WATER TECHNOLOGY
WATER, COASTAL & ENVIRONMENTAL CONSULTANTS

Response to Submissions for Public Exhibition

Hawkesbury-Nepean River System Coastal Management Program

HNRS CMP Steering Committee

12 October 2026



Document Status

Version	Doc type	Reviewed by	Approved by	Date issued
V01	Draft Report	CJB	CJB	25.06.2025
V02	Updated Report	CJB	CJB	26.08.2026
V03	Final Report	CJB	CJB	12.10.2026

Project Details

Project Name	Hawkesbury-Nepean River System Coastal Management Program
Client	HNRS CMP Steering Committee
Client Project Manager	Ana Rubio
Water Technology Project Manager	Christopher Beadle
Water Technology Project Director	Neil Dufty
Authors	Christopher Beadle
Document Number	24050036_R06_V02_RTS_Report

COPYRIGHT

Water Technology Pty Ltd has produced this document in accordance with instructions from HNRS CMP Steering Committee for their use only. The concepts and information contained in this document are the copyright of Water Technology Pty Ltd. Use or copying of this document in whole or in part without written permission of Water Technology Pty Ltd constitutes an infringement of copyright.

Water Technology Pty Ltd does not warrant this document is definitive nor free from error and does not accept liability for any loss caused, or arising from, reliance upon the information provided herein.

Suite 3, Level 1, 20 Wentworth Street
Parramatta NSW 2150
Telephone (02) 9354 0300
ACN 093 377 283
ABN 60 093 377 283

CONTENTS

1 INTRODUCTION 3
1.1 Purpose of this Report 3
1.2 Public Exhibition 3
1.3 How Submissions have been Considered 4
1.4 Report Structure 4
2 PUBLIC EXHIBITION DETAILS FOR THE CMP 5
2.1 Public Exhibition Period 5
2.2 Public Exhibition Methods 5
2.3 Summary of Submissions Received 6
3 SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED 7
3.1 Overview 7
3.2 Overarching Themes 7
3.3 Locations of Interest 8
3.4 Key Place-Based Issues 9
3.5 Other Notable Themes 10
4 RESPONSE TO SUBMISSIONS 11
4.1 Response Approach 11
4.2 Response to Key Themes 11
5 SUMMARY OF CMP UPDATES 14
5.1 Overview 14
5.2 CMP Action Updates 14
5.3 Matters for Future Implementation 19
5.4 Matters not resulting in CMP changes 19
6 NEXT STEPS 21

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2-1 Public Exhibition Engagement Portals 5
Table 2-2 Total Submissions Received 6
Table 3-1 Summary of submissions by CMP strategy theme 7
Table 3-2 Summary of submissions by location of interest 8
Table 4-1 Response to key submission themes 11
Table 5-1 Summary of CMP updates by action 15
Table 5-2 General document updates 19

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Purpose of this Report

This Response to Submissions Report has been prepared to document and respond to feedback received during public exhibition of the Draft Hawkesbury-Nepean River System (HNRS) Coastal Management Program (CMP).

The purpose of this report is to:

- summarise the key matters raised in submissions;
- explain how submissions have been considered;
- identify the changes made to the CMP in response to submissions; and
- provide a transparent record of the feedback received and the response to that feedback.

This report should be read alongside the final CMP. It does not repeat the full technical basis, risk assessment or action development process set out in the CMP and supporting studies. Rather, it focuses on the issues raised during public exhibition and how those issues have informed finalisation of the CMP.

1.2 Public Exhibition

1.2.1 Legislative Requirements

The *Coastal Management Act 2016* (CM Act) requires local councils to consult with the community and stakeholders before adopting a Coastal Management Program (CMP). Section 16 of the CM Act requires that:

> *(1) Before adopting a coastal management program, a local council must consult on the draft program with:*
>
> > *(a) the community, and*
> >
> > *(b) if the local council's local government area contains: (i) land within the coastal vulnerability area, any local council whose local government area contains land within the same coastal sediment compartment, and (ii) an estuary that is within 2 or more local government areas, the other local councils, and*
> >
> > *(c) other public authorities if the coastal management program: (i) proposes actions or activities to be carried out by that public authority, or (ii) proposes specific emergency actions or activities to be carried out by a public authority under the coastal zone emergency action subplan, or (iii) relates to, affects or impacts on any land or assets owned or managed by that public authority.*
>
> *(2) Consultation under this section is to be undertaken in accordance with the relevant provisions of the coastal management manual.*
>
> *(3) A failure to comply with this section does not invalidate a coastal management program.*

Part A of the NSW Coastal Management Manual (CM Manual) includes statutory provisions and mandatory requirements relating to community and stakeholder engagement. These provisions and requirements include:

> *A draft CMP must be exhibited for public inspection at the main offices of the councils of all local government areas within the area to which the CMP applies, during the ordinary hours of those*

offices, for a period of not less than 28 calendar days before it is adopted. This mandatory requirement does not prevent community consultation, or other consultation, in other ways.

