

NSW Coastal Panel	MEETING NUMBER: 9
	LOCATION: teleconference
	DATE: 23 April 2012
MINUTES	TIME: 2:00PM – 3:00PM

Present

Name	Nominating Organisation
Hon. Bob Debus	Chair
Mr Derek Rutherford	Office of Environment and Heritage (OEH)
Prof Bruce Thom	Local Government and Shires Associations (LGSA)
Prof Andy Short	Local Government and Shires Associations
Ms Jane Lofthouse	Local Government and Shires Associations
Ms Jane Gibbs	Office of Environment and Heritage – Coastal Panel Secretariat
Mr Phil Watson	Office of Environment and Heritage – Coastal Panel Secretariat
Ms Santina Camroux	Department of Planning and Infrastructure – observer
Mr David McPherson	Department of Primary Industries - observer

Agenda Item 1 – Welcome and apologies

The meeting opened at 2:00pm. Apologies were received from Mr Craig Abbs, Department of Primary Industries and Ms Yolande Stone, Department of Planning and Infrastructure.

Agenda Item 2 – Confirmation of previous minutes

Panel members were asked to provide comments on the minutes of previous meetings out of session to the secretariat.

Agenda Item 3 – Application from Lake Illawarra Authority

The Secretariat advised that an application had been received from the Lake Illawarra Authority to construct a groyne field on the northern shore of the Lake Illawarra entrance channel.

The Department of Primary Industries clarified that the minimum distance for the spacing of the groynes was 80 metres, with the range extending from 80 – 150 metres apart and that approval was being sought for up to three groynes, but three groynes may not actually be built. DPI also advised that sheet piling has been undertaken to stabilize the existing boardwalk from erosion currently being experienced and that further advancing of the erosion front could threaten a public road.

The Panel agreed to provide its considerations to the Lake Illawarra Authority as follows:

1. Given the limited range of assets under threat, that the relative costs and benefits of relocating these assets be considered and compared to the relative costs and benefits of the proposed activity.

2. The Coastal Panel notes that it is not clear whether the modelling undertaken to design the proposed groyne field has been specifically calibrated to the nearshore conditions in the area of its intended application, and notes that the modelling only considers ebb tide flows. The Panel suggests that further modelling be undertaken to take into account bi-directional tidal flows and high velocity flows including flood events.
3. The Coastal Panel notes that there is general uncertainty over the performance of groyne fields and that they have heightened potential to induce adverse, unintended environmental impacts elsewhere. Consistent with advice commissioned by the LIA, it is strongly recommended that a single groyne (rather than the 3 separate groynes proposed) be trialled at the location of the most upstream proposed groyne in accordance with recommendations of the Cardno Pty Ltd report. This will enable the performance of the trial groyne to be monitored to consider whether it was actually resulting in reducing the erosion potential along the foreshore in accordance with the modelling projections and to consider unintended adverse environmental impacts;
4. That the trial groyne be of timber or sand filled geotextile construction (rather than rock as proposed) to facilitate ease of removal in the event that the trial groyne induces unintended adverse environmental impacts elsewhere that are currently not predicted;
5. That commitment be given to a trial period of not less than 2 years in order to monitor and document the performance of the trial groyne and detect the emergence of unintended adverse environmental impacts elsewhere (if any). The trial should involve monitoring the position of the shoreline along the portion of the foreshore between the timber revetment to the north of the subject site and the entrance training works;
6. If the initial trial confirms the beneficial reduction in nearshore current flow and associated foreshore recession without unintended adverse environmental impacts elsewhere, the LIA then consider the staged introduction of further groynes as necessary with a similar monitoring protocol; and
7. Where the trial groyne fails to reduce nearshore current flow and associated foreshore recession or result in unintended adverse environmental impacts elsewhere, the groyne structure should be removed and the adverse impacts remediated.

Agenda Item 4 – Information Item – Coastal Management Grants

The Secretariat outlined that this paper identifies some applications that may require Coastal Panel consideration in the future. The assessment of coastal management grants for 2012/13 is currently being undertaken, and at least two projects have been identified which may require consideration of the Panel in future.

The secretariat also advised that Sutherland Council had provided an application for the Coastal Panel's consideration which is not considered to fall within the scope of the Panel's role. The secretariat will circulate the relevant papers to Panel members for information.

Agenda Item 5 – Other Business

No other business was raised.

Meeting closed: 2:40pm.