

Ian Notes: 9 March 2022

On 4 March reps from SCG Executive (JA,AR,MT,IT) attended meeting in CN (Council) chambers to discuss several items:

Council Members in Attendance: Nuatali Nelmes (LM) , Kathleen Hyland (Strategy & Engagement) , David Clarke (CFO), Philippa Hill, Nick Kaiser (Media and Stakeholder Relations Manager)

1. Proposed SCG Communications Plan with Council
2. Stockton Crown Land Issues and Developments
3. Several Beach Issues (revetments, MSN)

Item 1. Communication Plan.

Council (KH & LM) stated existing council processes were working across all suburbs and should continue to be used.

Extra SCG representation on SCLG possible & welcomed. SCG invited to propose any new members.

Access to Council works updates noted as available on Council Web site. This should be more widely distributed and used/referenced prior to formal communications see:

<https://newcastle.nsw.gov.au/council/news/projects-and-works>

SCG stated existing communication via SCLG is working but our concern was the level of details in communications (see comment later in Beach section revetments for example)

Item 2. Crown Land

LM noted revenues from relocated cabins had impacted cash flow from Rawson Trust (that provides funds for Stockton Council works)

SCG tabled a larger development plan for Stockton CL. JA to follow-up via email

Query as to status of Whispers on the Wharf lease , as this had expired last year. LM was unaware of this.

Item 3. Beach Issues (MSN = Mass Sand Nourishment)

SCG stressed importance on Timelines and funding issues. Noted past Council spending on Stockton (a good thing) but asked if Council had spent \$10M where were the matching 1:1 and 2:1 State funding amounts. This line of questioning was strongly challenged by Council.

SCG also suggested that funding requests for MSN can be made now given line-of-sight to project and stated \$21-22Million as the total funds for implementation phase.

LM noted that CMP funding levels did not extent to \$21M+ levels and that State funding had been problematic even after 'funding' assurances made.

DC emphasised the difficulties Council has with State providing agreed funds in the past.

LM further emphasised MSN funding was well outside Council norms and that SCG should pressure/lobby State and Federal sources for funding. EIS document noted as significant and works should have already started.

Whether Council will take lead on MSN project management was not discussed. (Hindsight issue)

Details on 3 revetments. (sheet pile driven last-line-of-defence per 2020 CMP). These are submerged/buried structures. SCG asked what would be visible above ground level and whether buried/submerged meant 50%, 80%, 90% or 100% burial. Council answer was that until contractor produces final plan this detail is unknown.

Planned retreat (letting the ocean take land as it wants): SCG noted that beachfront not sea walled, or to have last line of defence, were left undefended and therefore a principle of planned retreat applies. SCG asked whether this interpretation was correct and specifically asked for Corroba oval and Caravan Park beachfront. Council replied that protection would (eventually) be provided by MSN. SCG interpreted this response to mean to planned retreated would operate until adequate MSN were placed.

Council stated their belief that Stockton residents DO NOT WANT explicit shoreline structures to present further shoreline loss, and reiterated that the (demolished) day-care centre would still be there if council were allowed to implement their plan.

Given the increasing concerns over climate change and recent shoreline losses, it is unclear if the stated belief of Stockton residents accepting shoreline losses in future years, remains the current resident view.