1.2.2 Public Exhibition Process

The Draft CMP was placed on public exhibition to provide the community, agencies, organisations, landholders and other stakeholders with an opportunity to review the proposed management framework and provide feedback.

Submissions were received from a range of stakeholders, including private residents, community associations, environmental groups, government agencies, commercial waterway users and other interested parties. Feedback included both broad support for the CMP and requests for changes, clarification or additional focus on particular locations, issues or actions.

The matters raised were diverse, reflecting the size and complexity of the Hawkesbury-Nepean River System and the different ways in which communities use, value and interact with the coast, estuary and foreshore.

1.3 How Submissions have been Considered

All submissions received during public exhibition have been reviewed and considered. Where relevant, submissions have been grouped by theme to support a clear and consistent response. This approach recognises that many submissions raised similar issues, coastal hazards mapping, waterway health, water quality, ecological protection, foreshore access, recreational use and CMP implementation responsibilities.

The response to submissions considered whether the matters raised:

- were already addressed by the Draft CMP;
- required clarification in the CMP;
- required a change to an action, mapping, supporting text or implementation note;
- were more appropriately addressed through future implementation, detailed design, further investigation or a separate approval process; or
- fell outside the scope of the CMP.

Not all submissions have resulted in changes to the CMP. In many cases, the matters raised were already addressed through existing system-wide or local actions, or are matters that will be considered during implementation. Where no change was made, this report explains the reason for that position.

1.4 Report Structure

The remainder of this report is structured as follows:

- Section 2 summarises the public exhibition and consultation process.
- Section 3 outlines the key themes raised in submissions.
- Section 4 provides responses to the matters raised.
- Section 5 summarises the changes made to the CMP following public exhibition.
- Section 6 outlines the next steps for finalisation, adoption and implementation of the CMP.

2 PUBLIC EXHIBITION DETAILS FOR THE CMP

2.1 Public Exhibition Period

The Draft Hawkesbury-Nepean River System Coastal Management Program was placed on public exhibition for six weeks, from **Monday 20 April 2026 to Sunday 31 May 2026**.

The partner councils agreed to an extended 42-day exhibition period in recognition of the scale, complexity and regional significance of the CMP. The extended exhibition period provided additional time for community members, agencies, organisations, landholders and other stakeholders to review the draft CMP and prepare submissions

2.2 Public Exhibition Methods

The Draft CMP was made available online through each partner council's public exhibition portal. This approach allowed each council to engage with its own local community while presenting consistent core information across the six council areas. Each council hosted its own exhibition page (see Table 2-1), supported by common exhibition material.

Table 2-1 Public Exhibition Engagement Portals

Page Type	Links
Your Voice - Our Coast	https://www.yourvoiceourcoast.com/our-coast-our-waterways
Your Say Northern Beaches	https://yoursay.northernbeaches.nsw.gov.au/
Your Say Ku-ring-gai	https://yoursay.krg.nsw.gov.au/
Your Say Hornsby	https://yoursay.hornsby.nsw.gov.au/
Have Your Say (the Hills)	https://www.thehills.nsw.gov.au/Contact-Us/Have-Your-Say
Your Hawkesbury Your Say	https://www.yourhawkesbury-yoursay.com.au/

Each Partner Council exhibition page included:

- **Report:** A copy of the Stage 4 CMP Report Document PDF – in full
- **Executive Summary:** A community-facing Executive Summary (approximately 5–6 pages), designed to present the CMP in a concise and accessible format
- **Video:** A public exhibition video explaining the CMP, its purpose, key outcomes and proposed implementation approach.

To support different user preferences and accessibility needs, submissions could be made through multiple pathways, including:

- **Online submission form** – allowing open-text responses via the council portal
- **Email submission option** – for users who prefer to provide written feedback directly
- **Postal submission option** – enabling hard-copy responses to be submitted.

