Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water

# What we heard report

# Coastal Floodplain Drainage Project Options Report

November 2024



# Acknowledgement of Country



Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water acknowledges the traditional custodians of the land and pays respect to Elders past, present and future.

We recognise Australian Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples' unique cultural and spiritual relationships to place and their rich contribution to society.

Artist and designer Nikita Ridgeway from Aboriginal design agency – Boss Lady Creative Designs, created the People and Community symbol.

What we heard report: Coastal Floodplain Drainage Project Options Report

Published by the Water Group in the NSW Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water

dcceew.nsw.gov.au

First published: November 2024

Department reference number: DOC24/185712

#### Acknowledgements

NSW Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure – Planning; NSW Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure – Crown Lands and Public Spaces; NSW Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water – Biodiversity, Conservation and Science Group; NSW Department of Primary Industries and Regional Development – Fisheries and Forestry

#### Copyright and disclaimer

© State of New South Wales through Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water 2024. Information contained in this publication is based on knowledge and understanding at the time of writing, July 2024, and is subject to change. For more information, please visit:

#### dcceew.nsw.gov.au/copyright

# Contents

Executive summary       5         Introduction       7         About this report       7         Background       7         How we consulted       8         Who we heard from       9         What we heard       11         Option 1: One-stop shop webpage       11         Description – Option 1       11         Option 2: Drainage applications coordinator       12         Description – Option 2       12         Stakeholder feedback – Option 2       12         Option 3: Concurrent assessment       13         Description – Option 3       13         Stakeholder feedback – Option 3       13         Option 4: Risk-based approach       14         Description – Option 4       14         Stakeholder feedback – Option 5       15         Description – Option 5       15         Option 5(i) – Implementing drainage work approvals only when/where drainage works are proposed       16         Description – Option 5(i)       16         Description – Option 5(i)       17	Acknowledgement of Country		ii
Introduction 7 About this report 7 Background 7 Background 7 How we consulted 8 Who we heard from 9 What we heard from 9 What we heard	Executive summary		5
About this report       7         Background       7         How we consulted       8         Who we heard from       9         What we heard       11         Option 1: One-stop shop webpage       11         Description – Option 1       11         Option 2: Drainage applications coordinator       12         Description – Option 2       12         Stakeholder feedback – Option 2       12         Option 3: Concurrent assessment       13         Description – Option 3       13         Stakeholder feedback – Option 3       13         Option 4: Risk-based approach       14         Description – Option 4       14         Stakeholder feedback – Option 4       14         Option 5: Drainage work approvals       15         Description - Option 5       15         Stakeholder feedback – Option 5       15         Option 5(i) – Implementing drainage work approvals only when/where drainage works are proposed       16         Description – Option 5(i)       16         Option 5(ii) – Implementing drainage work approvals for all existing and new works across the entire drainage network       17         Description – Option 5(ii)       17         Option 5(iii) – Implementing drainage work approvals for all exi	Introduction		7
Background       7         How we consulted       8         Who we heard from       9         What we heard       11         Option 1: One-stop shop webpage       11         Description - Option 1       11         Option 2: Drainage applications coordinator       12         Description - Option 2       12         Stakeholder feedback - Option 2       12         Option 3: Concurrent assessment       13         Description - Option 3       13         Stakeholder feedback - Option 3       13         Option 4: Risk-based approach       14         Description - Option 4       14         Stakeholder feedback - Option 5       15         Description - Option 5       15         Option 5(i) - Implementing drainage work approvals only when/where drainage works are proposed       16         Description - Option 5(i)       16         Option 5(ii) - Implementing drainage work approvals for all existing and new works across the entire drainage network       17         Description - Option 5(ii)       17         Sta	About this report		7
How we consulted       8         Who we heard from       9         What we heard       11         Option 1: One-stop shop webpage       11         Description - Option 1       11         Option 2: Drainage applications coordinator       12         Description - Option 2       12         Stakeholder feedback - Option 2       12         Option 3: Concurrent assessment       13         Description - Option 3       13         Stakeholder feedback - Option 3       13         Option 4: Risk-based approach       14         Description - Option 4       14         Stakeholder feedback - Option 4       14         Stakeholder feedback - Option 5       15         Description - Option 5       15         Stakeholder feedback - Option 5       15         Option 5(i) - Implementing drainage work approvals only when/where drainage works are         proposed       16         Description - Option 5(i)       16         Option 5(ii) - Implementing drainage work approvals for all existing and new works across the         entire drainage network       17	Background		7
Who we heard from       9         What we heard       11         Option 1: One-stop shop webpage       11         Description - Option 1       11         Option 2: Drainage applications coordinator       12         Description - Option 2       12         Stakeholder feedback - Option 2       12         Option 3: Concurrent assessment       13         Description - Option 3       13         Stakeholder feedback - Option 3       13         Option 4: Risk-based approach       14         Description - Option 4       14         Stakeholder feedback - Option 4       14         Stakeholder feedback - Option 5       15         Description - Option 5       15         Stakeholder feedback - Option 5       15         Option 5(i) - Implementing drainage work approvals only when/where drainage works are proposed       16         Description - Option 5(i)       16         Option 5(ii) - Implementing drainage work approvals for all existing and new works across the entire drainage network       17         Description - Option 5(ii)       17         Stakeholder feedback - Option 5(ii)	How we consulted		8
What we heard       11         Option 1: One-stop shop webpage       11         Description - Option 1       11         Option 2: Drainage applications coordinator       12         Description - Option 2       12         Stakeholder feedback - Option 2       12         Option 3: Concurrent assessment       13         Description - Option 3       13         Stakeholder feedback - Option 3       13         Option 4: Risk-based approach       14         Description - Option 4       14         Stakeholder feedback - Option 4       14         Description - Option 5       15         Stakeholder feedback - Option 5       15         Stakeholder feedback - Option 5       15         Option 5(i) - Implementing drainage work approvals only when/where drainage works are proposed       16         Description - Option 5(i)       16         Stakeholder feedback - Option 5(i)       16         Option 5(ii) - Implementing drainage work approvals for all existing and new works across the entire drainage network <td>Who we heard from</td> <td></td> <td>9</td>	Who we heard from		9
