

---

**Sent:** 7/10/2018 12:52:08 PM  
**Subject:** Online Submission

07/10/2018

MR David James  
3 Bolwarra RD  
North Narrabeen NSW 2101  
dj6331@gmail.com

**RE: DA2017/1274 - 52 Cabbage Tree Road BAYVIEW NSW 2104**

Objection to amended Application 2017/1274 at 52 Cabbage Tree Rd Bayview  
I continue to object to this development application on the grounds of unacceptable loss of biodiversity and intrusive impact that is out of character with neighbouring residential development.

- The main point of my objection has to do with a failure, in my opinion, within the application documents to properly consider likely adverse changes to existing and known flood hazard as a direct consequence of the proposed raising of the natural ground level of the floodplain with excavated material.
- The quantity of excavated material proposed to be deposited on the floodplain has never been accurately established by the applicant. Therefore, it cannot be said with any degree of confidence that the existing net overbank floodplain storages will not be adversely affected to a significant degree.
- The flood calculations accompanying the Application and the Council response thereto are both deficient in respect of their failure to adequately address the issue of internationally recognised Sea Level Rise and the failure to consider the consequent effect which that will have upon the operation of the major tidal flow control reflux mechanisms (4) which are affixed to the outlet side of the Cahill Creek box culvert under Pittwater Road.
- The geometry of these reflux valves is arranged so that their normal position is closed to the entry of sea water into the Golf Course. The valves can only open when the water level in Cahill Creek is significantly higher to overcome variable tidal pressure from within the Pittwater estuary.
- From that, it follows that the occurrence and duration of a positive head of fresh water in Cahill Creek, capable of overcoming the tendency to closure from the estuary must diminish within the life of the proposed development as sea level rises.
- I contend, because this tidal input control mechanism has not been considered in either the Application documents nor the Council Report both are inadequate to properly address the commonly accepted range of sea level rise scenarios, currently of up to 90 cm rise by 2100

For these reasons, I say this application should be refused.

---

-----  
I say that the recognised time span for residential development decrees 100 years for life-of-structure. This has not been applied in consideration of flood planning for this application.

On Site Detention of stormwater run-off caused by the large increase on site of

impervious material (roofs, driveways etc) may be successful, except that during heavy rain when all the OSD devices are full, their combined discharge can actually worsen the flooding situation in the Cahill Creek catchment.

This part of the Cahill Creek sub-catchment is a short, narrow and steep-sided, incised valley. Consequently the time of concentration of stormwater is also short with the risk of flash flooding in 1% AEP-(1 in 100 years) and less catchment rainstorms. In combination with Sea Level Rise-driven increases in tail-water depths which will increase the flood hazard, and to which the additional effects of discharges of rainwater emanating from fully charged OSD's, taken together, require further investigation and overall re-calculation.

David James