

Attachment 1 to Item 10.3.1.

Table 1: Matters raised in submissions and Council Officer response to the submissions

Date of meeting: 8 April 2025 Location: Council Chambers Time: 6:30pm

1 Object Concerns about the study's data. The letter highlights that a local resident, who had firsthand knowledge of about the accuracy of the study's data. Flood management recommendations:	Submission No		Matters Raised in Submission	Officer Comment
2 Object Key points include: In accordance with the NSW State Governm impacts on private properties, such as their own, particularly with increased run-off from the Redbank Housing development. In accordance with the NSW State Governm data collection and flood study stage of the under the existing cathment conditions. De occupients will protect properties or reduce damage. In accordance with the NSW State Governm data collection and flood study stage of the under the existing cathment conditions. De occupients will protect properties or reduce damage. In accordance with the NSW State Governm data collection and flood study stage of the under the existing cathment conditions. De occupients and experienced study indeed property overs or reduce damage. In accordance with the NSW State Governm data collection and flood study stage of the under the existing cathment conditions. De occupients is the accurate the provide sufficient detail on how mitigation measures will protect properties or reduce damage. In accordance with the NSW State Governm data collection and flood study stage of the under the existing cathment conditions. De occupients and expension: The area has experienced flooding in recent years (2021–2024), and the study does not provide sufficient detail on how mitigation measures will protect properties or reduce damage. In accordance with the NSW state Governm data collection and flood study stage of the under the existing cathment conditions. 2 Object 4. Requests for action: In accordance with the study and its recommendations. In accordance with areasite for integer properties, including property-specific risks and potential damages. In accordance with areasite graphysic for forogenty owners to ensure their concerns and experience	1	Object	 Key takeaways include: 1. The Presentation was overly technical and difficult to follow due to excessive jargon and unclear delivery. The data presented was also questioned for its reliability. 2. Concerns about the study's data: The letter highlights that a local resident, who had firsthand knowledge of flooding in Redbank Creek since 1978, was not consulted by the council or research team, raising concerns about the accuracy of the study's data. 3. Flood management recommendations: Thorough on-the-ground inspections of the entire Redbank Creek are needed, with the removal of debris and obstructions to improve water flow and prevent bank erosion. Drainage pipes should be installed to manage water flow, potentially directing it to storage facilities or back into the river. A large pumping station should be established to manage excess water during heavy rains. Upgrade of North Richmond Treatment Plant should include measures to pump excess water away. 4. Suspension of further development: The letter calls for the immediate suspension of further development at Redbank (Peels Dairy) until flooding and erosion issues are addressed. Concerns are raised about the impact of existing and future developments on flooding and damage to properties in the area. 5. Developer accountability: The letter criticises the developer for causing damage to the creek and properties, and for broken promises regarding infrastructure improvements. It urges the council to hold the developer 	Initial consultation was undertaken between 16 knowledge of flooding behaviour and consequen This consultation gathered local knowledge in re events. The information gathered from this com
3 Object			 Key points include: Insufficient focus on private properties: The homeowner feels the study inadequately addresses the specific impacts on private properties, such as their own, particularly with increased run-off from the Redbank Housing development. Previous flooding concerns: The area has experienced flooding in recent years (2021–2024), and the study does not provide sufficient detail on how mitigation measures will protect properties or reduce damage. Lack of support and compensation: The homeowner highlights the absence of provisions for compensating property owners or supporting flood-proofing efforts. Requests for action: Detailed Impact Assessments: The study should be updated to include a more detailed analysis of the potential impact of flooding on private properties, including property-specific risks and potential damages. Community Consultation: Facilitate further consultations with affected property owners to ensure their concerns and experiences are incorporated into the study and its recommendations. Clear Mitigation Strategies: Provide clear and actionable strategies to minimize the risk of flood damage to private properties, such as infrastructure improvements, zoning changes, or funding for flood-proofing initiatives. Support for Property Owners: Outline any available support mechanisms for homeowners, including grants or subsidies for flood resilience measures and assistance with recovery efforts in the event of future 	The draft Flood Study includes mapping that de including flood frequency, extent, depth, velocity systems will be readily accessible for interpretation