Submissions received through the partner council portals and other accepted pathways were collated and reviewed as part of the response to submissions process. The key matters raised, and the responses to those matters, are summarised in the following sections of this report.

2.3 Summary of Submissions Received

A total of 111 submissions were received. Submissions were received across five of the six partner council areas, with the largest number received through Central Coast Council and Northern Beaches Council.

The number of submissions received by each partner council is summarised in Table 2-2. The key matters raised in submissions are summarised thematically in Section 3 of this report.

Table 2-2 Total Submissions Received

Council	Submissions Received
Central Coast Council	64
Northern Beaches Council	32
Ku-ring-gai Council	0
Hornsby Shire Council	10
The Hills Shire Council	2
Hawkesbury City Council	3
Total	**111**

3 SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED

3.1 Overview

A total of 111 submissions were received during public exhibition of the Draft HNRS CMP. Submissions were received from private residents, community associations, environmental groups, commercial waterway users, agency stakeholders and other interested community members.

The submissions covered a broad range of matters, reflecting the scale and complexity of the HNRS and the different ways in which communities use and value the estuary, river, foreshore and coastal environments.

Submissions were reviewed by location, primary CMP strategy theme and key issue. Where submissions raised multiple matters, they were assigned to the theme and location that best reflected the main issue raised. A number of submissions raised broader system-wide issues rather than being focused on a single location.

3.2 Overarching Themes

Submissions were reviewed and assigned to the most relevant CMP strategy theme. In many cases, submissions raised matters relevant to more than one strategy. For reporting purposes, each submission has been assigned to the primary strategy theme that best reflects the main issue raised.

Based on the 111 categorised submissions reviewed, the largest proportion of feedback related to Strategy 5: Estuary and Waterway Health, which accounted for approximately half of all submissions. These submissions commonly raised matters relating to water quality, sedimentation, dredging, foreshore and riparian vegetation, aquatic habitat, seagrass, invasive species and the ecological health of the river system.

The second largest theme was Strategy 6: Coastal Hazard Resilience, which accounted for around one quarter of submissions. These submissions primarily related to coastal inundation mapping, foreshore erosion, coastal protection works, beach scraping, sand redistribution, navigation impacts and localised hazard management actions.

A smaller number of submissions related to social and recreational amenity, cultural heritage, community engagement, planning and adaptation, or raised general comments on the CMP

Table 3-1 Summary of submissions by CMP strategy theme

CMP Strategy Theme	Number of submissions	Percentage of categorised submissions
General	10	9%
Strategy 1: Governance and Program Delivery	0	0%
Strategy 2: Monitoring, Evaluation, and Reporting	0	0%
Strategy 3: Resilience, Planning, and Adaptation	1	1%
Strategy 4: Community & Stakeholder Engagement	1	1%
Strategy 5: Estuary & Waterway Health	56	51%
Strategy 6: Coastal Hazard Resilience	30	28%
Strategy 7: Social and Recreational Amenity	10	9%
Strategy 8: Cultural Heritage Protection	1	1%
Strategy 9: Research and Knowledge Sharing	0	0%

The distribution of submissions indicates that community feedback was strongly focused on estuary health and coastal hazard resilience. This reflects the central role of waterway condition, sediment processes, foreshore erosion, inundation risk and local access issues in how communities experience and value the HNRS.

3.3 Locations of Interest

Submissions were also reviewed based on their primary location of interest. Some submissions related to a specific place or foreshore area, while others raised broader matters relevant to the whole estuary or river system. The geographic distribution of submissions is summarised in Table 3-2. The largest number of location-specific submissions related to Patonga, followed by Great Mackerel Beach, Pittwater, Phegans Bay and Hardys Bay

Table 3-2 Summary of submissions by location of interest

Location	LGA	Responses
Patonga	Central Coast Council	35
Whole of Estuary	N/A	16
Great Mackerel Beach	Northern Beaches Council	14
Pittwater	Northern Beaches Council	9
Phegans Bay	Central Coast Council	8
Hardys Bay	Central Coast Council	6
Brooklyn	Hornsby Shire Council	5
Careel Creek	Northern Beaches Council	3
Upper Hawkesbury Waterways	The Hills Shire Council / Hawkesbury Shire Council	2
Dangar Island	Hornsby Shire Council	2
Scotland Island	Northern Beaches Council	2
Umina / Ettalong	Central Coast Council	2
Pearl Beach	Central Coast Council	1
Woy Woy	Central Coast Council	1
Davistown	Central Coast Council	1
Upper Catchments	Upper Catchment LGAs	1
Cattai	Hawkesbury City Council	1
Wisemans Ferry	Hornsby Shire Council / The Hills Shire Council	1
Berowra Creek	Hornsby Shire Council	1

The distribution of submissions should not be interpreted as a direct measure of importance across the CMP study area. Rather, it reflects the level of community interest, local concern and willingness to participate during public exhibition. Some locations generated a high number of submissions because they are experiencing visible or immediate issues, while other system-wide issues may be less locally concentrated but remain important to CMP implementation.

