

**Inner West Council
Flood Management Advisory Committee
Minutes of Meeting Tuesday 16th May 2017
Petersham Service Centre**

Meeting commenced 6:30pm

1. Present

Voting Members

Chair	Frank Breen
Deputy Chair	Alex Lofts
State Emergency Service	Michael Carney
State Emergency Service	Robert Baker
Community Representative	Lois Gray

Non-voting Technical Advisory Members

Office of Environment & Heritage	Gus Pelosi
Inner West Council	Wal Petschler
Inner West Council	Ryan Hawken
Inner West Council	David Paton
Inner West Council	Tony Giunta

Visitors and Observers

Cardno	David Whyte
Cardno	Bala Kilaparty

2. Apologies

Community Representative	Tim Harnett
Sydney Water	David Grasby
State Emergency Service	Alexander Bailey
State Emergency Service	Denise Tolhurst
State Emergency Service	Pilar Lorenzo
Inner West Council	Peter O'Sullivan
Inner West Council	Christine Phillips

3. Terms of Reference

The Committee is advisory in nature and any recommendations are not binding on Council. The Committee currently has eight voting members and a quorum of 50% of current voting members.

4. Disclosures of Interest

Nil declared

5. Confirmation of Minutes

Minutes of the previous meeting held 1 February 2017 were accepted as correct.

Committee Recommendation:

THAT the minutes of the previous Flood Risk Management Advisory Committee's be noted.

For Motion: Unanimous.

6. Matters Arising

Council presented the Committee with an overview of correspondence received relating to integrated flood solution for St Peters.

Transport for NSW, Sydney Water and Council have engaged consultants to assess feasibility of alternative options which better meets the requirements of all parties including Westconnex, Sydney Metro, Sydney Water and Council. The study is likely to take 6 to 8 weeks.

It was noted that Council officers will monitor developments and undertake appropriate actions based on the outcome of the study currently underway.

THAT the correspondence be noted.

For Motion: Unanimous.

7. Reports

ITEM 1: Marrickville Valley Flood Risk Management Study and Plan

Council's consultants presented to the committee with an update of the Marrickville Valley Flood Risk Management Study and Plan, including details of the method, the options and the proposed implementation plan.

The committee discussed the issue of storm water quality and treatment in relation to the current study. Water quality measures are not considered as part of the flood Risk Management Study and Plan as they have an insignificant impact in large storm events. Water quality measures would generally be considered during design development of priority options where appropriate.

The committee discussed the preparation of flood evacuation plans for vulnerable properties. The SES indicated they already work with the community to prepare emergency planning for vulnerable properties.

The committee discussed the Multi Criteria Analysis (MCA) and how it was derived. It was recommended to include the formula showing how the MCA scores were calculated and make some changes to the layout of the implementation plan to include the MCA score

The committee also discussed the likely implementation time frame for the flood management options. It was indicated that this was influenced by a number of factors including available Council funding, other funding sources and coordination with other Council and non-Council works. It was indicated that, based on current levels of funding, implementation of high and medium priority options would occur within around 10 to 20 years. Acceleration of the delivery would require additional funding and reductions in spending in other areas.

The Committee gave a vote of thanks to Cardno for their attendance and presentation.

Committee Recommendation:

THAT Council endorses the Marrickville Valley Draft Flood Risk Management Study and Plan for public exhibition.

For Motion: Unanimous.

ITEM 2: Johnstons Creek Final Draft Flood Study and Alexandra Canal Final Draft Flood Study

Council presented the Committee with an update of the status of the Johnstons Creek Final Draft Flood Study and Alexandra Canal Final Draft Flood Study.

The flood studies were put on public exhibition from 13 March to 16 April. A website was established to enable feedback online and to provide a copy of the flood studies.

A total of 16 residents attended the information sessions and 30 submissions were received on the Johnstons Creek Flood Study. No submissions were received on the Alexandra Canal Flood Study.