Table 1: Redbank Creek Flood Study - Summary of Submissions and Officer Response

ere provided as feedback to the consultants.

ent's Flood prone land policy, this study constitutes the nanagement process to study the flood behaviour

16 October 2023 to 13 November 2023 to seek local uences.

n relation to flood behaviour and the impacts of specific ommunity consultation was used in the sensitivity

social, ecological and economic factors are part of the hich is outside of the scope of the current study, but cess (subject to securing grant funding).

ent's Flood prone land policy, this study constitutes the nanagement process to study the flood behaviour ermining management options based on social, ne flood risk management study / plan stages which is

demonstrates the impacts of flooding on properties, city and hazards, and once incorporated into Council's station.

Submission No	Matters Raised in Submission	Officer Comment
	There are many issues pertaining to Redbank Creek study that have not been addressed or covered in the flood study as presented to Council. I also mention the lack of consultation with those who have been impacted by the flooding of the creek, especially in 2020, 2021, 2022 and 2024, who live along the creek bank downstream from the Redbank development and have had damage to their property and in some cases their homes and belongings. This should have been done before the final draft of the flood report being even presented to council.	Initial consultation was undertaken between 16 O knowledge of flooding behaviour and consequence This consultation gathered local knowledge in rela- events. The information gathered from this comm analysis of the flood modelling.
	For persons to make assumptions from measurements from the river height at North Richmond Bridge, and NEVER HAVING SEEN, OBSERVED or WITNESSED the video data and photos of those who are ratepayers who reside along the creek is irresponsible and unprofessional as this is an important part of the study impact that has been OMITTED. Many of these residents have resided on the creek with the creek as their back surveyed boundary for many years myself nearly 24 years, my neighbours 45 and 50 years.	Throughout the exhibition period, the draft Study available to view on Council's online community e yoursay.com.au, and between 9am to 4pm Mond George Street, Windsor.
	I have lived on the creek with my surveyed back fence line as where the land meets the creek water and there are issues this study does not cover, due to lack of local consultations and/or onsite examination with the residents concerned. The questionnaire I believe only 7 responses were given, due to the lack of Council advertisement and that many are also elderly people who do not use computers, mobile phones as a necessity to breathe and live. One elderly neighbour is 78 has dyslexia and cannot use a computer or mobile phone and relies on other methods or people letting her know verbally. I did that survey, and it was superficial, limited and showed ignorance of the true nature of the flooding of the creek.	 The community was engaged through the followin Letters to all property owners and r Council website – YourHawkesbury Councils Newsletter Media/Social Media Pop up at North Richmond Shoppin
	Every waterway has its own character and cannot be treated as a per a textbook or the Act that is followed, as appears to be outlined in the State guidelines. Issues of Concern:	to 2pm. This resident provided information, including phot consultation seeking local knowledge, and this int catchment.
	The nature of the creek is very narrow and very very windy with 180-degree U-turn bends in places, like at my back yard, this type of physical character does not allow or is conducive to high velocity or excess water flows. When I talked with the Hawkesbury Nepean River Trust in the early 2000s about the creek, they informed me this creek could only handle 5 cusecs per hour.	The Redbank Creek Flood Study has been condu Government's Flood Prone Land Policy, focusing under the existing catchment conditions. This study management planning but does not include an im-