Overall, the submissions confirm that community interest is strongest where coastal processes, waterway health, foreshore access, navigation, private property and local amenity intersect. This is particularly evident at Patonga Creek and Great Mackerel Beach, where submissions raised both technical coastal management issues and day-to-day community impacts.

3.4 Key Place-Based Issues

While submissions raised matters across the full CMP study area, Patonga and Great Mackerel Beach attracted the greatest concentration of location-specific feedback. These locations are discussed below because of the number of submissions received and the level of detail provided.

Patonga

Submissions relating to Patonga focused primarily on Patonga Creek, including siltation, shoaling, changing creek morphology, reduced navigability, reduced tidal exchange, drainage issues, water quality, creek bank erosion and impacts on aquatic habitat. Many submitters raised concerns that the condition of the creek has deteriorated over time and requested more urgent management intervention.

A recurring concern was the build-up of sand and sediment within Patonga Creek and the impacts this is perceived to have on boating access, pedestrian access, water movement, fish habitat, seagrass, amenity and public safety. Several submissions requested dredging or sediment removal, while others emphasised the need for a careful, environmentally sensitive approach that protects the creek's ecological values.

Submissions also raised concerns about boat wash, bank erosion, stormwater runoff, litter, flooding, maintenance responsibility and the need for better coordination between agencies. A number of submissions requested that the relevant Patonga Creek action be given a higher priority in the CMP.

The submissions indicate strong local concern that Patonga Creek requires active management and that any future works should consider the creek, beach, foreshore, drainage network and adjoining public areas as a connected system.

Great Mackerel Beach

Submissions relating to Great Mackerel Beach focused on beach erosion, sand movement, beach scraping, beach nourishment, coastal protection works, hazard mapping, access and the relationship between the sandy beach and the southern headland area.

A key recurring theme was the need for a whole-of-beach approach. Submitters raised concern that the beach functions as a connected coastal system and that management actions should consider sand movement from north to south, the interaction between the northern beach, central beach and southern foreshore, and the potential effects of coastal protection works on beach condition and access.

Several submissions requested that Action S6.NBC.H be broadened or clarified to better reflect the full range of issues at Great Mackerel Beach. These included requests for the action to consider sand redistribution further south, remediation of the sandy beach, careful design and placement of coastal protection works, and future management of the southern end of the beach.

Access was also a major theme. Submitters raised concerns that erosion and sand loss have reduced safe access along parts of the beach, particularly toward the southern headland and sandstone steps. Submissions noted the role of the beach and reserve road as access routes for residents, visitors, workers, bushwalkers and emergency services. Some submissions raised recent safety incidents and requested that the CMP recognise access as a core management issue, not only an amenity issue.

Some submissions also raised technical concerns about coastal hazard mapping and the interpretation of supporting coastal hazard studies, particularly for properties at the transition between sandy beach and rocky

foreshore. These submissions requested reconsideration of hazard mapping or further site-specific review before future master planning or detailed design is progressed.

Pittwater

Submissions relating to Pittwater raised broader waterway health, boating and foreshore management issues. Key matters included water quality, marina and slipway impacts, mooring management, abandoned vessels, houseboat wastewater, aquatic habitat, seagrass protection and the cumulative effects of waterway use. These submissions generally sought stronger recognition of Pittwater as a highly used and environmentally sensitive waterway requiring coordinated management across land-based runoff, vessel activity, infrastructure and ecological restoration.

Phegans Bay

Submissions relating to Phegans Bay focused on foreshore erosion, public land impacts and the need for more timely intervention. The feedback indicated concern that erosion is affecting the usability, stability and amenity of the foreshore. Submissions generally supported action to improve foreshore resilience, while recognising that future works would need to consider coastal processes, environmental values, access, approvals and funding.