Option 1: One-stop shop webpage       11         Description - Option 1       11         Option 2: Drainage applications coordinator       12         Description - Option 2       12         Stakeholder feedback - Option 2       12         Option 3: Concurrent assessment       13         Description - Option 3       13         Stakeholder feedback - Option 3       13         Option 4: Risk-based approach       14         Description - Option 4       14         Stakeholder feedback - Option 4       14         Description - Option 5       15         Option 5: Drainage work approvals       15         Description - Option 5       15         Stakeholder feedback - Option 5       15         Stakeholder feedback - Option 5       15         Option 5(i) - Implementing drainage work approvals only when/where drainage works are proposed       16         Description - Option 5(i)       16         Stakeholder feedback - Option 5(i)       16         Option 5(ii) - Implementing drainage work approvals for all existing and new works across the entire drainage network       17         Description - Option 5(ii)       17         Stakeholder feedback - Option 5(ii)       17         Option 5(iii) - Implementing drainage work approvals for all exi	What we heard		11
Description - Option 1       11         Option 2: Drainage applications coordinator       12         Description - Option 2       12         Stakeholder feedback - Option 2       12         Option 3: Concurrent assessment       13         Description - Option 3       13         Stakeholder feedback - Option 3       13         Option 4: Risk-based approach       14         Description - Option 4       14         Stakeholder feedback - Option 4       14         Option 5: Drainage work approvals       15         Description - Option 5       15         Stakeholder feedback - Option 5       15         Option 5: Drainage work approvals       15         Description - Option 5       15         Stakeholder feedback - Option 5       15         Option 5(i) - Implementing drainage work approvals only when/where drainage works are proposed       16         Description - Option 5(i)       16         Stakeholder feedback - Option 5(i)       16         Option 5(ii) - Implementing drainage work approvals for all existing and new works across the entire drainage network       17         Description - Option 5(ii)       17         Stakeholder feedback - Option 5(ii)       17         Option 6: Further streamlining Fisheries and Crown Land approv	Option 1: One-stop shop web	opage	11
Option 2: Drainage applications coordinator       12         Description - Option 2       12         Stakeholder feedback - Option 2       12         Option 3: Concurrent assessment       13         Description - Option 3       13         Stakeholder feedback - Option 3       13         Option 4: Risk-based approach       14         Description - Option 4       14         Stakeholder feedback - Option 4       14         Option 5: Drainage work approvals       15         Description - Option 5       15         Stakeholder feedback - Option 5       15         Option 5(i) - Implementing drainage work approvals only when/where drainage works are proposed       16         Description - Option 5(i)       16         Option 5(ii) - Implementing drainage work approvals for all existing and new works across the entire drainage network       17         Description - Option 5(ii)       16         Option 5(ii) - Implementing drainage work approvals for all existing and new works across the entire drainage network       17         Description - Option 5(ii)       16         Option 5(ii) - Implementing drainage work approvals for all existing and new works across the entire drainage network       17         Description - Option 5(ii)       17         Stakeholder feedback - Option 5(ii)       17	Description – Option 1.		11
Description - Option 2       12         Stakeholder feedback - Option 2       12         Option 3: Concurrent assessment       13         Description - Option 3       13         Stakeholder feedback - Option 3       13         Option 4: Risk-based approach       14         Description - Option 4       14         Stakeholder feedback - Option 4       14         Option 5: Drainage work approvals       15         Description - Option 5       15         Stakeholder feedback - Option 5       15         Option 5(i) - Implementing drainage work approvals only when/where drainage works are proposed.       16         Description - Option 5(i)       16         Option 5(ii) - Implementing drainage work approvals for all existing and new works across the entire drainage network.       17         Description - Option 5(ii)       17         Stakeholder feedback - Option 5(i)       17         Option 5(ii) - Implementing drainage work approvals for all existing and new works across the entire drainage network.       17         Description - Option 5(ii)       17         Stakeholder feedback - Option 5(ii)       17         Stakeholder feedback - Option 5(ii)       17         Option 6: Further streamling Fisheries and Crown Land approvals through drainage work approvals.       18	Option 2: Drainage application	ons coordinator	12
Stakeholder feedback - Option 2       12         Option 3: Concurrent assessment       13         Description - Option 3       13         Stakeholder feedback - Option 3       13         Option 4: Risk-based approach       14         Description - Option 4       14         Stakeholder feedback - Option 4       14         Option 5: Drainage work approvals       15         Description - Option 5       15         Stakeholder feedback - Option 5       15         Option 5(i) - Implementing drainage work approvals only when/where drainage works are proposed       16         Description - Option 5(i)       16         Option 5(ii) - Implementing drainage work approvals only when/where drainage works are proposed       16         Description - Option 5(i)       16         Option 5(ii) - Implementing drainage work approvals only when/where drainage works across the entire drainage network       17         Description - Option 5(i)       16         Option 5(ii) - Implementing drainage work approvals for all existing and new works across the entire drainage network       17         Description - Option 5(ii)       17         Option 6: Further streamlining Fisheries and Crown Land approvals through drainage work approvals       18         Description - Option 5(ii)       18         Description - Option 5(ii	Description – Option 2		12
Option 3: Concurrent assessment       13         Description - Option 3       13         Stakeholder feedback - Option 3       13         Option 4: Risk-based approach       14         Description - Option 4       14         Description - Option 4       14         Stakeholder feedback - Option 4       14         Option 5: Drainage work approvals       15         Description - Option 5       15         Stakeholder feedback - Option 5       15         Option 5(i) - Implementing drainage work approvals only when/where drainage works are proposed       16         Description - Option 5(i)       16         Option 5(ii) - Implementing drainage work approvals only when/where drainage works are proposed       16         Description - Option 5(i)       16         Option 5(ii) - Implementing drainage work approvals only when/where drainage works across the entire drainage network       17         Description - Option 5(ii)       16         Option 5(ii) - Implementing drainage work approvals for all existing and new works across the entire drainage network       17         Description - Option 5(ii)       17         Option 6: Further streamlining Fisheries and Crown Land approvals through drainage work approvals       18         Description Option 6: Option 6       18	Stakeholder feedback	– Option 2	12