	The creek is now being used as a stormwater drain/outlet for the Redbank estate which consists of approx. 179.2 hectares [442.4 acres] of development, with a proposal before Council to add another 35 hectares, with an ADDITIONAL 300-350 lots (tiny weeny 375m2 mainly and a few lots at 1500m2). This will increase the number of homes to around 1750. The creek cannot handle any more development and at the moment cannot and does not handle the excessive stormwater velocity and volume being put into the creek by the development, I cite Peel Park stormwater outlet here. My talks with the Nepean Hawkesbury River Trust revealed that the creek could only handle 5 cusecs per hour more than the normal flow. This was prior to the to the Redbank development being approved and is not mentioned in the report. The Redbank Creek Impact study for the creek development was done during a 20-year drought, also with NO CONSULTATION with those who live along the creek and know the creek behaviour. The report on the flood issues of the creek does not mention the stormwater aspects of the flooding, causing the velocity and high volumes, with very quick rise in height at velocity and then dropping. This is causing the damage, erosion and the damage of the habitat for native animals, reptiles and other creatures.	 It is a requirement of the Hawkesbury Development. Following development, both the runoff f avoid destabilising the downstream creet. The peak flow rates of runoff from the site existing rates for all severity of storms. For the Redbank Development a condition of Wate increase of flows into Redbank Creek as well as a undertaken through Water Sensitive Urban Design through the open space network. Part of the over these facilities to become water body features.
	Add to this many of the details quoted in the report are from documents tabled by the Redbank developers prior to the estate being approved, and thus are no longer accurate due to the development and the overland drainage changes and the stormwater entering the creek. With the filling in [removal] of some of the dams and the flood contours to slow and gather water and direct to dams	 This is achieved through: Requiring stormwater management plan applications to demonstrate how these redevelopment
	of the original Keyline system, the overland water flow has changed and due to the amount of sealed roads, driveways, paved footpaths and house rooftops etc, the water will drain at a faster speeds and a quicker volume. Even with the compulsory water tanks for homes once these are filled that water ends in the creek. Therefore, the development has interfered with natural drainage of the overland water drainage.	 Ensuring that stormwater control design, stormwater management plans, and ass control plans, engineering specifications approval Undertaking inspections to ensure that w
	The government as the control body of the creek {crown Land] and the responsibility of all water travelling in the creek also Government responsibility, the creek has never been cleaned of the debris. Fallen trees, and flood debris, chairs, logs, trees, fencing, sheds, toys, bikes, ladders, etc etc from the waterway ever to my knowledge. This then impedes the water flow especially at the North Richmond Bridge over Belles Line Of Road, where debris etc lodges on the upstream side of the bridge. If council is not responsible for this they have not referred the issue to the government body that has that authority. This is irresponsible and neglect re a flood issue.	 approved designs Requiring Works-as-Executed plans to b certificates/occupation certificates. In accordance with the NSW State Government's
	A council engineer came to my residence [as all the homes that back onto the creek in streets mentioned in the report are ordinary town blocks not acreage] after flood in 2020 stated that trees had fallen across the creek upstream from me, and that would impact on the flow and flood heightbut nothing was done and have done nothing about it, but I "should plant more trees". Seven had been ripped out and were washed away. The Fire brigade people	data collection and flood study stage of the mana under the existing catchment conditions. Determine ecological and economic factors are part of the flo outside of the scope of the current study.

