

Minutes of the Flood Risk Management Advisory Committee Meeting

Meeting Commenced at 1:03pm

**COMMITTEE REPRESENTATIVES PRESENT**

Clr Mat Howard	Councillor – Midjuburi-Marrickville Ward (Chair)
Clr Marghanita Da Cruz	Councillor – Gulgadya-Leichhardt Ward
Lois Gray	Community Representative
Shad Wall	Community Representative
Alexander Bailey	Ashfield-Leichhardt SES
Robert Baker	Marrickville SES

**NON VOTING MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE**

David Paton	IWC Engineering Services Manager
James Ogg	IWC Coordinator Stormwater & Asset Planning
Rafaah Georges	IWC Stormwater & Asset Planning Engineer
Sadeq Zaman	NSW Department of Planning and Environment (DPE)
Martin Griffin	Representative from Stantec – IWC’s Flood Modelling Consultant

**Observers**

Klaus Neuscheler	SES
Liam Hogan	SES
Michael Carney	SES
Deborah Kearns	SES
Cian Currie	SES
Helen Slater	SES
Stuart McTaggart	City of Sydney
Neville Naicker	Bayside Council

**Apologies**

Tim Harnett	Community Representative
Ryann Midei	IWC Director Infrastructure
Douglas Wylie	SES
Shelly Stingmore	SES
Peter Kaye	SES

**1. Acknowledgement Of Country – Clr Howard**

*I acknowledge that we are meeting on the land of the Gadigal and Wangal people of the Eora Nation and pay my respects to the elders past and present and I extend that respect and acknowledgement to any Aboriginal people who are here with us today.*

**2. Disclosures of Interest**

**Councillor Howard** declared a possible conflict of interest as a local resident of Marrickville. This was considered a non-significant, non-pecuniary interest as the items of the agenda do not address areas of Marrickville.

### 3. Confirmation of Minutes

That the Minutes of the Flood Management Advisory Committee Meeting held on Thursday, 22 August 2022 be confirmed.

### Point of Order

**Councillor Da Cruz** queried as to why the agenda and previous minutes were not published on the Council website. As it was believed to be a Council requirement to publish the agendas unless matters were considered confidential, and that this committee is under this jurisdiction.

**James Ogg** replied that it was an oversight of the publishing process and would review the Terms of Reference for the Advisory Committee moving forward. Previous practice has been to publish the minutes once they have been adopted by Council. Council staff have resolved to ensure future meeting agendas are publicly published and would review the minutes process with Council's Governance Team.

**Councillor Mat Howard** noted it would be better to have the information publicly and in advance of the meetings for the purpose of declaring conflicts.

**It was resolved that the meeting could proceed, noting the actions for future meetings.**

### 4. Items for the Committee - FMAC0727(1) – Item 1

Dobroyd Canal and Hawthorne Canal Flood Risk Management Study & Plan – Proposed Endorsement

#### SUMMARY

A short slideshow presentation for the committee outlining actions to date as it had been a few years since the report was last presented to the committee.

- 2015 – Dobroyd Canal Flood Risk Management Study commenced by Ashfield Council
- 2016 – Hawthorne Canal Flood Risk Management Study commenced by Marrickville Council with Ashfield Council as significant stakeholder
- 2017 – Following Council amalgamations in 2016, these studies were combined into a single project
- 2018 – Initial community consultation conducted to develop proposed options
- Modelling of options undertaken by consultant WMA Water
- 2019 – Multi-criteria analysis of options, considering complexity of construction, impact to public, and cost-benefit ratio
- Draft report presented to Flood Risk Advisory Committee in 2019 prior to public exhibition
- Public Exhibition undertaken in mid 2019, with Your Say Inner West portal, in person information sessions, and phone calls to Council engineers
- Report amended to address community questions about Hawthorne Parade levy & expansion of Dobroyd Canal
- Committee endorses the Flood Risk Management Study & Plan, subject to
- Responses issued to all written submissions
- Review of wording and grammatical errors and Figure inconsistencies
- Additional comments about vulnerability education in an urban catchment

Following these amendments the Flood Risk Management Plan identified 5 flood mitigation options, 3 response modification options, and 2 property modification options.

- FM0403A / FM403B – Grosvenor Street pipe upgrade and Darrell Jackson Gardens detention basin

- FM0404C – Nowranie Street pipeline upgrade
- FM0501G – Petersham Park detention basin
- FM0605C – Sloane Street pipeline upgrade
- FM0702 – Pratten Park detention basin
- RM01 – Investigate Flash Flooding Warning System for Heighway Avenue
- RM02 – Update SES and Council flood model data for future flood response
- RM03 – Community Education Program
- PM01 – Development Controls associated with Flood Planning Levels
- RM02 – Residential Flood Proofing

Items that had best value under multi-criteria analysis were community education options and localised damage minimisation through development controls. Floods upgrade options had a lower score, due to greater constraints and difficulties, but would continue to investigate the viability of these options.