Description - Option 3       13         Stakeholder feedback - Option 3       13         Option 4: Risk-based approach       14         Description - Option 4       14         Description - Option 4       14         Stakeholder feedback - Option 4       14         Option 5: Drainage work approvals       15         Description - Option 5       15         Stakeholder feedback - Option 5       15         Option 5(i) - Implementing drainage work approvals only when/where drainage works are proposed       16         Description - Option 5(i)       16         Stakeholder feedback - Option 5(i)       16         Option 5(ii) - Implementing drainage work approvals for all existing and new works across the entire drainage network       17         Description - Option 5(ii)       17         Stakeholder feedback - Option 5(ii)       17         Option 5(ii) - Implementing drainage work approvals for all existing and new works across the entire drainage network       17         Description - Option 5(ii)       17         Option 6: Further streamlining Fisheries and Crown Land approvals through drainage work approvals       18         Description - Option 6       18	Option 3: Concurrent assess	ment	13
Stakeholder feedback - Option 3       13         Option 4: Risk-based approach       14         Description - Option 4       14         Stakeholder feedback - Option 4       14         Option 5: Drainage work approvals       15         Description - Option 5       15         Stakeholder feedback - Option 5       15         Description - Option 5       15         Stakeholder feedback - Option 5       15         Option 5(i) - Implementing drainage work approvals only when/where drainage works are proposed       16         Description - Option 5(i)       16         Stakeholder feedback - Option 5(i)       16         Option 5(ii) - Implementing drainage work approvals for all existing and new works across the entire drainage network       17         Description - Option 5(ii)       17         Description - Option 5(ii)       17         Option 6: Further streamlining Fisheries and Crown Land approvals through drainage work approvals       18         Description Option 6: Further streamlining Fisheries and Crown Land approvals through drainage work approvals       18	Description – Option 3		13
Option 4: Risk-based approach       14         Description – Option 4       14         Stakeholder feedback – Option 4       14         Option 5: Drainage work approvals       15         Description – Option 5       15         Stakeholder feedback – Option 5       15         Option 5(i) – Implementing drainage work approvals only when/where drainage works are proposed       16         Description – Option 5(i)       16         Description – Option 5(i)       16         Option 5(ii) – Implementing drainage work approvals or all existing and new works across the entire drainage network       17         Description – Option 5(ii)       17         Description – Option 5(ii)       17         Option 5(ii) – Implementing drainage work approvals for all existing and new works across the entire drainage network       17         Description – Option 5(ii)       17         Option 6: Further streamlining Fisheries and Crown Land approvals through drainage work approvals       18         Description 0: Option 6: Further streamlining Fisheries and Crown Land approvals through drainage work approvals       18	Stakeholder feedback	– Option 3	13
Description – Option 4.       14         Stakeholder feedback – Option 4.       14         Option 5: Drainage work approvals.       15         Description – Option 5.       15         Stakeholder feedback – Option 5.       15         Option 5(i) – Implementing drainage work approvals only when/where drainage works are proposed.       16         Description – Option 5(i)       16         Stakeholder feedback – Option 5(i)       16         Option 5(ii) – Implementing drainage work approvals for all existing and new works across the entire drainage network.       17         Description – Option 5(ii)       17         Stakeholder feedback – Option 5(ii)       17         Option 5(ii) – Implementing drainage work approvals for all existing and new works across the entire drainage network.       17         Description – Option 5(ii)       17         Stakeholder feedback – Option 5(ii)       17         Option 6: Further streamlining Fisheries and Crown Land approvals through drainage work approvals.       18         Description Option 6:       18	Option 4: Risk-based approa	ach	14
Stakeholder feedback - Option 4       14         Option 5: Drainage work approvals       15         Description - Option 5       15         Stakeholder feedback - Option 5       15         Option 5(i) - Implementing drainage work approvals only when/where drainage works are proposed.       16         Description - Option 5(i)       16         Description - Option 5(i)       16         Option 5(ii) - Implementing drainage work approvals for all existing and new works across the entire drainage network       17         Description - Option 5(ii)       17         Stakeholder feedback - Option 5(ii)       17         Option 5(ii) - Implementing drainage work approvals for all existing and new works across the entire drainage network       17         Description - Option 5(ii)       17         Option 6: Further streamlining Fisheries and Crown Land approvals through drainage work approvals       18         Description Ontion 6       18	Description – Option 4		14
Option 5: Drainage work approvals.       15         Description - Option 5       15         Stakeholder feedback - Option 5       15         Option 5(i) - Implementing drainage work approvals only when/where drainage works are proposed.       16         Description - Option 5(i)       16         Stakeholder feedback - Option 5(i)       16         Option 5(ii) - Implementing drainage work approvals for all existing and new works across the entire drainage network.       17         Description - Option 5(ii)       17         Stakeholder feedback - Option 5(ii)       17         Option 6: Further streamlining Fisheries and Crown Land approvals through drainage work approvals.       18         Description - Option 6       18	Stakeholder feedback	– Option 4	14
Description – Option 5.       15         Stakeholder feedback – Option 5.       15         Option 5(i) – Implementing drainage work approvals only when/where drainage works are proposed.       16         Description – Option 5(i)       16         Stakeholder feedback – Option 5(i)       16         Option 5(ii) – Implementing drainage work approvals for all existing and new works across the entire drainage network.       17         Description – Option 5(ii)       17         Description – Option 5(ii)       17         Option 6: Further streamlining Fisheries and Crown Land approvals through drainage work approvals.       18         Description – Option 6       18	Option 5: Drainage work app	provals	15
Stakeholder feedback – Option 5       15         Option 5(i) – Implementing drainage work approvals only when/where drainage works are proposed.       16         Description – Option 5(i)       16         Stakeholder feedback – Option 5(i)       16         Option 5(ii) – Implementing drainage work approvals for all existing and new works across the entire drainage network       17         Description – Option 5(ii)       17         Description – Option 5(ii)       17         Option 6: Further streamlining Fisheries and Crown Land approvals through drainage work approvals       18         Description 0 option 6       18	Description – Option 5		15
Option 5(i) - Implementing drainage work approvals only when/where drainage works are proposed	Stakeholder feedback	– Option 5	15
Description – Option 5(i)	Option 5(i) – Implementing c proposed	drainage work approvals only when/where drainage works are	16
Stakeholder feedback – Option 5(i)	Description – Option 5	(i)	16
Option 5(ii) – Implementing drainage work approvals for all existing and new works across the entire drainage network       17         Description – Option 5(ii)       17         Stakeholder feedback – Option 5(ii)       17         Option 6: Further streamlining Fisheries and Crown Land approvals through drainage work approvals       18         Description – Option 6       18	Stakeholder feedback	– Option 5(i)	16
Description – Option 5(ii)	Option 5(ii) – Implementing ( entire drainage netwo	drainage work approvals for all existing and new works across t rk	the 17
Stakeholder feedback – Option 5(ii)	Description – Option 5	(ii)	17
Option 6: Further streamlining Fisheries and Crown Land approvals through drainage work approvals	Stakeholder feedback	– Option 5(ii)	17
Description Option 6	Option 6: Further streamlinin approvals	ng Fisheries and Crown Land approvals through drainage work	18
Description – Option o	Description – Option 6		18

