

RECORD OF COUNCIL AND APPLICANT BRIEFING

SYDNEY SOUTH PLANNING PANEL

BRIEFING DETAILS

BRIEFING DATE / TIME	Tuesday, 3 December 2024, 9am – 10am
LOCATION	MS Teams

BRIEFING MATTER(S)

PPSSSH-169 – Sutherland Shire – DA24/0290 – 165 Sir Joseph Banks Drive, Kurnell - NPWS coastal protection works - Kamay Botany Bay National Park. Construction of sandstone revetment wall, stairs, path, artwork and sandstone block seating.

PANEL MEMBERS

IN ATTENDANCE	Annelise Tuor (Chair), Doug Lord, Greg Britton, Fiona Prodromou
APOLOGIES	None
DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST	None

OTHER ATTENDEES

COUNCIL ASSESSMENT STAFF	Sue McMahon Timothy Jennings, Slavco Bujaroski
APPLICANT REPRESENTATIVES	Greg Abbott (Environment), Asher Seeto (Environment), Charlie Sammoun (ARUP)
DPHI	Amanda Moylan, Tracey Gillett

KEY ISSUES DISCUSSED

The Panel notes the Applicant presentation and matters discussed during the briefing. In particular, the Panel notes:

Response to RFI

• The applicant has provided additional information to respond to Council's RFI. Council intends to engage a coastal engineer to review the information in relation to coastal issues. The other information is being assessed and only preliminary comments were discussed.

Coastal

• The Coastal experts have reviewed the additional information provided in response to the RFI within the requirements of the Coastal Management Act 2016 and relevant Section of the NSW SEPP Resilience and Hazards 2021 (Part 2.2, Division 5, 2.12). The following matters were discussed:

Retention of the existing geobag structure

• The DA proposes to retain the existing geobag structure and construct the new coastal protection works landward of it. The Applicant explained that retention was to minimize disturbance to middens and the Norfolk Island Pines and to respond to comments from the local Aboriginal community. These matters would need to be balanced against the outcome that removal of the geobag structure would allow the new coastal protection works to be constructed further landward resulting in less encroachment on the foreshore/beach.

Sodium sulfate soundness of sandstone armour and underlayer

• A sodium sulfate soundness acceptance value of 25% is proposed for the sandstone armour rock and for the sandstone underlayer to be located behind the dimensioned sandstone blocks. The Panel noted that this is a relatively high value and is indicative of a relatively low durability outcome for sandstone in a marine environment. The Applicant advised that the high value is considered reasonable based on the ability to replace the armour rock over time as required (the rock being accessible on the external face) and since the underlayer would be protected by the outer sandstone blocks. However, the Panel understands that the joints between the outer sandstone blocks are not proposed to be fully mortared hence the underlayer (which would not be readily accessible) would be exposed to the marine environment. The Applicant should provide additional comment on the acceptability of the adopted sodium sulfate soundness value for the sandstone armour and the sandstone underlayer and/or the additional maintenance of the new coastal protection works that may be required.

Coastal sediment compartment and impacts

• The Panel notes that impacts from the proposed construction of the revetment seaward of the existing geobag wall need to be considered for the current conditions and those at the end of the nominated design period within the coastal sediment compartment. Particular emphasis should be placed on potential overtopping and inundation, changes to coastal processes and alongshore access as well as interruption to the sediment transport sources and pathways. The consideration should include potential impacts to the beach and back beach area and include the downdrift shoreline.

Extent of design period

• The Panel notes that as the revetment proposed is presented as a permanent solution it is appropriate to address the impacts on the works by coastal processes and the impacts of the works on the adjacent shorelines beyond the nominated design period and rate of sea level rise adopted for the design period. Part A of the NSW Government Coastal Management Manual nominates a longer term (100 years or more) assessment of the potential changes to the foreshore and impacts from any current works.

Other matters

- Council advised that an updated arborist report has been received which;
 - o makes recommendations in relation to the path and accessway which have not yet been translated into the plans
 - o indicates an incursion of tree #310 on the pathway and access stairs
 - o recommends the path be constructed at existing ground level to forgo any excavation
 - digging is to be completed by hand to minimise disturbance
- The Panel notes that the above matters have not been addressed in the revised architectural plans as they may require "design during construction" and requested the Applicant confirm how the recommendations of the arborist will be addressed and managed.

- The public art work detailed on the plans does not form part of the development application currently under consideration.
- Integrated approvals;
 - Heritage NSW have provided GTAs in regard to ACH which require an AHIP be obtained under s90 of National Parks and Wildlife Act 1974
 - Heritage NSW requested consultation with the local Aboriginal community. Council advised that there is an outstanding referral from La Perouse LALC
- Heritage NSW have provided approval under s65 of the Heritage Act 1977

Next Steps

- Council will continue to work through the process to engage a coastal engineer to undertake a review.
- The Panel encourages the applicant to work through the matters raised to ensure Council has the required information to undertake a thorough assessment.
- The Crown applicant will require two weeks to review draft conditions of consent once they are available.
- A tentative determination date has been scheduled for 24 February 2024