#### OFFICERS RECOMMENDATION

That the Flood Management Advisory Committee endorse the Final Draft Dobroyd Canal and Hawthorne Canal Flood Risk Management Study and Plan to Council for adoption.

#### DISCUSSION

**Councillor Howard** asked what the key concerns were that had been raised in the previous submissions.

*Council officers advised that the key concerns were uncertainty about why properties were considered flood affected as flooding had not been seen in the area. Residents were satisfied once the criteria for mapping and the size and nature of flooding in the area were explained during the information sessions.*

**Councillor Howard** asked how previous written submissions were addresses as resolved by the previous committee, and whether people at that time were satisfied with the outcome.

*Council officers advised that a written response was provided by Council's consultants to any written submission during the exhibition process. No further feedback from those written responses were received. As noted residents that attended drop-in sessions during the exhibition were satisfied with the explanations provided at the time.*

**Councillor Howard** sought clarification for the delay in adoption, noting that the report was complete in 2019, and the impact of new residents moving into the area on proposed outcomes.

*Council officers noted that prioritisation of resourcing in a time of high demand on the Asset Planning team resulted in delays in taking the report to Council, however this was no being rectified. There are no changes proposed to flood mapping, risk modelling, property zoning, or development controls to flood affected properties. These details have already been adopted by Council as part of the Hawthorne Canal Flood Study and Dobroyd Canal Flood Study.*

*The representative from the Department of Planning noted that while the plan was not progressed to Council adoption in 2020 due to difficulty in resourcing, the study was very comprehensive and acknowledged Council officer comments that this is a highly built-up catchment and the impact to the study due to land use change and increase in impervious areas, which are among the main drivers of increasing flood risk, would not be significant.*

The representative from the Department of Planning noted that the study was completed based on the ARR 1987 dataset, which has since been superseded by the ARR 2019 dataset published through The Bureau of Meteorology, hence there may be an opportunity to check in on the outcome by using the latest rainfall data.

*Council officers noted that a comparison check was undertaken for another study currently underway in Johnstons Creek on the impact of using ARR 2019 compared to ARR 1987. The results of the comparison noted that the changes caused by the updated rainfall patterns were not significant to undertake a new rainfall model. Given the minor nature of the changes and the design to maintain consistency in the assessment of flood mitigation impact assessment, Council has maintained the 1987 rainfall data in this study.*

**Councillor Howard** noted that the report investigates a levy on Hawthorn Parade and the potential expansion of Dobroyd Parade and if this was still the proposed plan

**Councillor Da Cruz** wanted clarification that the levy was a physical levy and not a monetary levy.

*Council officers confirmed that the levy was a physical levy rather than monetary contribution. The report reviews these two options due to resident considerations, however as both options result in a net worsening of flood impacts these were not recommended for further investigation.*

**Lois Gray** noted that it would seem that the flood situation for most of affected properties does not change.

*Council officers confirmed that since flooding in these two catchments is largely across minor tributaries rather than overflow of the creeks themselves, there weren't any substantive options to eliminate or reduce flooding across large sections of the catchment. As such the key options was about community awareness in conjunction with SES and property modification through DCP controls. This was supported by the representatives from Leichhardt-Ashfield SES and Marrickville SES.*

**Councillor Da Cruz** asked if Council could comment on climate change and sea level rise.

*Council officers advised that climate change was factored into both the Flood Study and the Flood Risk Management Study and Plan under guidelines issued by the Department of Planning. The guidelines recommend modelling 10%, 20% and 30% increases to the intensity of rainfall and modelling sea level rise as a water level condition on Council's outlets to the canal. These changes to the model parameters do not see significant variation to the flood depths modelled within the catchments.*

**Councillor Howard** foreshadowed an amended recommendation which he wanted to raise for discussion. Conscious of population change, opportunity should be given to get renewed feedback from the current community about the policies that impact them and educate new residents about the potential impacts to their property.

#### **DISCUSSION OF AMENDED RECOMMENDATION**

**Lois Gray** suggested that the community consultation should not be to seek new resident views, but rather further inform residents about what it means to have an existing flood affected property, noting that the study recommendations of the study were unlikely to change and the DCP controls only relate to new builds or significant redevelopment.

**James Ogg** commented that education was one of the recommendations of the report itself, as a method of risk reduction through knowledge rather than constructed methods to reduce flood levels and that ongoing engagement with the community would continue to occur outside of the process developing and adopting the Flood Risk Management Study

**Lois Gray** asked if advice is given to people with the section 10.7 certificates for flood affected lots and controls that may be applicable and if this would assist new residents who may have just moved into the area.