Stakeholder feedback – Option 6	18
Opinions on which option/s address the project objectives	19
Opinions on which option/s reduce approvals complexity, time and cost	19
Opinions on which option/s improve water quality	20
Key issues and suggestions	21
Land use and water quality	21
Responsibility and funding for drainage infrastructure	
Regulatory requirements	
Compliance	23
Northern Rivers' Agricultural Drainage Review	23
Next steps	24

## **Executive summary**

The Coastal Floodplain Drainage Project commenced in 2019 and is one of several Marine Estate Management Strategy (MEMS) projects aiming to deliver healthy coastal habitats with sustainable use and development. The objectives of the project are to improve the regulatory framework for coastal agricultural drainage works and activities by:

- addressing the complexity, time and costs associated with the approvals process
- reducing the impact of these works and activities on downstream water quality, aquatic ecosystems, communities and industries.

The project is delivered by a NSW Government interagency working group, led by the Water Group in the NSW Department of Climate Change, Energy, Environment and Water, with representatives from:

- NSW Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure:
  - Planning
  - Crown Lands and Public Spaces
- NSW Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water Biodiversity Conservation and Science Group
- NSW Department of Primary Industries and Regional Development Fisheries and Forestry.

From 2020 to 2021, the interagency working group undertook targeted stakeholder consultation focused on hearing the key issues related to the regulation of water quality and the complexity of the regulatory framework for coastal floodplain drainage. This consultation informed the development of the Coastal Floodplain Drainage Project Options Report (the Options Report).

The Options Report was published in December 2023. It describes improvements to the approval process that have already occurred and proposes six options to address the project's objectives. The six options are:

- Option 1: one-stop shop webpage
- Option 2: drainage applications coordinator
- Option 3: concurrent assessment
- Option 4: risk-based approach
- Option 5: drainage work approvals under the Water Management Act 2000
- **Option 6:** streamlining of Fisheries and Crown land approvals through the use of drainage work approvals.

In 2024, the interagency working group publicly consulted on the Options Report to seek feedback on the level of support for implementing any one or a combination of the proposed options. This What we heard report details the feedback we received during the consultation period from 19 February to 21 April 2024.

Community and stakeholder feedback provided diverse views on the project's six options, with Options 1 and 2 receiving the most support.

Several other issues and/or suggestions as alternatives to, or in addition to the proposed options were also raised in the feedback, including:

- opposing views on approvals: some suggested that no approvals should be required for maintenance of drainage infrastructure, while others opposed streamlining of approvals or requested strengthening of regulations
- the view that genuine improvements to water quality would require modification of the existing drainage network
- a need for strategic guidance on long-term coastal floodplain management, including allocating responsibility and funding for maintaining drainage infrastructure, consideration of sea level rise, land use and land management practices.
- support for the Northern Rivers' Agricultural Drainage Review.

The project's working group is considering all feedback, which will inform recommendations to the NSW Government.

