

## Record of Preliminary Briefing

### Sydney South Planning Panel

<b>PANEL REFERENCE &amp; DA NUMBER</b>	PPSSSH-169 – DA24/0290
<b>APPLICANT OWNER</b>	Charlie Sammoun - ARUP NSW National Parks and Wildlife Service
<b>APPLICATION TYPE</b>	Development Application
<b>REGIONALLY SIGNIFICANT CRITERIA</b>	Certain Coastal Protection Works
<b>CIV</b>	\$2,897,959 (excluding GST)
<b>BRIEFING DATE</b>	22 July 2024

#### ATTENDEES

<b>APPLICANT</b>	Greg Abbott, Asher Seeto, Charlie Sammoun
<b>PANEL MEMBERS</b>	Annelise Tuor (Chair), Doug Lord, Greg Britton, Fiona Prodromou
<b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</b>	None
<b>COUNCIL OFFICERS</b>	Timothy Jennings, Sue McMahon, Slavco Bujaroski
<b>PLANNING PANELS TEAM</b>	Joel Burgess
<b>APOLIGIES</b>	Carol Provan

**DA LODGED:** 13 June 2024

**DAYS SINCE LODGEMENT:** 39 days

**TENTATIVE PANEL BRIEFING DATE:** TBD in consultation with council.

**TENTATIVE PANEL DETERMINATION DATE:** Within the 275-day timeframe

#### KEY MATTERS DISCUSSED:

The Panel notes the Applicant's presentation and matters discussed with the Applicant and Council during the briefing.

The Applicant's explained the proposal, its relationship to the existing protection works and other works being carried out within the Kamay Botany Bay National Park, consistency with

the Plan of Management; consideration of elements such as aboriginal middens and tree protection, consultation, technical details of the design, consideration of coastal management and other approvals required etc.

Council advised that:

- the application has been notified (including La Perouse Local Aboriginal Land Council) and referred internally and it is integrated development requiring referral under section 91 - Water Management Act (Certain Coastal protection Works within 40 metres of a water course); section 60 - Heritage Act (works to a heritage item – this approval has already been granted); and section 90 - National Parks and Wildlife Act (potential impact to Aboriginal heritage item).
- Preliminary comments from internal referrals include:
  - construction methodology and the potential impacts on Tree Protection Zones, specifically in relation to the material storage and vehicle access areas identified in the Construction Management Plan.
  - The location of the Access Stairs through the tree protection zone of tree number 3310 which may require modification if roots are found prior to commencement.
  - potential concerns around the extent of seagrass to the West around the Kamay Ferry Wharf.
  - additional architectural cross-sections to demonstrate mean high-water mark and appearance from the beach.

The Panel notes that to approve the development, the Panel needs to be satisfied that the design conforms with the requirements of the *Coastal Management Act 2016* (CM Act) and *Resilience and Hazards SEPP* (SEPP). Division 5 (2.12) of the SEPP states “*Development consent must not be granted to development on land within the coastal zone unless the consent authority is satisfied that the proposed development is not likely to increase risk of coastal hazards on that land or other land*”. This requires consideration of how the development addresses the objects and management objectives of the CM Act, including Object 3(a), 3(e), 3(f); and the management objectives for coastal vulnerability area, 7(2) (b), (c), (e), and (g).

To adequately address these matters, the Panel considers that the following additional information would be required:

- i. Detailed design information including an assessment of the current and potential coastal hazards over the life of the structure proposed. This should recognise that the site is a potential coastal vulnerability area, which has not been mapped.
- ii. Description of options that were considered for the coastal protection works and the reasoning for selection of the proposed option.
- iii. Reasoning why the existing temporary geobag structure is not proposed to be removed and the sandstone blockwork constructed further landward along a similar alignment as the geobag structure (thus less encroachment on the foreshore/beach).
- iv. Commentary on the suitability of constructing the proposed coastal protection works (pattern placed blocks relying in part on interblock friction), having a design life of 50 years, over the existing geobag structure which has a limited design life. In the event the geotextile fabric degrades, will the released sand pass through the seaward portion of the works, leading to settlement and loss of integrity of the sandstone blocks.

- v. Assessment of the potential impacts of and on the works proposed, both adjacent to and downdrift of the structure, as sea level rises and climate changes.
- vi. Acknowledgment of the coastal input data used for the design of the revetment now and at the end of the design life.
- vii. Details relating to stability of the design, including: armour unit sizes, density and strength; filtration design; stability under present and future design forces (waves and water level); potential runup/inundation levels and frequency over the design life. Include explanation as to why the required sodium sulfate loss is <10% for the sandstone blocks but is relaxed to <25% for the sandstone armour and underlayer.
- viii. Assessment of the impacts on beach access to and alongshore, both on the beach or behind the structure crest at present and in the future.
- ix. Assessment of the performance/potential modifications to ensure the structure provides an ongoing solution over the design life.
- x. Given the proposal has been described as providing a permanent solution, how would/could the design be modified to perform beyond the selected design life.

#### NEXT STEPS

- Council tentatively expects to be able to send the applicant an RFI in the next 30 days (Wednesday 21 August), depending on internal responses.

#### **Note:**

Council is yet to undertake its full application assessment, and therefore future comment will not be limited to matters discussed at the preliminary briefing.