**James Ogg** confirmed that the 10.7 planning certificates outlines planning and zoning controls, but does include a section stating whether the property is subject to development controls due to flooding. If the lot is identified as a Flood Affected Property under Council's Development Control Plan, this section advises potential residents to contact Council's Stormwater & Asset Planning team for further specific information. Consequently, any new property owners would have been notified through this process.

**Councillor Da Cruz** sought clarification of the impact of undertaking a new FRMS&P or if the committee should consult on the current document.

**Council officers** noted that though the Flood Management Process is an iterative process, the relative lack of change in the urban character and residential zoning of the affected areas means that any revised modelling would show limited impacts to flood hazard, flood depths, or damage estimates. Similarly a new study would not be expected see substantial changes to the value of the options assessed and recommended.

The adoption of the report provides legislative support for further investigation and design of identified options, inclusion within future works programs, inclusion within development control plans, financial support from the NSW Government, and guide ongoing community engagement and education. Further detailed design and assessment is required for each design option and further community would occur with each of those options during detailed design.

**Alexander Bailey** commented that the Ashfield and Leichardt SES would continue to work with Council to engage residents in the area around matters of flood hazard and flood safety.

**Councillor Da Cruz** wanted to clarify if ongoing SES education was dependent on the adoption of this plan and Council doing some of the work.

**James Ogg** responded that this plan did inform some of the measures taken by SES, such as route planning and hazard mapping, as well as any high-risk communities.

**Councillor Howard** advised that he understood the benefits of ongoing education related to the adoption of the report, and valued the work that the SES and Council were doing, however still had concern that the potential for significant population change within the catchment, with information not available online for the public to review.

It was further noted that the committee makes a recommendation to the Council and the elected Council make the final resolution in this respect.

**Councillor Da Cruz** proposed that the committee could consider the endorsement of the report and recommend a further report committing Council to develop an education strategy for presentation to the next committee meeting. This would also provide opportunity for ongoing feedback to the committee and Council once the document was adopted.

**Councillor Howard** moved to amend the recommendation to endorse the Study and plan, subject to a further report to Council about options for further community engagement prior to or following the adoption of the study.

**COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION**

1. That the Flood Management Advisory Committee endorse the Final Draft Dobroyd Canal and Hawthorne Canal Flood Risk Management Study and Plan to Council for adoption.
2. That Council receive a report on options of further community engagement or notification on the study and plan, noting that new residents may wish to be informed of the recommendations of the study and plan.

**For Motion:** Unanimous

**4. Items for the Committee – FMAC0727(1) – Item 2**

Alexandra Canal Flood Risk Management Study & Plan and Johnsons Creek and Whites Creek Flood Risk Management Study & Plan – Review of initial mitigation proposals

James Ogg and representatives from Council's flood modelling consultant Stantec provided an update on progress of the Alexandra Canal Flood Risk Management Study and Plan and Johnsons Creek & Whites Creek Flood Risk Management Study and Plan.

Throughout the project there has been a technical working group involving representatives from Council, Stantec and DPE meeting fortnightly to keep the project progressing and maintaining ongoing feedback.

Both studies are partial catchment studies – the Alexandra Canal study area focuses only on areas north of the canal, and west of Barwon Park Road and the Johnstons Creek & Whites Creek study area focuses only on areas south of Parramatta Road. Leichhardt Flood Risk Management Study and Plan. The remaining areas are already covered by studies undertaken the City of Sydney and Inner West Council.

The Alexandra Canal catchment is generally industrial and commercial land with some residential areas in Tempe and near Sydney Park. Changes to the catchment since the Alexandra Canal Flood Study include the St Peters Interchange component of WestConnex and the Sydney Gateway project. The change to drainage patterns as a result of these projects does not significantly affect the flood risk for the wider area as both these projects are located in the lower region of the catchment and have had to demonstrate as part of their approval that there would be no worsening of flooding to the surrounding catchment.

The second study area is Johnsons Creek and Whites Creek, limited to the area south of Parramatta Road and west of King Street and Church Street Newtown. These catchments are largely residential, with limited areas of commercial and industrial buildings along major roads.

An assessment of model updates, including new building footprints and rainfall data sets was undertaken when the project commenced. The results showed minor water level reductions associated with the new rainfall data. However, in order maintain continuity between the previous Flood Study and the current Flood Risk Management Study the previous model was maintained, noting that this would also be a more conservative approach. The project is otherwise operating consistent with the revised guidelines of the NSW Government 2022 Flood Prone Land Package guidance.

