

Director Environment & Building Policy  
NSW Dept of Planning & Environment  
GPO Box 39, Sydney NSW 2001  
20<sup>th</sup> January 2017

Reference: Draft Coastal Management SEPP and Draft Coastal Management Areas

Dear Sir/Madam

My name is Maureen Webb, a resident of St Georges Basin within the City of Shoalhaven.

I have been involved for some years (16) with our local Community Consultative Body (Basin Villages Forum) and have been their representative on Shoalhaven City Council's Central Shoalhaven Floodplain and Catchment Management Committee where many discussions were held about the coastal lakes and villages within the central area of the City of Shoalhaven and the future impacts of Climate Change and sea level rise.

I would like to comment on the Draft Coastal Management SEPP and Draft maps of the Coastal Management Areas.

#### **1) Coastal Vulnerability Areas**

##### ***Recommend Precautionary Principle & Consistent Mapping to align with the State Govt for all Councils***

It does not seem that the Management Plan can be a workable plan if all Councils do not follow the same mapping, taking into consideration the accepted results of Climate Change with Sea Level Rise predictions.

It appears some (majority) of Shoalhaven City Councillors believe Shoalhaven Council can stand alone with their mapping and predictions on Sea Level Rise. These Councillors apparently also do not believe in the Precautionary Principle or Climate Change even though their maps now out for comment are based on mid range projections and present accepted emissions are currently tracking much higher than predicted.

The action of the Council will then give rise to problems of insurance down the track when developments in vulnerable areas are permitted, and these permitted developments are inundated with water after using Council's sea level predictions. If the State Govt permits Councils to take these matters into their own hands, chaos can be the only result with the undermining of this SEPP Plan.

I am particularly concerned that Shoalhaven City Council's documents now on exhibition will amend hazard mapping and reduce predicted impacts of sea level rise along Collingwood Beach at Vincentia (southern NSW) and in my own area of St Georges Basin.

Shoalhaven Councillors did not consider the recommendations made in a joint report amazingly commissioned by Shoalhaven & Eurobodalla Councils and authored by Whitehead & Associates.

This must then relate to the your governments Coastal Vulnerability Area mapping and how it can be utilised in the future to protect rate and tax payers from liability with the undermining by Shoalhaven City Council.

## **2) Coastal Environment Area**

### ***Recommend - Coastal Zone of 500metres.***

It is of grave concern that the coastal zone has been significantly reduced to 100 metres. This does not permit a sufficient buffer to protect the valuable habitats surrounding the sensitive waterway of St Georges Basin (SGB), (as well as others along the Shoalhaven Coast). The SGB lakes foreshore areas are known to contain freshwater and saltwater wetlands, especially those on the western and southern shores of 'the Basin'.

These unmodified shorelines require particular concerns and higher protection.

If the coastal zone must be reduced the most efficient and sensible approach would be to reduce the zone to 500 metres allowing some protection to the unmodified shores of this sensitive waterway

I therefore recommend as a matter of urgency that the Coastal Zone be raised to 500metres.

## **3) Littoral Rainforest and Coastal wetlands**

### **Recommend – Prohibit development within Littoral rainforests and Coastal wetlands.**

Failure to enact strict development controls in these sensitive areas will undermine the Objectives of the Coastal Management Act.

Strict controls must be in place and development in (and near) Littoral rainforests and coastal wetlands prohibited

## **4) Wildlife Corridors, Threatened Species, their populations and Ecologically Endangered Communities (EEC's)**

### ***Recommend – Inclusion of these considerations in this new Plan***

Provisions of SEPP 71 that require consideration are given to wildlife corridors, threatened species, their populations and EEC's have not been carried over into the Draft SEPP.

If the Objects of the Act are to be adequately achieved it is vital that this issue is rectified. Protection for our wildlife, their habitats and EEC's cannot be ensured without this.

Thank you

Maureen Webb  
Shoalhaven resident

