Precinct 2.

AIDA has long argued that if the total cost of sealing is considered then regular maintenance of unsealed roads is the more economic option. However, the sticking point here is that the shire raises the initial capital cost of sealing by imposing a special charge scheme on residents for capital works. In effect, the shire offloads much of the initial cost of road sealing onto the residents. The shire's rationale is that residents receive a benefit in having a sealed road; however, this view is not shared by many residents, who would much prefer unsealed roads that were regularly maintained.

In 2006 the Aireys Inlet road and drainage reference panel divided Aireys into precincts based on water catchment areas. Precinct 1 was most of the eastern part of Aireys on the ocean side of the Great Ocean Road with the western boundary just west of Albert Street. The reference panel recommended that no roads in Precinct 1 should be sealed, and vegetated swale drains should be installed instead of a more formal approach. This decision was fully upheld by the citizens' jury.

The decisions of the citizens' juries from both precincts made the residents' views about sealing roads patently clear, so it was astonishing when, earlier this year, AIDA was informed that the intersection of Beach Road and Eaglerock Parade (plus 50 metres along each road) had been sealed with spray seal. One AIDA member was informed by a council officer that the decision to seal the intersection was part of the shire's intersection sealing program. A search of the shire's website fails to find any mention of such a program. The council officer then went on to say that the priority of determining which intersections are sealed is based on community requests, road hierarchy, traffic volumes and road safety.

This approach to our roads is disturbing, especially given the community's attitude to sealing of roads. The intersection of Eaglerock Parade and Beach Road could hardly be described as dangerous, or busy. That roads should be sealed as a matter of safety defies logic, as sealed roads enable cars to travel faster, especially once they come off an unsealed part of the road. That sealing of a road improves vehicle braking and traction with the road surface is also hard to understand.



Further, the sealing of only 50 metres from the intersection creates an unstable interface between the sealed and unsealed sections. It is here that the road surface is most vulnerable, resulting in degradation of the surface, and dangerous driving conditions.



Further correspondence with another council officer stated that intersections were sealed as a matter of safety, and that the sealing was spray seal, considered to be a short-term solution envisaged to last not more than five years. The question then is what happens when the spray seal breaks down? Will the residents be left with an unsightly mess of pot holes at that intersection?

It is a great pity that such a visually pleasing road as Eaglerock Parade has now been compromised by a large patch of bitumen.

Several weeks later AIDA received news that two more intersections had been sealed: one at the intersection of Boundary Road and Great Ocean Road, and the other at the intersection of Hopkins Street and Hartley Street. Once again, neither of these intersections is renowned for being particularly dangerous, and both are in Precinct 1, where both the reference panel and the citizens' jury went to great

lengths to ensure that no roads be sealed.

It seems as though the shire, having come up against such community resistance to sealing roads, has decided to seal by stealth. We are now seeing the ad hoc sealing of roads, to the detriment of our coastal character. If intersections can be sealed to between 50 and 100 metres along the road, then there really is no point maintaining the bit of unsealed road between the intersections as the informal coastal character is lost.

What makes the sealing of Hopkins and Hartley Streets, and Boundary Road and Great Ocean Road even more interesting is that these works were carried out after a council resolution had been passed on 28 March 2012 stating that the community had to be consulted before the start of design works in sensitive coastal areas.

*10. Endorse for all future infrastructure solutions in sensitive coastal areas a design approach in sympathy with the local neighbourhood character and request that engagement with impacted communities occurs prior to the commencement of design work to ensure communities contribute to proposed infrastructure solutions.*

Clearly, this did not happen in the case of the sealing of these intersections.

Our roads are being sealed despite the wishes of residents. It is difficult to fathom why the council persists in their pursuit to suburbanise our streets. In 2000 less than a third of the roads were sealed from Aireys Inlet to Eastern View; by 2010 it was almost a half. The outcome of the citizens' juries and community reference panels have clearly stated residents' views, but still the council perseveres with these unwanted capital works. As residents we must continue to lobby our local councillors and stop the irreversible suburbanisation of our beautiful streets.

*Frieda Wachsmann*

## Ten and Twenty Years Ago

AIDA has been around for quite some years! Recently we scanned and recorded to CD all of our past newsletters – dating back to 1989. This segment provides selected items from newsletters past, perhaps reminding us all that nothing really changes ...

### WINNING OR LOSING?

As usual, we have mixed messages for our members in this newsletter: some hopeful signs and some exasperating frustrations. On the hopeful side we feel that in the local authorities and government departments that affect our lives most of the decision makers are gradually coming to accept, if only in a vague and general way, that our district has a special character which should be preserved.

On the frustrating side we often find that the particular decisions they make can be inconsistent and pretty strange. Even more often, matters that one might think would be dealt with promptly are put off for month after month.

It is now more than twelve months since the discussion document, the draft of the Structure Plan for Aireys Inlet to Eastern View, was released for public comment. We have been waiting for it to be adopted by the Barrabool Shire Council and the Geelong Regional Commission – It looks as though we may have to wait at least another two months.

*AIDA Newsletter, July 1992*

### VILLAGE OR SUBURB?

What price do we pay for being so popular? Is it worthwhile to fight for our special place? Are we just reactionary to change? Is it realistic to expect things to stay the same in the Aireys Inlet district? I think not!

Have no doubt that the 'village' character of our district is under serious threat right now.

As all of you would be aware, there has been a huge rise in planning permit applications for our small area. Many are for single dwellings with reasonable designs, but increasingly, with the huge rise in the price of land, more multi-storey, multi-dwelling developments filling the land with houses, are being put forward.

AIDA is taking a three-pronged approach to deal with this situation at the moment:

1. Reactionary – that is, putting in objections where it seems the most unsuitable development is proposed. Though this is decidedly limited by our lack of man/woman power, finances and expertise.
2. We are talking with shire Councillors and planners trying to improve the planning process and Planning Scheme.
3. We are, so far unsuccessfully, trying to persuade the Council to do the Neighbourhood Character study for our area now, not in 2002–3 or possibly later. It is important that the character of Aireys Inlet is described now, before it has all changed too much.

*AIDA Newsletter, April 2002*