# Introduction

## About this report

This report provides an overview of community and stakeholder feedback on the Options Report, received during the consultation period 19 February to 21 April 2024. The purpose of this document is to provide the community with an understanding of the diverse range of feedback we received on the issues and the possible options for reform to address the project's objectives. It also aims to assure the community and stakeholders that we have heard the concerns and issues they raised in their feedback.

This report consists of:

- an overview of the engagement process and participation by stakeholders
- a summary of key feedback on the Options Report, including responses to each option proposed to improve the regulatory framework for coastal agricultural drainage works
- other coastal floodplain drainage concerns raised by stakeholders
- next steps for the project.

Publication of the Options Report coincided with the release of the <u>Northern Rivers' Agricultural</u> <u>Drainage Review</u>, prepared by Mr John Culleton. These two reports have different objectives and scope, though both aim to address coastal floodplain drainage issues. This report also includes information heard from stakeholders about the Northern Rivers' Agricultural Drainage Review.

## Background

The NSW Government is committed to improving the regulatory framework and water quality impacts associated with coastal floodplain drainage.

The <u>Coastal Floodplain Drainage Project Options Report</u> lays out six options for reform to address the complexity, time and costs involved with the approvals process, and reduce the impact of agricultural drainage works on downstream water quality, aquatic ecosystems, communities and industries.

Each of the options could be implemented independently (except for Option 6) or in combination with others.

The options are evidence-based and take account of social, cultural, economic and environmental interests, including a range of stakeholder views expressed during consultation in 2020 and 2021.

The project's focus is NSW coastal floodplains with extensive agricultural drainage systems, including the Tweed, Richmond, Clarence, Macleay, Hastings, Manning and Shoalhaven rivers. The outcomes, in terms of any changes to the regulatory framework, could apply to all coastal areas of NSW where drainage works exist.

## How we consulted

The Options Report was published on the Water Group's <u>Coastal Floodplain Drainage Project</u> website on 18 December 2023. It was accompanied by an <u>Attachments paper</u> with supporting information about the management of coastal floodplains. The publication was shared on the NSW Marine Estate website and to a broad range of stakeholders via email and e-newsletters.

Public consultation on the Options Report ran from 19 February to 21 April 2024. It was promoted in print, radio, social media and by email to the Water Group's e-newsletter subscribers, MEMS's newsletter subscribers and peak organisations.

The consultation process provided a range of engagement opportunities, including:

- public webinars
- stakeholder meetings
- an online survey
- written submissions.

Figure 1 provides an overview of engagement statistics during the consultation period.

Figure 1: Overview of engagement statistics during the consultation period



## Who we heard from

We received 197 survey responses and 13 submissions (one photo and 12 written submissions). Seven of the submissions were provided by organisations or individuals who also completed the survey.

Respondents included both individuals and organisations, with many of them identifying with more than one stakeholder group. The types of stakeholders included:

- Consultant environmental and horticultural
- Environmental organisation
- Farmer including dairy, grazing, macadamia, sugar cane, oyster
- First Nations organisation
- Fishers commercial and recreational
- Industry and interest groups drainage union, cane growers, oyster farming, commercial fishers, recreational fishers, and boating
- Local Aboriginal community member
- Local community member
- Local government
- Tourism.

Respondents were largely coastal, from the state's far north coast down to the far south. The majority were from the Northern Rivers region.

Figure 2 shows the local government areas of survey respondents, noting that 10.7% of respondents falling under 'other' are from parts of the Northern Rivers, Nambucca, Port Macquarie, Hunter region, Central Coast, Sydney, Bega Valley, whole coast and other parts of NSW and southern Queensland.





# What we heard

This section provides a brief description of the project's six options and what we heard from stakeholders about these options. It also records other stakeholder feedback on coastal floodplain drainage management and coastal floodplains in general.

## Option 1: One-stop shop webpage

## **Description – Option 1**

Option 1 proposes establishing a one-stop shop webpage. This would provide a single source of information on the various approvals that may be required by government agencies for coastal floodplain drainage works. This one-stop shop webpage could include:

- an overview of different types of approvals
- a checklist to help applicants identify the required approvals
- guidance on the application process across agencies and the sequence of submission
- a list of information needed to apply for various approvals under different legislation
- links to guidance material and best practice management resources
- guidance on planning approvals.

#### Stakeholder feedback – Option 1

Survey results indicated support for this option (Figure 3) with 47% of respondents 'strongly' or 'somewhat' supportive, compared with 30% who were strongly or somewhat opposed.

Some commented that this option is simple, practical, fast and cuts red-tape, and could reduce frustration in having to deal with multiple agencies. It was also stated that Option 1 would provide information efficiently and is the least complicated of the proposed options.

Most of the environmental organisations and an oyster farming industry group expressed support for this option. Some other stakeholders felt this option did not provide value as they were already aware of the types of information and approvals required of them. However, during the public consultation it was apparent that knowledge gaps exist and help may be required to improve understanding of the approvals framework.



## Option 2: Drainage applications coordinator

## **Description – Option 2**

Option 2 proposes establishing a drainage applications coordinator, who would be a central contact point for coastal floodplain drainage stakeholders. Their role would include providing guidance on the application process for approvals from various NSW government agencies and local councils, making it easier and quicker for applicants to apply for required approvals. The assistance would not include legal advice or guarantee that approvals will be granted. All applications would be assessed under relevant legislative requirements.

### Stakeholder feedback – Option 2

Survey responses to Option 2 were mixed (Figure 4). Although over a third of respondents (35.5%) were opposed to this option, the overall sentiment was supportive, with more than 45% indicating that they strongly support, or somewhat support this option.

Some respondents considered that this option would benefit those who find the application process overly complex or difficult to navigate or are unable to obtain consistent and timely feedback from government agencies. Some saw value in having a single point of expertise, including being able to speak to someone with an awareness of relevant requirements and who could assist with questions and coordination of information.