Based on the outcome Councils consultants have undertaken some minor changes to the modelling including assumptions around the rail corridor, updating pipe dimensions in a few locations and updating some areas of the DTM.

The recommended changes to Councils Flood Planning Area (FPA) and Flood Liable Land (FLL) maps stemming from the Johnstons Creek and Alexandra Canal flood studies will be considered at a future meeting in tandem with proposed changes for the Hawthorne Canal FPA and FLL.

Committee Recommendation:

THAT Council adopts the Johnstons Creek and Alexandra Canal Flood Studies

For Motion: Unanimous.

6. General Business

Council officers answered a question on notice regarding the identification of options for the Leichhardt Flood Risk management Study and Plan. The associated email is attached to the minutes

Sydney Water have advised that the condition of the lower reaches of the Whites Creek channel are in poor condition and will likely need replacement in coming years. The replacement of the channel presents an opportunity for increasing the capacity of the channel and also naturalisation. A more detailed update will be presented at the next FMAC meeting.

It is anticipated that the next FMAC meeting will be in late June, primarily to discuss the Leichhardt Flood Risk management Study and Plan.

Meeting closed 8:20pm

7. Post Meeting Notes

Ryan Hawken

From: Paton, David <David.Paton@innerwest.nsw.gov.au>
Sent: Monday, 15 May 2017 10:06 PM
To: Breen, Frank
Cc: Ryan Hawken; Phillips, Christine; Jarvis, Rick
Subject: FW: Flood Committee response to Frank Breen's question

Dear Mr Breen,

For your information, in response to your Question on Notice to the Leichhardt Flood Risk Management Advisory Committee meeting on 2 March 2016, which was deferred at the last Inner West Council Flood Management Advisory Committee, I propose to table the following answer at tomorrow night's meeting.

The question is repeated below for your information:

What other structural mitigation options were considered and ultimately discarded during the process of determining which options were to be modelled? Why were those options discarded?

Answer:

The structural mitigation options chosen for modelling and assessment were determined jointly at meetings between Leichhardt Council engineers and consultants Cardno. The process first identified the areas subject to flooding in the 100 year ARI event in the Leichhardt Flood Study (Cardno 2010). Once these areas were identified consideration was given to what structural options might be available to modify the flood behaviour and reduce the flooding in these areas (for example, detention basins, levees, diverting water away from properties and increasing the pipe capacity).

All parks and reserves along the path of the flooding were considered and reviewed in relation to their position in the catchment and their suitability for use as a detention basin or for construction of a levee. Preliminary modelling of the potential detention basin sites was undertaken to determine whether they achieved any improvement to downstream flooding. Where the detention basins did not achieve an appreciable improvement, the option was recorded as being considered but discarded from further modelling. This was the case for Evan Jones Playground, Leichhardt and Gladstone Park, Balmain. The proposed levee in Hogan Park/Smith Park, Annandale was discarded after modelling showed the option worsened the effect of flooding on properties upstream of the levee.

Pipeline upgrades were considered where areas affected by flooding followed the alignment of an existing pipeline or culvert (this could be a Council or Sydney Water pipeline/culvert). Consideration was given to whether the pipeline or culvert could be upgraded and, if so, what was the most cost effective and practical way to do so. Where the existing pipeline and associated flooding generally followed a roadway, upgrade of the pipeline along the existing alignment was modelled. Where the existing pipeline passed through private property and there was no drainage easement, consideration was given to whether the pipeline could be diverted to other roads or public land. Where this was not possible, modelling proceeded with the pipeline upgrade following the existing alignment.

Regards

David Paton | Stormwater and Development - Team Leader

Inner West Council

p: 02 9367 9107 | **e:** david.paton@innerwest.nsw.gov.au | **w:** www.innerwest.nsw.gov.au

Ashfield Service Centre: 260 Liverpool Road, Ashfield NSW 2131

Leichhardt Service Centre: 7-15 Wetherill Street, Leichhardt NSW 2040

Petersham Service Centre: 2-14 Fisher Street, Petersham NSW 2049