6 October 2023 to 13 November 2023 to seek local ences.

relation to flood behaviour and the impacts of specific mmunity consultation was used in the sensitivity

dy and other supporting documentation was made ty engagement site www.yourhawkesburyonday to Friday at Council's Administration Office, 366

wing:

nd residents oury-YourSay

pping Centre on Thursday 26 October 2023 – 10am

hotos and videos in response to the initial information was used in the flood modelling of the

nducted in accordance with the NSW State ing on data collection and flood behaviour analysis study forms the foundation for future flood risk impact assessment of specific developments.

ment Control Plan/Engineering Specifications that:

off flow rate and pollutant load should be controlled to reek bed and adversely affecting the ecology. e site should be controlled so as not to exceed s.

Water Management for the site is that there is no net as ensuring the water quality is improved. This is esign (WSUD) initiatives integrated across the site verall scheme is to utilise existing dams and adapting

lans to be submitted for all subdivision/ development e requirements will be achieved for future

ign/management is consistent with any approved assessed under the requirements of development ons, and other best practice guidelines, prior to

at works are constructed in accordance with

to be provided prior to the issue of subdivision

nt's Flood prone land policy, this study constitutes the anagement process to study the flood behaviour mining management options based on social, e flood risk management study / plan stages which is

Submission	Matters Raised in Submission	Officer Comment
No	came and chopped up 2 of them that had been ripped out. These trees etc caused damage to a retaining wall that cost the insurance company \$64,000 to repair the damage. This is serious damage to a property. The creek in the past has flooded in a manner that it rose gradually, occasionally breaking the banks and then go down gradually as in floods in the 1990s and up to 2019, with no damage to the waterway of the banks or the habitat.	
	Not all flooding of the creek coincides with the flooding of the Hawkesbury River, therefore the quote: "derived from the simulated water level at the north Richmond Bridge", and ignorance about the actual flooding patterns of the creek prior or since extensive overland development, means the study is not accurate and therefore seriously flawed. The properties that back onto the creek that are residents of Bradley Road have not been included in the report or even mentioned.	
	Further to this the Redbank Estate developers allow the stormwater to access the creek on a downgrade through Peel Park at a very high velocity and volumes reaching the already flooded creek at a 90° angle. I have video of this. They have provided reinforced and very sturdy passageway for the water to travel so it does not erode Peel Park to the creek, but once it hits the creek at velocity it then starts eroding and damaging the creekbank and wildlife habitat. Where there is some debris whirlpooling can be seen which causes further damage. I have videos of this.	
	https://www.facebook.com/jeanette.l.hayden/videos/4082216658670916	
	This is another aspect of the flooding that this report does not cover. Once again, the neglect due to not cleaning the waterway is contributing to this happening.	
	I have sent video of this to council with a letter via email in July 2022, but they say they have no correspondence from me relating to this. Everyone on the CC list of that email received that email, so why didn't council????	
	There have been two occasions where the small park in Susella Crescent has gone underwater. From somewhere there is underwater pressure that residents have witnessed fountains of water spewing out of the access pits to the underground sewerage pipes. This is a health hazard if any sewage water or materials are entering the park and then entering the flooded waterway. This is not mentioned in the flood report.	
	There is now serious erosion around the stormwater outlet in the creek between no's 27 and 29 Susella Crescent. One resident is concerned if the erosion continues, he will lose his backyard, and the other resident a widow in her late 70s is very concerned for the welfare of her backyard. The erosion of the creekbanks has caused to concrete stormwater pipe to protrude out into the creek, which will cause further whirlpooling effects, obstruction to water flow, and erosion damage to the banks. I attended with the two residents when the council engineers came and examined it. They were not concerned said it was not a council problem. But the council are responsible for these pipes and government is responsible for the creek and the water, so have they referred this then to the appropriate govt body?????	
	This is a sample of the type of stormwater that is run into the creek. Note the noise, the velocity and amount of water coming out of pipes in Peel Park:	
	https://www.facebook.com/jeanette.l.hayden/videos/1671319943262186	
	Further to this is the now very fast rise in levels in the creek within hours. I cite April 2024 where the creek rose a minimum of 15 to 20 feet in a matter of about 2 to 3 hours, at the worst velocity I have ever witnessed on the creek in all my 34 years here, and it was frightening. The water was roaring. This was at approximately 3:00am in the morning. For so much water to rise in such a quick time, to such a great height, something is seriously wrong upstream, and this report does not cover the rising heights of water levels in the flood times, which are no correspondent to the flooding at North Richmond Bridge over the Hawkesbury River. The other alarming aspect to those on the creek was the quick time the water level dropped. Now if the river was in flood, and with all the backwater theories the report has expostulated, would not happen in this manner. So this leads to the fact that other factors are at play in relation to the flood water in the creek, the height, the velocity and the water height, and thus the development re land runoff, and the stormwater issues have not been looked into in the study and draft flood report. The velocity and drastic rise in height has never been evident in the past years of my living on the creek. There has been talk/mention in the community that Redbank estate has pumps on some dams and do use the pumps to let water out of the dams if they are to full, and in one instance they actually made an opening in the dam wall to let water go. This is not acceptable and would most certainly increase the water velocity of water flow, happen during the night. As most of the residents who live on the creek no longer sleep well at night during flood and heavy rain due to the creek flooding over the last 4 years, many like myself sit up and watch the water rise and go down. We are frightened to go to sleep. I have taken video of the flood water in April 2024 at 4:00am trying get enough light to show the water rises. This seriously needs to be investigated and is not covered in the flo	