An oyster farming industry group noted that the improved access to information from this option (and Option 1 and 3) should contribute to less unauthorised works. Some environmental organisations also supported this option as it would pose a low risk to the environment.

Most of the survey respondents (about 74%) who supported Option 2 also supported Option 1.



## **Option 3: Concurrent assessment**

## **Description – Option 3**

Option 3 proposes consolidating the information required for multiple approvals into an integrated application, to allow for concurrent assessment by relevant authorities and reduced timeframes. Applications could be expedited as the required information and assessment could occur as part of the integrated development process.

## Stakeholder feedback – Option 3

Responses to this option were mixed (Figure 5). More than double the number of respondents 'strongly opposed' this option, compared to 'strongly supported' (64, to 30 respectively). However, 72 respondents (more than a third) 'strongly' or 'somewhat' supported this option.

A local government and a cane growers industry group stated this option provided no value to them as it did not address their issue with being required to obtain specific approvals or being able to do drainage works in specific areas.

Some environmental organisations supported Option 3, seeing it as a common-sense option with low environmental risk.



## Option 4: Risk-based approach

#### **Description – Option 4**

Option 4 proposes to categorise coastal floodplain drainage works and areas into low-risk, medium-risk, and high-risk. The level of risk would determine:

- the information required from applicants
- the degree of assessment by the approval authority, and
- the conditions applied to approvals.

The risk-based approach for approvals would help applicants better understand the impacts of proposed works and how to reduce, mitigate or eliminate those impacts. This approach should better coordinate the administrative process for applicants and agencies.

### Stakeholder feedback – Option 4

Responses to this option were mixed (Figure 6). Almost an equal number of respondents expressed a level of support for this option (total of 81, with 22.3 % 'strong' and 18.8 % 'somewhat') to those that were opposed (total of 80, with 7.6 % 'somewhat opposed' and 33% 'strongly opposed).

Some respondents believed that Option 4 would provide transparency and quicker assessments. An environmental organisation supported a strengthened version of Option 4 that would automatically disallow approvals with high or extreme risk of polluting the water.

However, some respondents expressed concern that it would not provide efficiency and could allow for environmental regulations to be minimised or ignored. A local government considered that it adds to regulatory complexity. A cane growers industry group suggested an alternative risk-based approach, based on a publication from the NSW Canegrowers' Association titled *Streamlining* 

*Procedures for Regular Maintenance of Drain Outlets in Northern NSW ... a proposal* (2018). Two environmental organisations opposed the option, with one stating that there is insufficient spatial data to implement it.

Figure 6: Feedback on Option 4: Risk-based approach for approvals



## Option 5: Drainage work approvals

### **Description – Option 5**

The Water Management Act 2000 has provisions for landholders to obtain a drainage work approval for constructing and using drainage works. These provisions are currently inactive. If activated, the drainage work approval would replace the need for a controlled activity approval in areas where a 'drainage work' is the most suitable approval type. This approval could apply to all floodplain drainage infrastructure and provide a fit-for-purpose approval that could address water quality impacts.

Public authorities are exempt from needing to hold a controlled activity approval. Options for public authorities for drainage work approvals could include:

- requiring them to hold a drainage work approval
- giving them a conditional exemption, or
- exempting them altogether.

Exemptions for low-risk activities could be applied to private landholders and public authorities.

### Stakeholder feedback – Option 5

A number of survey respondents said that drainage work approvals could protect water quality and aquatic habitat. Multiple respondents thought that in combination with other options, drainage work approvals could simplify the approvals process. An environmental organisation believed that both

Option 5(i) and Option 5(ii) could reverse the worst drainage infrastructure if the approval imposed extra conditions on existing drains.

Several respondents opposed Option 5, including a local government and a cane growers industry group, who considered it would be an additional regulatory burden. The cane growers industry group was concerned that drainage work approvals would impact their industry's ability to self-regulate, as currently allowed.

Other respondents expressed concerns about potential exemptions for public authorities from holding a drainage work approval.

# Option 5(i) – Implementing drainage work approvals only when/where drainage works are proposed

## Description – Option 5(i)

Option 5(i) proposes to implement drainage work approvals only when and where works are proposed, including maintenance or modification of existing drainage infrastructure and construction of new infrastructure. Option 5(i) could potentially achieve water quality improvements.

## Stakeholder feedback – Option 5(i)

Responses to this option were mixed (Figure 7), but overall sentiment was largely opposed ('strongly' and 'somewhat' combined 43.1 %). There were limited comments from respondents specific only to Option 5(i). One survey respondent thought Option 5(i) would require the least resources and cost and would be politically acceptable, noting that regulating older developments (as alternatively proposed in Option 5(ii)) would be very difficult.

Figure 7: Feedback on Option 5(i): Drainage work approvals only when and where works are proposed



# Option 5(ii) – Implementing drainage work approvals for all existing and new works across the entire drainage network

## **Description – Option 5(ii)**

Option 5(ii) proposes to implement drainage work approvals across the entire drainage network for existing drainage infrastructure and the construction of new drainage infrastructure. This option would likely achieve greater improvements to water quality than Option 5(i) because it considers the whole drainage system.

## Stakeholder feedback – Option 5(ii)

Survey responses to Option 5(ii) were mixed (Figure 8), with overall sentiment being close to neutral. The level of support ('strong' and 'somewhat' combined 39.1%) was equal to the level of opposition ('strong' and 'somewhat' combined 39.0%).

