Water Management Referral Response

Application Number:	DA2021/0199

Date:	15/04/2021
To:	Lashta Haidari
Land to be developed (Address):	Lot B DP 402309 , 4 Jacksons Road WARRIEWOOD NSW 2102 Lot 1 DP 595298 , 4 Jacksons Road WARRIEWOOD NSW 2102 Lot 7 DP 455967 , 4 Jacksons Road WARRIEWOOD NSW 2102 Lot 6 DP 8561 , 4 Jacksons Road WARRIEWOOD NSW 2102 Lot 5 DP 8561 , 4 Jacksons Road WARRIEWOOD NSW 2102 Lot 4 DP 654321 , 4 Jacksons Road WARRIEWOOD NSW 2102 Lot 6 DP 737137 , 4 Jacksons Road WARRIEWOOD NSW 2102 Lot 8 DP 455967 , 4 Jacksons Road WARRIEWOOD NSW 2102 Lot 3 DP 8561 , 2 Jacksons Road WARRIEWOOD NSW 2102 Lot 2 DP 8561 , 2 Jacksons Road WARRIEWOOD NSW 2102 Lot 1 DP 8561 , 2 Jacksons Road WARRIEWOOD NSW 2102 Lot 15 DP 26902 , 2 Jacksons Road WARRIEWOOD NSW 2102

Reasons for referral

Council's Water Management Officers are required to consider the likely impacts.

Officer comments

Council does not support the inclusion of proprietary filters in the stormwater treatment train for a number of reasons:
1. We don't currently have this type of asset, so management would require additional capacity in terms of systems/knowledge etc.
2. They are a very high-cost item to maintain because they must be maintained by the manufacturer and it's not possible to seek other providers in a competitive procurement process. For instance, the Filterra device uses an engineered filter media that is only available through Ocean Protect.
3. It would not be possible to use our own staff to maintain the devices.
4. Drainage from the area is poor due to the lack of fall to discharge points, and these filter devices automatically go into bypass if they are submerged at all.

The solution also makes use of 14 Enviropods (pit inserts to capture gross pollutants). This is an excessive number to maintain and the size of the site warrants a CDS unit. Enviropods that are not maintained/cleaned create a blockage and contribute to localised flooding.

While the reports discuss rainwater tanks they are not shown on the engineering plans. The plans MUST include the tanks and show how reuse will be achieved, because when details are left off DA approved plans they are not built.

Please refer to the stormwater team's advice relating to drainage. If a pipe is required, it may be difficult to discharge to the creek above the waterline, resulting in a submerged pipe in a tidal section of the creek that is very susceptible to sediment accumulation.

I question the need to include OSD, as it will do little to prevent flooding given the position of the site in the floodplain, and usually at this point in the catchment, it is preferable to remove water as quickly as possible to reduce held water when the upper catchment flows arrive.

With the removal of the OSD, you have clear options for placement of bio-swales to treat stormwater. Consideration should be given to a bio-swale along the boundary of the site with the playing field (if Parks and Reserve are agreeable). A grassed swale would possibly need to be three metres wide, with graded banks that don't present a risk so close to the cycle path, and water should not be retained to over 300mm depth as a fence is not suitable on the floodplain. The best bet is to use as much roof water as possible to minimise the runoff that needs to be dealt with.

The proposal is therefore unsupported.

Note: Should you have any concerns with the referral comments above, please discuss these with the Responsible Officer.

Recommended Water Management Conditions:

Nil.