1 December 2020

Robert.Drew@planning.nsw.gov.au

Dear Rob,

City of Canada Bay Response to Flood Review

Thank you for providing Council with a copy of the Independent Peer Review of Flood Related Aspects of the Planning Proposal for 7 Concord Avenue, Concord West.

Section 4 Key Findings

4.1.1 and 4.1.2 deficiencies noted.

4.1.3 Appendix B shows a grade across the void from RL1.7 at the Eastern side to RL1.6 at the western side over a distance of approximately 80m. This is a gradient of approximately 0.13% which is not sufficient to drain a slab. After inundation has subsided, water will pond in "birdbaths" due to small irregularities in the concrete. The flat gradient will exacerbate sedimentation. As a comparison it is generally considered a gradient of 0.4% is a minimum for a functional kerb and gutter.

The RL1.6m outlet level is important because of considerations of tidal inundation. Raising the outlet level from RL1.2 to RL1.6 should eliminate tidal inundation of the void at Highest Astronomical Tide (HAT) up to the 2050 sea level rise (SLR) scenario, but it will still inundate regularly under the 2100 SLR scenario (Ref Table 3 Jacobs 7 Feb 2017) However in reducing the tidal inundation, other problems are created. Some land surface levels in properties to the East are below RL1.2. (Ref Survey by Degotardi Smith and Partners 2005)

4.1.4 Deficiencies Noted

4.1.5 This statement is equivalent to saying provided you don't change anything, then nothing will change. In the context, it is impossible to comply with the assumption.

4.2.1(b) Council disagrees that the planning proposal would reduce the risk. The change in exposure is from a handful of adults during working hours to a population of hundreds including the young and elderly for 24 /7.

Council disagrees that the proposal in consistent with the principals of the FDM. Appendix

J2.1.1 states:-

Canada Bay Civic Centre Drummoyne
1a Marlborough Street Drummoyne NSW 2047
Locked Bag 1470 Drummoyne NSW 1470
ABN 79 130 029 350

Tel 9911 6555
council@canadabay.nsw.gov.au
www.canadabay.nsw.gov.au

> *"Adjustments to zonings to adequately consider flood risk normally occur after the completion of the floodplain risk management plan."*

4.2.3 The Flood RISK Management Guideline on Floodway definition published by DECC in 2007 and which carries the weight of an annexure to the FDM states:-

> *floodways are generally areas where development is undesirable due to:*
>
> - *the potential to redirect flows*
> - *the level of potential danger to personal safety*
> - *significant financial losses due to the damage potential*

4.2.5 Council disagrees with the dissonant opinion that a significant increase in the development of the site is of minor significance.

4.2.6 Again this statement is equivalent to saying provided you don't change anything, then nothing will change. In the context, it is impossible to comply with this assumption. Further, with respect to government expenditure, Section 4.2.6 says it will be necessary to upgrade surrounding drainage systems to 10% AEP Standard. This may not be possible because of available grade and backwater conditions.

It appears from Annexure A that the consultant was not briefed with a copy of the SES submission on the proposal and the comments regarding the SES were made without knowledge of their position.

4.2.7 The Planning Proposal is seeking to introduce floor related development controls above the residential flood planning level and is inconsistent with the Planning Direction. This departure remains unresolved.

4.3.2 Again this statement is equivalent to saying provided you don't change anything, then nothing will change. In the context, it is impossible to comply with this assumption.

4.3.3 From Annexure a it appears that the consultant has not been briefed with reports by Jacobs 7 Feb 2017 regarding the risk of rapid rise in water levels from short duration storms at the site access ways.

4.4.1 Again this statement is equivalent to saying provided you don't change anything, then nothing will change. In the context, it is impossible to comply with this assumption.

4.4.2(d) While it is a matter for consideration at a later stage, note that Council would not normally require or permit on site detention (OSD) in a site at the bottom of the catchment as it has the effect of holding up discharge till the upstream flow arrives. OSD would only be allowed if justified by whole catchment modelling.

4.5.1 Frequency of inundation of the void - Tidal inundation has not been addressed.

4.5.2 Increased maintenance requirements – Suggestion for increased headroom within any void are noted.

Conclusion

The Planning Proposal is deficient when assessed against the following requirements of the Local Planning Direction 4.3 for Flood Prone Land:

- 4.3 (6) (a) as the planning proposal permits development in a floodway area.
- 4.3 (6) (c) as the planning proposal significantly increases the development of the land.
- 4.3 (6) (d) as the planning proposal is likely to result in substantially increased government spending on infrastructure.
- 4.3 (7) as the planning proposal seeks to impose flood related development controls.

It is Council's view that a number of relevant issues were not addressed in the peer review. These include:-

- The effect of sea level rise during the life of the development that would be enabled by the proposal.
- The effect of rising backwater due to sedimentation in downstream drainage structures, accretion within the mangrove forest downstream and SLR

It remains the view of Council that the site is not suitable for high density residential development and does not meet either the literal interpretation or spirit of Section 9.1 Direction 4.3 pertaining to Flood Prone Land.

Yours Sincerely

Paul Dewar

Acting Director, Community & Environmental Planning