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**Agenda Item 1 – Welcome and apologies**

The meeting opened at 9:35am.

An apology was received from Ms Yolande Stone, Department of Planning and Infrastructure.

**Agenda Item 2 – Minutes of previous meetings**

The Panel agreed to adopt the minutes of Meeting 5 subject to minor corrections provided.

**Agenda Item 3 – Kingscliff advice to Minister**

The Minister for the Environment has requested the advice of the Panel in relation to beach erosion at Kingscliff. The Panel discussed the draft report for terms of reference 1 relating to the causes of erosion.

Ms Lofthouse declared an interest in the management of Kingscliff. Panel members were satisfied that there was no conflict of interest and encouraged her participation in discussion about Kingscliff.

The Panel provided a range of comments and clarification for the Secretariat to incorporate into the final report.
Agenda Item 4 – Application from Tweed Shire Council

The Secretariat outlined an application received from Tweed Shire Council for construction of proposed works at Kingscliff. The works comprise placement of rocks on the beach in front of the amenities block and contiguous with an existing geobag wall. The works are designed to prevent erosion that is creating an imminent threat to the amenities block for the Kingscliff Holiday Park. Council wishes to commence construction work immediately prior to the Christmas holiday period and while tidal conditions are favourable.

Panel members expressed significant concern about the use of rocks on the beach for a structure that is described as temporary in nature.

In particular, concerns were raised about:

- The design of the wall provided, as it appears to be a more permanent structure
- That the potential for end effects from the proposed wall have not been addressed
- That more consideration could be given to the trade off between the impacts of the proposed wall and benefits
- The short time frame available for the Panel to comment on the proposal.

It was agreed that the Coastal Panel would provide early advice to Tweed Council as follows:

“The Panel has some concerns about the proposal and believes that the REF has not addressed a number of key issues.

The nature of the Panel’s concerns can be categorised as follows:

- The proposed works
- Consideration of physical coastal processes
- Other issues

The proposed works

The Panel understands the proposed works to entail construction of a temporary rock revetment wall, with the indicative design shown in Figure 4 of the REF. The estimated length of the wall is approximately 60 metres, and the estimated cost to be constructed from rock is $152,000.

The temporary rock revetment wall is being constructed to protect the amenity block at the Kingscliff Beach Holiday Park.

The proposed temporary rock revetment wall is proposed to be filled behind with sand either excavated from footings, or from sand from the beach to the north of the site. The Panel is concerned that the volumes of sand required are not quantified and draws Council’s attention to the draft Guidelines for Managing the Impacts of Seawalls (available at http://www.environment.nsw.gov.au/resources/coasts/101043draftgdlnsseawalls.pdf ) which clearly specify that use of sand from the beach for construction of works is not considered appropriate.
Physical Coastal Processes

Based on a site inspection undertaken by the Coastal Panel on 8 November 2011 and examination of the photographs provided, it is likely that erosion is occurring at the site of the amenities block due to the ‘end effects’ of the existing geobag structure built immediately to the south of the site of the proposed activity.

The REF for the proposed works does not address the matters set out in cl. 228(p) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Regulation 2000 which requires assessment of

\[(p) \text{ any impact on coastal processes and coastal hazards, including those under projected climate change conditions.}\]

Specifically, the Panel considers the following matters should be addressed:

- The nature of any downdrift impacts from the proposed works. Given that the existing geobag wall, understood to have been completed in early October 2011, has created end effects such that these works are now considered necessary, Council should consider what the impacts of the proposed structure will be and how these impacts are to be mitigated.
- The nature of the works are described as temporary, and it is understood that the intention is that they remain in place for 2-3 years to allow a more permanent solution to be developed. However, the end effects of the previous geobag wall have been evident within a matter of weeks, and it is likely that the leading edge of the erosion scarp would continue to progress along the beach, thus requiring further works.
- It is not clear from the REF about how the construction of temporary works relates to the longer term plan for the area, other than to indicate that material would be reused to the extent possible. Similarly, the REF should outline how the temporary works would be removed and how the site would be rehabilitated following removal of the temporary works.”

Agenda Item 5 – Verbal update – meeting with Professor Bob Beeton, Chair, Marine Parks Audit Scientific Panel

Mr Rutherford indicated that he had met with Professor Bob Beeton, Chair, Independent Scientific Audit Panel for Marine Parks concerning the role of the Coastal Panel. Mr Rutherford indicated that the main area of discussion was the statutory role of the Coastal Panel.

Agenda Item 6 – Other Business

There was no other business.

Next meeting

A further meeting will be held to finalise the request for advice to the Minister for the Environment on Kingscliff. Meeting to be held 13 December 2011 by teleconference.

Meeting closed 11:20am