Submission	Matters Raised in Submission	Officer Comment
No		
	Also, the flood has left debris to where the water rose to. There have been no surveyors or engineers out to register the levels of rise, or the level of the normal creek water level. There are no official flood height markers that I am aware along the creek. So how can the report on figures gathered from the heights of river and the rainfall give an accurate report when the factors I have outlined have not been considered, as also the issues re the Estate releasing water from dams at flood height times of the creek especially AT NIGHT???? What has Council or the Redbank Estate done to review the water impact upon the waterway since the development upstream as per the Water and Soil Conservation Act????. The Act to my understanding when having a discussion with them early this year, is that any development along a waterway requires regular reviews on the impact upon the waterway by the certifying Council and those who develop along the waterway. If this has not been done this flood report does not give ran accurate report about the flooding in Redbank Creek and questions have to asked as to why this has not been done.	
	Council has stated in conversation with me that there was no flooding in some areas of the creek as the SES had made no mention/report. In March 2022 the SES refused to come to my property when called for a landslide about 7 feet from my back steps and water lapping the steps. So how can council and the SES state this when they refused to come. I addressed this issue when I made my submissions to the Senate and State government flood inquiries. I was even told by the SES that I was not in a designated flood area, but the water was lapping my back steps and resulted in a landslide and other severe erosion losing ¾ of my backyard. I thought SES was for emergencies, which this was. They did come in the July 2023 floods and pushed the red buttons stating it was severe, dangerous and unstable. But council have stated it is not their responsibility.	
	Council ignored all my correspondence for 2 years and treated me atrociously when I called at the Council offices to speak to someone, until I threatened to refer them to the Ombudsman.	
	Since there has been no consultation with the residents along the creek and no actual visitation by those who compiled the report or council or Redbank to view the damage, I quote from the report:	
	'A calculation of flood damages to estimate the tangible damages sustained every year [on average] over a long period." This is not an accurate statement as there has been no consultation or assessment of damage with those who live along the creek about the damage and impact over the years to ascertain any assessment of damage.	
	With this there are a number of platypi colonies along the creek. I had one at the back of my place. Since the April flood this year I have seen no sign of them.	
	With discussions with the Parks and Wildlife some time ago, as I already mentioned this creek was scheduled as a wildlife corridor. The amount of wildlife since 2022 has declined, was starting to reappear, but since April 2024 has declined again. I have had Koala bears in my back years, the platypi have gone, the bower birds have gone, the eels and fish have gone, and so have many other creatures who made their home in and on the creek banks. I remind you that the Platypus and Koala are now protected and ENDANGERED SPECIES. This means that the issues of the creek have endangered the lives and habitat of these animals and it is an offence to not address the situation. Add to this the horrendous erosion, their habitats have been wiped out or severely damaged.	
	The persons who did this study also do not realize that on many occasions there is flooding of the creek caused by rain further up the creek in the Kurrajong Hills, when there is no rain at all and no Hawkesbury River flooding. On 2 Occasions this water has come down the creek as a 6-foot wall of water. It did not cause damage to the waterway and stayed within the banks. Do people even know about these behaviours of the creek? At other times there has been flooding, but it rose slowly and subsided slowly with no damage of the creek of the banks, of people's sheds, fences and other details of their properties. Some did coincide with Hawkesbury River in flood, but not all. No damage to creek or property.	
	It is only since March 2020, and with the food issues of 2021, the two flood in 2022 [March and July] and again in April 2024, that the extreme high levels and damage to the creek to date, property and wildlife and their habitat, with massive sever and SUDDEN WATER HEIGHT RISE, that damage has been done to the creek. Prior to that the water rose and went down slowly and with no damage to property of infrastructure, fences etc. This was not backwater as it was flowing in a very fast manner with velocity. The floods rose very quickly with water velocity and heights NEVER SEEN BEFORE.	
	I have photos and videos of all these mentioned flood events and others, as well as all my correspondence with council AND OTHER GOVERNMENT BODIES, AND 4 YEARS OF DIARY DOCUMENTATION, ENGINEERS' REPORTS, and other incidents re this flooding issue, if anyone at Council, or those who put this report together wish to contact me that is outlined in this submission or what I have had to leave out due to time and volume of material wishes to contact me they may.	
	I have done a street walk of properties along the creek. Everyone I talked to had serious concerns. Many did not do the questionnaire as they stated council did not care, or they have had a bad experience with council and did/or did not believe it would help that the council would ignore what they said and would not help. Also, there are a lot of older	