Multiple respondents believed it provides a strategic, catchment-wide way to address water quality impacts, in a consistent and efficient way, as it applies the same process to all works. Others said that in combination with other options, Option 5(ii) could streamline the approvals process. Some respondents also said that this option would lower costs and time involved for decision-making, with one noting that this would occur in the long term.

An oyster farming industry group strongly supported Option 5(ii) asserting it provides a holistic approach to drainage management and would deliver significant water quality benefits.

Environmental organisations were split on this option. Some supported it, with one noting that it allows for the identification and decommissioning of non-functioning drainage infrastructure. Another expressed uncertainty about how it would improve water quality and thought that the current lack of enabling regulation may make it the hardest option to implement in the near future. Several environmental organisations considered that public authorities should be required to hold a drainage work approval.





# Option 6: Further streamlining Fisheries and Crown Land approvals through drainage work approvals

## **Description – Option 6**

Option 6 proposes to further streamline Fisheries and Crown Lands approvals and is only possible alongside the implementation of Option 5 (drainage work approvals). Drainage work approvals consider water quality at a drainage network or sub-catchment level. This would provide greater certainty for Fisheries and Crown Lands that environmental impacts have been considered and appropriate conditions applied, supporting quicker assessments of applications lodged with them.

## Stakeholder feedback – Option 6

Survey responses to this option were mixed (Figure 9), with strong opposition (32.5 %) being higher than strong support (23.4 %). However, 83 respondents (more than 42%) 'strongly' or 'somewhat' supported this option.

Some respondents thought it was the most effective way to address approvals complexity, time and cost and provides a holistic way to manage the impact of specific works on the whole catchment. It was also asserted that this option would provide certainty in dealing with environmental issues.

However, Option 6 was not supported by some local governments, as it was believed to add to complexity. Some environmental organisations also did not support this option as they were opposed to further streamlining.





## Opinions on which option/s address the project objectives

The survey asked respondents for their opinion on which option/s address the project objectives. Specifically, they were asked two questions:

- In your opinion, which option/s will reduce approvals complexity, time and cost?
- In your opinion, which option/s will improve water quality?

Respondents were then asked to provide reason/s for their choice. Summaries of survey responses, together with opinions expressed in written submissions, are provided below.

#### Opinions on which option/s reduce approvals complexity, time and cost

Two-thirds of survey respondents (130 responses from a total of 197 or 66%) considered that one or more of the options proposed by the coastal floodplain drainage project would reduce approvals complexity, time and cost. Respondents provided many reasons why they thought the project's options would reach this objective. Some of these comments are included above, under the relevant option heading.

The survey question allowed for a high number of different outputs. Overall, responses were highly variable, and did not produce a stand-out option or combination of options. The top response was that none (22.8%) of the project's options would reduce approvals complexity, time and cost, and the second highest was 'not sure' (11.2%) (Table 1). The reasons for selecting 'none' and 'not sure' are summarised in this section.

Table 1: Top 2 responses (by number) to the survey question 'In your opinion, which option/s will reduce approvals complexity, time and cost?'

Response	Number of responses	% of total responses
None	45	22.8
Not sure	22	11.2

Many of the respondents felt that none of the options reduced red tape, with some stating that no options streamlined approvals for drainage works in coastal wetlands, key fish habitat, acid sulfate soil areas and areas with mangroves. Some local governments said that the options provided little value and added regulatory complexity.

A number of respondents considered that the options do not reduce application costs or speed up approvals, while others were broadly concerned with over-regulation and imposition of cost by government.

Some believed that maintenance of existing drainage infrastructure should not require approvals, citing reasons such as landholder responsibility to maintain drainage, competent management of waterways by farmers, and government abandonment of infrastructure. Others were concerned that the options do not address funding required for maintenance of drainage infrastructure.

Some respondents said that streamlining or continuing to provide approvals for drainage works perpetuates environmental problems, including water pollution. Several felt that drainage infrastructure should be removed, and floodplains allowed to operate naturally. Concerns were also raised about overdevelopment of the floodplains. Others stated that none of the options would stop floods and/or were concerned about flood mitigation.

Some agricultural stakeholders felt that no option provides benefits to agriculture or said that the lack of representation from the Department of Primary Industries and Regional Development – Agriculture & Biodiversity on the project's working group resulted in unbalanced options. A number of agricultural stakeholders chose 'none' because they wanted the Northern Rivers' Agricultural Drainage Review to be implemented instead.

A First Nations organisation raised concerns about consultation with Aboriginal people and a lack of acknowledgement of the importance of the area to them. An environmental organisation was also concerned that agricultural stakeholders have driven the project and considered that environmental stakeholders have been excluded from development of the options.

### Opinions on which option/s improve water quality

More than half of the survey respondents (115 responses from a total of 197, or 58.4%) considered that one or more of the options proposed by the coastal floodplain drainage project would improve water quality. Respondents provided many reasons why they thought the project's options would reach this objective. Some of these comments are included above, under the relevant option heading.

The survey question allowed for a high number of different outputs. Overall, responses were highly variable, and did not produce a stand-out option or combination of options. The top response was that none (32.5%) of the project's options would improve water quality, and the second highest was 'not sure' (9.1%) (Table 2). The reasons for selecting 'none' and 'not sure' are summarised in this section.

Table 2: Top 2 responses (by number of responses) to the survey question 'In your opinion, which option/s will improve water quality?

Response	Number of responses	% of total responses
None	64	32.5
Not sure	18	9.1

Multiple respondents considered that the options would not improve water quality nor address the causes of poor water quality. Others thought that water quality cannot improve where there are drainage systems or that the options allow the continuation of water pollution, asserting that the government should be filling in the drains.

While some respondents said that drainage infrastructure and creeks should be cleared, or the lower estuary dredged, others considered that water quality and ecosystem health would only be improved by restoration of natural flow. Some respondents were concerned that controlling nature or disturbing the land would have repercussions.

