

### Beach Nourishment

Great to read in Stage 2 the repeated support for beach nourishment and scraping. Continued active support from all Departments of Government will be a very important component of this option. Example: Jimmy's Beach re-nourishment project, actively and financially supported by local council, OEH, state government and even maybe federal government. Great result for an important public amenity.

### Funding Beach Nourishment

I am unable to understand why homes collapsing into the sea is not classified as a disaster, and thus funded in the same way as fires and floods. I understand that even the only thing the SES are allowed to do to help, is to tell the homeowner that the house is in imminent danger and to get out. At great odds with all other types of disaster assistance.

### Sea Level Rise

Figures relating to sea level rise would be better provided by the State, surely a more consistent and satisfactory approach than having, for example, adjoining Councils with greatly varying sea level rise figures. If there is to be "overlapping" of Council areas, when the mapping is completed, makes sense to have consensus with sea level rise figures. A level playing field. And the State has access to expertise in this field.

### Asset Management

When roads were transferred to local councils some/many councils did not embark immediately on an Asset Management program. The terrible degradation and financial burden of the roads is the now the result. A "fix it when it's broken" type management.

If "soft engineering" measures, as encouraged in the CMM are to be effective, then also needed in the CMM, is adequate delivery of Asset Management for long lived assets. Long term budgeting and planning is essential to success.

### Managed Retreat

"managing retreat in such a way that people can enjoy their property for as long as possible before having to retreat as their current location becomes non-viable"

[draft Manual Part B Stage 3 p18]

Relieved that the old, nerve wracking, arbitrary distance based triggers for enforced retreat are not in the CMM. They were not considered necessary on Sydney's Northern beaches, so good to note that they are now, also not considered necessary everywhere.

Question: Wondering what happens to the property owner that has had orders to demolish his home, his only asset? Live on the streets, perhaps? Put a tent on his remaining portion? But is it his land anymore? Will he be compensated if taken over by Crown lands for the public good. [like they do with house acquisition for a new road?] His problem? His home has been involved in a disaster, but not a fire or flood.

Any thoughts?

Over 2 years, in House of Representatives, the George Report heard submissions from about 178 highly qualified people, in their field of expertise. Only 1 of those submissions, dealt with the human aspect of coastal erosion, and the human consequences.

The CMM is to be congratulated for the management and environmental components. Good stuff from people with long term "on the ground" knowledge.

Continued government support for re-nourishment programs, backed by a decent asset management program, take on-board there are humans living in this environment, and I reckon you have a success story.

Yours sincerely,

A large black rectangular redaction box covering the signature area.

Clause 28 of the Bill, *Modification of doctrine of erosion and accretion* was brought to my attention by Paul Flemming [Lake Cathie Coastal Residents Group] last night.

Of course the erosion component is of great interest to Old Bar, some properties having lost approximately 40 metres to erosion. But there seems to be no reference to erosion in the Clause. Why is this?

Helen Hardes,  
18 Lewis Street,  
Old Bar