Community consultation was undertaken from March to April of this year. Over 2700 letters were mailed to owners and occupiers in the one in one hundred year affected properties, with three in person information sessions, and an online survey/submission portal through the Your Say Inner West portal. The community engagement had five survey responses, five in person visitors across the

three sessions and two interactive map responses. The have your say page had a bit better engagement with 650 views 501 and one of those that were unique, 7 hours of viewing and 49 flood study report downloads.

Stantec provided a brief outline of the flood planning controls review, hazard mapping and damages assessment taken to date, noting that these would be fully documented in the Draft Flood Risk Management Study to be presented to the committee later in the year. It was noted that the 20%AEP event (previously referred to as the 1-in-5-year event) contributes almost 50% of average annualised damage assessment. Consequently, Council and Stantec would be focusing on options that provided the greatest benefit in these smaller more frequent events.

A preliminary list of options has been prepared by Stantec, guided by site visits, flood model results, and workshops with internal Council teams as well as local stakeholder organisations including SES and City of Sydney.

Stantec presented to the committee fourteen mitigation options that it is believed would reduce or improve flood levels and flood impacts across these catchments, seeking comment from the committee, before undertaking further detailed modelling

#### Alexandra Canal

- Station Street - drainage upgrade to Tempe Reserve
- Bay Street - drainage upgrade
- Princess Highway drainage upgrade between Campbell Street and Barwon Park Road
- Talbot Street drainage upgrade to maintain regional evacuation route on Princes Highway

#### Johnstons Creek

- Bridge Road - pipe capacity upgrade and detention storage
- Camperdown Park - on-site stormwater detention storage
- Salisbury Road - review blockage capacity in inlet maintenance schedules
- Clarendon Street / Clarendon Lane - pipe capacity upgrade
- Trafalgar Street - pipe upgrade within rail corridor west of Stanmore Station
- Cardigan Street and Kingston Street - pipe upgrade and inlet capacity improvements
- Probert Street - improved inlet capacity into existing network
- Railway Avenue - pipe capacity upgrade
- Lennox Street - new stormwater pipeline along Lennox St connecting in further downstream

#### Whites Creek

- Drainage upgrade between Westbourne Street and Parramatta Road

The Flood Risk Management Study will also evaluate the suitability and capacity of six typical Emergency Management options

- Flood Prediction and Warning (noted that there were complexities with such systems in a flash flooding catchment)
- Review of Flood Planning & Information Availability
- Community Flood Awareness
- Education Programs
- Flood Signage & Markers
- Post Flood Data Gathering

Once detailed options are investigated a draft report and public exhibition will be undertaken followed by finalisation and completion of the study. The draft report will be presented to our technical working group and the committee and then the draft final report post comment will go on public exhibition. At the next Flood Advisory Committee meeting it is planned to have the draft report finished and the detailed options summary to present to the committee.

**DISCUSSION**

**Councillor Da Cruz** noted the response to the community consultation process and suggested that the method of community engagement, notification and communication was important and requested feedback as to how this could be improved moving forward.

*Council officers noted that this was an ongoing point of discussion and will provide further feedback / plans at next Flood Advisory Committee prior to exhibition of the final Flood Risk Management Study and Plan*

**Clr Marghanita Da Cruz** asked for clarification whether Weekly Park in Johnstons Creek was assessed for flood mitigation.

*Representatives from Stantec and Council officers noted that the modelling did not show a significant depth of flooding affecting many properties, and options in this context are not typically included in a Flood Risk Management Study due to comparatively minor benefit.*

*Council officers noted investigations had been undertaken to this area in previous years to reduce frequency of flooding. However Council would commit to including a pipe upgrade option in this area as one of the options to undergo further benefit testing.*

**Councillor Howard** sought clarification as to what was required of the committee regarding the Alexandra Canal and Whites Creek and Johnsons Creek mitigation proposed options presented.

*Council officers confirmed that Council was seeking comments on the options identified, and any specific areas of concern that members of the Flood Advisory Committee wanted to raise as part of these studies.*

**COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION**

That the information slides be provided to the members of Flood Advisory Committee with any comments to be returned by 11 August 2023.

**4. Items for the Committee - FMAC0727(1) – Item 3**  
Review of Committee Terms of Reference

Upon Council officer review, the Terms of Reference for the Inner West Flood Risk Management Advisory Committee is consistent those of similar bodies within neighbouring Councils in terms of structure, responsibilities, number of meetings and meeting procedure. However due to changes to organisational structures and responsibilities of State bodies the relevant stakeholders and representatives from State Government agencies will need to be reviewed.

Review deferred to next meeting.

Council officers to provide draft updates prior to next meeting.

**5. General Business**

Shad Wall had photos of historic flooding in Leichhardt to share with Council officers.

**6. Meeting Closed 3:10pm – Clr Howard**