Others suggested alternative, long-term solutions such as incorporating natural ecosystem cycles into land management practices or stated that landholders should be compensated to revegetate their land, which would improve water quality. Some were more concerned about flooding or over-development of floodplains, whilst others asserted that the options do not provide economic or environmental benefit to agriculture or the waterways. One agricultural stakeholder considered that food production should be supported, and a number of respondents endorsed the recommendations of the Northern Rivers' Agricultural Drainage Review.

## Key issues and suggestions

Several issues and/or suggestions were raised in stakeholder meetings and written submissions as alternatives to, or in addition to the proposed options. These issues are categorised and described below.

#### Land use and water quality

In written submissions, a diverse range of stakeholders including local government, a farmer, an environmental consultant and environmental organisations, raised issues related to coastal floodplains. Together, their overall message suggested that there should be a NSW Government position on land use and drainage infrastructure in coastal floodplains – with a consideration of how this is impacted by sea level rise.

Suggestions or requests included:

- removal of drainage infrastructure that poses greatest negative risk to water quality (acid sulfate and blackwater)
- redesign of a drainage system that considers sea level rise and incorporates water detention and management
- restoration of wetlands
- the need to incorporate the values and views of First Nations / Traditional Owners into any review or on-ground response

• managing the impact on agricultural land and productivity.

Similarly, a number of survey respondents variously noted their concerns for:

- climate change and sea level rise
- floodplain development in general
- overhaul of drainage infrastructure to improve water quality
- concern that the continuation of drainage works is environmentally irresponsible
- conserving and restoring wetlands
- erosion and sedimentation, with some wanting rivers to be dredged
- concern about other pollutants, e.g., pesticides, fertilisers, sewage
- flooding and flood mitigation
- support for farmers and local food production.

#### Responsibility and funding for drainage infrastructure

During a stakeholder meeting, a cane growers industry group requested that government maintain and/or reassume responsibility for relevant drains and floodgates.

Some survey respondents were also concerned about:

- lack of responsibility for drainage infrastructure, with one requesting that local government be responsible for maintaining all floodgates, on both public and private land
- lack of funding to maintain drainage infrastructure.

#### **Regulatory requirements**

The following issues were variously raised in written submissions and a stakeholder meeting:

- Two local governments requested that they not be required to obtain Fisheries and Crown lands approvals for the maintenance or repair of public infrastructure.
- A cane growers industry group requested or suggested:
  - the removal of the requirement for designated development applications for maintenance on drainage infrastructure in coastal wetlands mapped under the State Environmental Planning Policy (Resilience and Hazards) 2021
  - implementation of their best practice self-regulation framework across the state and applicable to all relevant industries/land uses
  - "one agency and one approval" approach to assist local government in their maintenance of drainage infrastructure.
- An environmental organisation suggested that the approvals process for restoration of coastal wetlands should be simplified to only require a Review of Environmental Factors (REF) through the *State Environmental Planning Policy (Hazards and Resilience) 2021.*
- Two environmental organisations and an oyster farming industry group suggested strengthening legislation, variously requesting:

- removal of exemption from development consent under local environmental plans for agriculture works carried out in accordance with a drainage management plan endorsed by the Sugar Milling Cooperative (that is, sugar cane growers)
- no exemptions from approvals for public authorities.
- An environmental organisation suggested that any approval of drainage works should be assessed by locally-based officers with technical and local site knowledge instead of a centralised or standardised departmental process.

Similarly, some survey respondents variously suggested the following:

- Maintenance of existing drainage infrastructure should be considered as pre-approved, requiring no further approvals and/or with a notification process
- Government should be focused on protection of the environment rather than streamlining the regulatory framework
- A preference for education and monetary incentives rather than regulation.

## Compliance

The following issues were raised in written submissions:

- an oyster farming industry group said that approval conditions should include clear penalties for non-compliance
- an environmental organisation suggested increased compliance enforcement should be done by local government.

A number of survey respondents were also concerned about unauthorised drainage works and a lack of compliance enforcement, with one respondent suggesting the use of an environmental levy or bond to ensure compliance with conditions.

### Northern Rivers' Agricultural Drainage Review

The Northern Rivers' Agricultural Drainage Review (also known as the 'Culleton Report') was released on 20 December 2023. This independent review was commissioned by the previous government following the 2022 northern NSW floods.

The Culleton Report and the Coastal Floodplain Drainage Project have different objectives and scope, though both aim to address coastal floodplain drainage issues.

Five of the 12 written submissions referred to or indicated their preference for the Culleton Report, with some expressing disappointment that the Options Report did not consider or incorporate the Culleton Report's recommendations. Most of these five submissions were from local government. During a stakeholder meeting, a cane growers industry group also endorsed the Culleton Report and enquired about the status of the Northern Rivers Drainage Reset Program, which provides \$5 million funding for maintenance of agricultural drainage infrastructure in the region.

Twelve of the 197 survey respondents (6.1%) supported the Culleton Report. The majority of these 12 respondents were farmers. Ten rejected all of the Coastal Floodplain Drainage Project's options, while two supported both the Culleton Report and one or more of the project's six options.

## Next steps

During the consultation period, stakeholders provided diverse viewpoints on the Coastal Floodplain Drainage Project's Options Report and broadly, other key concerns related to coastal floodplain drainage, coastal floodplain land use and water quality. The project's working group is considering all feedback, which will inform the final recommendations to present to the NSW Government.

To stay in touch with the Coastal Floodplain Drainage Project and other Water updates, <u>subscribe to</u> our Water monthly news and Have Your Say notifications.