Submission No		Matters Raised in Submission	Officer Comment
		people who live on the creek some having lived here for 50 years, many are not on computer literate or do studies online or were unaware of it. Therefore, the questionnaire study was flawed and incomplete.	
		I am now very concerned that the Redbank estate has put in an application for rezoning for 32 hectares for 300 -350 homes. This goes to the council the NIGHT BEFORE the Council Public meeting with the residents about the flood report. I ask is this not ridiculous and a sign that Council does not care, as that development application if approved is going to destroy out homes and lives. So do the council care?????? This meeting is not consultation. We need people to sit down and listen to what is happening and then look at why it is happening. The personal impact has never been looked at.	
		I for one, and I know others did, when my husband and I looked at purchasing the property on Redbank Creek [husband now deceased] we did a great deal of investigation regarding the flood issues, talking with people along the creek, to government agencies, etc and maps of the flood etc etc. For 20 years there have been no issues.	
		The damage to properties is outlined briefly mentioned on Section 11 page 75. But there is no inclusion of the damage to soil on loss of ground, which many of the residents who live on the creek are retired, many are on pensions and do not have the monies to repair the damage and of an age where they are unable to secure loans to do the repairs. Most insurance companies do not insure the dirt.	
		Council mentioned in the meeting of the 12 November that there was \$13million for flood repairs. So why has this not been used for these properties? Why has government/council not addressed this issue as it was not our fault that in the last 4 years we have had our properties destroyed and our lives ruined through no fault of our own, but no care is taken with developments that impact our backyards and homes.	
		Our properties were all council approved and certified, and we pay our rates. We bought the home in good faith, it is expected the Council does the right thing by the ratepayers and the homes that already been approved etc and never had flood or damage, to be looked after in their development applications etc for the future. Due to the flood over the past 4 years, I have nightmares when it rains, or cannot sleep and sit up all night watching the creek. It has caused severe stress, and medical issues which are documented.	
		It has made me question many issues about the Council and their policies re development, when they disregard the impact of those applications on people in areas downstream of the development. I am sure if the council employee and members were in my place, and others who also reside along the creek they would feel the same way.	
		What is more important: People or money from the rates of the developments in the Council coffers????? Where is the DUTY OF CARE to the RATE PAYER and responsibility of how they impact properties and people's lives.	
		This report is flawed in that the issues of the fast rise in water level and velocity has only occurred since 2020, since the Redbank Estate development has gone ahead and there has been no mention of these issues in this report.	
		The real issue is that the storm water from the estate is causing serious problems and it needs to be investigated before houses are washed into the creek, yards disappearing, possible lives in danger. I Have lost $\frac{3}{4}$ of my back yard the actual dirt, as a war Widow I do not have the finance to repair the damage, and no one cares.	
		Two points. Firstly as the report was heavily based around Hawkesbury River heights, all residents potentially flood affected, Council should personally advise the directly effected property holders of their land flood related levels.	The Redbank Creek Flood Study is based or Creek catchment. Section 8.2.4.1 of the Red respect. A range of tailwater levels within the Hawkes analysis. The flood extents due to a range of
4	Commont	Secondly there should be a strong emphasis on clearing debris and blockages from the creek.	from the NSW Reconstruction Authority's Har added to the peak flood depth maps. This int from Redbank Creek or overland flooding pre Hawkesbury River flooding predominates.
4	Comment		Following the NSW State Government's Floc collection and flood study stage of the manage existing catchment conditions. Determining n economic factors are part of the flood risk ma scope of the current study.

