

BRIEFING DETAILS

BRIEFING DATE / TIME	Tuesday, 11 October 2022, 9am – 10am
LOCATION	MS Teams

BRIEFING MATTER(S)

PPSSTH-162 – Shoalhaven – RA22/1003 – River Road Shoalhaven Heads – Coastal Protection Works - Modification of an existing rock revetment structure.

PANEL MEMBERS

IN ATTENDANCE	Chris Wilson (Acting Chair), Angus Gordon, Doug Lord
APOLOGIES	None
DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST	Greg Britton

OTHER ATTENDEES

COUNCIL ASSESSMENT STAFF	Andre Vernez, Cathy Bern, Jack Rixon - Council Consultant Planner (Mecone)
OTHER	Verity Rollason, Tracey Gillett (DPE)

KEY ISSUES DISCUSSED

- Council briefed the panel on the objectives and status of the application
- The Panel raised several issues which it considered needed to be addressed by the applicant. These are discussed in more detail below.
- Of particular concern was the need to understand how the proposed works interrelate with the broader environment (i.e., coastal zone) including the adjacent navigation channel and further, how the works interrelate with the beach nourishment proposal which is to be delivered under a different planning mechanism.
- In this respect the Panel noted that an assessment in accordance with the provisions of the Resilience and Hazards SEPP (Chapter 2 – Coastal Management) was a precondition to the grant of consent.
- Under these provisions, 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 cause an increased risk of coastal hazards on that land or other land.
- This clause covers all land in the coastal zone and requires an assessment of coastal hazards regardless of whether a coastal vulnerability zone has been mapped.
- The Panel noted that for the structure to meet the threshold requirement of Cl 2.12 of the SEPP, it is likely that beach nourishment would be required.

- Consequently, the Panel considers that the applicant should:
 - Set the context of the area in terms of its broad coastal processes (i.e., wind waves, tidal currents, swell/ocean waves);
 - Set the context of the proposed coastal management approach for this section of shoreline referring to the Coastal Management Program, whether this is in draft or not, and the intended vision for this area;
 - Document how the Council intends to manage the offsite impacts from the proposed structure (i.e. end effects and public access along the shoreline at the base of the new revetment section);
 - Outline the beach nourishment proposal in terms of scope of work, timing, and funding and how this supports the proposal including whether the 40-metre strip immediately adjoining the new section of revetment wall is included as part of this DA; and
 - Consider the need for any conditions of consent linking the proposed development with the beach nourishment works.

- The Panel also questioned the thickness of the revetment wall and the efficacy of its thickness noting that the existing wall comprised two layers of rock whilst the proposal was for only one layer. The Panel seeks clarification as to what has changed in the original design conditions that previously required two primary armour layers and is now considered satisfactory with a single layer.