on the direct rainfall approach across the entire Redbank Redbank Creek Flood Study provides further detail in this

kesbury River were investigated as part of the sensitivity of Hawkesbury River flooding mechanism were derived Hawkesbury-Nepean River Flood Study 2024 and were integration allows to differentiate areas where flooding predominates from areas where riverine flooding due to

lood prone land policy, this study constitutes the data nagement process to study the flood behaviour under the g management options based on social, ecological and management study / plan stages which is outside of the

Submission No		Matters Raised in Submission	Officer Comment
5	Object	 I am making this submission knowing it is unlikely to make a difference to the decision that Council intends making. This flood study information is useful but should remain as a flood study for informational purposes only. I do not think it should go any further. This report does not take into consideration the impact this report will have on ratepayer insurance premiums. A number of properties may be tagged as "flood prone" on the basis that Redbank Creek rises and falls due to rain events. Redbank Creek flows through my property and may be tagged as flood prone if this report is adopted even though it will never flood in a 1000 years. Insurers are currently using information provided by councils to increase premiums. If Council adopts this report a significant number of ratepayers will face unnecessary increases in our premiums thanks to Hawkesbury Council. 	There is a distinction between a property being and elevated (High flood island). The Responde Flood Island), meaning that while the building its flood water. Insurance companies use their own methods to certainty to insurance companies who in the abs postcode/area, not property specific circumstant
6	Comment	 See letter. The issue of overland flooding and inadequate drainage at North Richmond as well as Redbank Creek issues impacting residents who back onto Redbank Creek have been a long-standing problem. These issues have been well documented and discussed by Council over many decades with local North Richmond residents long before the development of the Redbank seniors living development or the Redbank residential development occurred. Significant upgrades of the old stormwater drainage system is required including the creation of unobstructed overland flow paths for when the old inadequate drainage system is overwhelmed during significant rain events. A memorandum in the form of a file note (dated 24 January 2003) provided by Council has noted that the existing drainage system (twin 1200 mm diameter RCP and separate 750 mm RCP east through North Richmond) lacks sufficient capacity to adequately provide an acceptable standard of protection from larger storms (Ref J. Wyndam Prince 10 May 2013 Stormwater Management Strategy and Flooding Report). When residential development at North Richmond occurred along the riparian zone of Redbank Creek between O'Dea Place and William Street planning regulations at the time did not protect the riparian corridor along the creek through setbacks compared to planning regulations that have been in place in more recent times. This encroachment of the creek has caused both inpact on the stability of the banks of the creek including removal of trees which previously assisted to hold the bank in place and residents' infrastructure like sheds and gardens that have been constructed within what should have been the riparian zone are impacted significantly in times of intense rainfall when Redbank Creek is in full flood. 	 The Redbank Creek Flood Study has been cond Government's Flood Prone Land Policy, focusin under the existing catchment conditions. This st management planning but does not include an in It is a requirement of the Hawkesbury Developm Following development, both the runoff avoid destabilising the downstream cree The peak flow rates of runoff from the se existing rates for all severity of storms. For the Redbank Development a condition of W increase of flows into Redbank Creek as well as undertaken through Water Sensitive Urban Desi through the open space network. Part of the over these facilities to become water body features. This is achieved through: Requiring stormwater management plat applications to demonstrate how these development Ensuring that stormwater control desig stormwater management plans, and as control plans, engineering specification approval Undertaking inspections to ensure that approved designs Requiring Works-as-Executed plans to certificates/occupation certificates.

ng flooded and a property being flood-affected, isolated idents property is classified as flood-affected (High g itself remains dry, access to the property is cut off by

to determine flood risk. Flood studies provide absence of known data can refuse insurance based on ances.

onducted in accordance with the NSW State sing on data collection and flood behaviour analysis study forms the foundation for future flood risk in impact assessment of specific developments.

pment Control Plan/Engineering Specifications that:

noff flow rate and pollutant load should be controlled to creek bed and adversely affecting the ecology. he site should be controlled so as not to exceed ns.

Water Management for the site is that there is no net as ensuring the water quality is improved. This is lesign (WSUD) initiatives integrated across the site overall scheme is to utilise existing dams and adapting

plans to be submitted for all subdivision/ development se requirements will be achieved for future

sign/management is consistent with any approved assessed under the requirements of development ions, and other best practice guidelines, prior to

nat works are constructed in accordance with

to be provided prior to the issue of subdivision

Submission No		Matters Raised in Submission	Officer Comment
7	Object	 See letter. Key Takeaways from the letter: 1. Concerns over flood damage – The resident, living along Redbank Creek since 2009, has witnessed severe flash flooding during the March 2021 and March 2022 events. They highlight extensive property damage, including erosion, structural damage to fences, sheds, and homes, as well as debris accumulation caused by high water flows. While their own property was minimally affected, neighbours experienced significant damage, including lower-floor flooding and unsafe backyard conditions due to progressive erosion. 2. Impact of Redbank development – The resident expresses disappointment that the flood study does not acknowledge the link between the Redbank development and increased stormwater runoff into the creek. They believe that despite commitments to maintain pre-development flow levels, the development has significantly increased water volumes, contributing to worsening flash flooding. They criticise both the Redbank group and Hawkesbury Council for failing to manage and mitigate this impact. 3. Call for accountability & action – The email urges the council to take responsibility for addressing stormwater runoff from the development and to consider the ongoing risk posed by future housing expansions. The resident also raises concerns about declining property values due to flooding issues and requests that their submission be taken seriously as part of a broader complaint from affected residents. 	 The Redbank Creek Flood Study has been cond Government's Flood Prone Land Policy, focusing under the existing catchment conditions. This stu- management planning but does not include an in It is a requirement of the Hawkesbury Development. Following development, both the runoff avoid destabilising the downstream creed. The peak flow rates of runoff from the si- existing rates for all severity of storms. For the Redbank Development a condition of Wa increase of flows into Redbank Creek as well as undertaken through Water Sensitive Urban Desig through the open space network. Part of the over these facilities to become water body features. This is achieved through: Requiring stormwater management plan applications to demonstrate how these in development Ensuring that stormwater control design stormwater management plans, and ass control plans, engineering specifications approval Undertaking inspections to ensure that a approved designs Requiring Works-as-Executed plans to l certificates/occupation certificates.

nducted in accordance with the NSW State ing on data collection and flood behaviour analysis study forms the foundation for future flood risk impact assessment of specific developments.

ment Control Plan/Engineering Specifications that:

off flow rate and pollutant load should be controlled to reek bed and adversely affecting the ecology. e site should be controlled so as not to exceed s.

Water Management for the site is that there is no net as ensuring the water quality is improved. This is sign (WSUD) initiatives integrated across the site verall scheme is to utilise existing dams and adapting

lans to be submitted for all subdivision/ development e requirements will be achieved for future

ign/management is consistent with any approved assessed under the requirements of development ons, and other best practice guidelines, prior to

at works are constructed in accordance with

to be provided prior to the issue of subdivision