Hardys Bay, Pretty Beach and Wagstaffe

Submissions relating to Hardys Bay, Pretty Beach and Wagstaffe were generally focused on the accuracy and clarity of proposed local foreshore actions. Submitters requested that action descriptions, wharf names, mapping and foreshore treatment extents better reflect local conditions and existing planning work. These submissions were useful in identifying practical refinements to action wording and supporting mapping.

Brooklyn and Sandbrook Inlet

Submissions relating to Brooklyn and Sandbrook Inlet focused on sedimentation, dredging, navigation and waterway access. Submitters raised concern that shoaling is affecting the usability of the waterway and requested more active consideration of dredging or sediment management. These matters require further site-specific assessment, including coastal processes, sediment quality, environmental approvals, maintenance requirements, costs and responsibilities.

3.5 Other Notable Themes

Other recurring matters raised across multiple submissions included:

- water quality, catchment runoff and stormwater pollution;
- microplastics and emerging pollutants;
- protection of seagrass, mangroves, saltmarsh and riparian vegetation;
- boating impacts, moorings, abandoned vessels and marina-related pollution;
- dredging, sediment movement and navigation;
- foreshore access, wharf access and all-abilities access;
- coastal inundation mapping and implications for private property;
- cultural heritage and Aboriginal values;
- governance, funding, implementation timing and interagency coordination.

These issues are addressed thematically in Section 4.

4 RESPONSE TO SUBMISSIONS

4.1 Response Approach

Each submission received during public exhibition was reviewed and considered during finalisation of the CMP. For reporting purposes, submissions have been summarised by key theme and location rather than reproduced individually.

This approach has been adopted to provide a clear and accessible summary of the issues raised, while avoiding unnecessary repetition and protecting the privacy of submitters. Personal information, property addresses, contact details and other identifying details have not been included in this report.

The original submissions and internal submission review register have been retained by the relevant partner councils in accordance with council record-keeping requirements. The responses in this report provide a summary of the key matters raised, how those matters were considered, and any resulting changes to the CMP.

A thematic response approach is considered appropriate for this report because many submissions raised overlapping or repeated issues. Providing a response to each individual submission would result in substantial duplication and could increase the risk of identifying individual submitters, particularly in small communities or where submissions referred to specific properties, access issues or local circumstances.

The thematic approach allows the key matters raised during public exhibition to be reported transparently, while keeping the report focused on the implications for finalising the CMP. This approach also allows the responses to be linked directly to resulting CMP updates, future implementation steps or the reasons why no change was made.

4.2 Response to Key Themes

Table 4-1 Response to key submission themes

Theme	What was raised	Response	Where addressed
General support for the CMP	Several submissions supported the coordinated, whole-of-system approach and the development of a 10-year management framework.	Support is noted. The CMP provides a coordinated framework for partner councils and agencies to manage coastal hazards, waterway health, access, ecological values and implementation priorities across the river system.	CMP retained.
Patonga Creek	Submissions raised concerns about siltation, shoaling, reduced navigability, water quality, bank erosion, drainage, boating impacts and the overall condition of Patonga Creek. Several submissions requested more urgent action.	The matters raised are consistent with the intent of the existing Patonga Creek action. Future implementation will require further technical assessment, ecological consideration, approvals, funding and coordination with relevant agencies.	See Action S6.CCC.S and Table 5-1.

Theme	What was raised	Response	Where addressed
Phegans Bay foreshore erosion	Submissions raised concerns about ongoing foreshore erosion, impacts to public land and the need for more urgent intervention.	The concerns are noted and align with the intent of the existing Phegans Bay action. The priority of this action has been reviewed in response to submissions.	See Action S6.CCC.E and Table 5-1.
Great Mackerel Beach	Submissions requested a "whole-of-beach" approach that recognises the connectedness of the Great Mackerel Beach compartment. This is reflected in the general requests for properly considered sand redistribution works that leverage off the historical body of knowledge, and extend to the southern end of the beach compartment. Feedback also includes safe access, foreshore restoration, and consideration of managing utilities infrastructure at the southern headland end of the beach.	Following consideration of submissions, the CMP was amended to better reflect community priorities. Key changes included refinement of the Great Mackerel Beach action to adopt a whole-of-beach management approach incorporating sand management, dune access and foreshore resilience considerations; strengthening references to emerging water quality issues including microplastics; addition of a new management action; and consolidation of overlapping actions to improve implementation efficiency. These amendments improved the clarity and effectiveness of the CMP while retaining its overall strategic direction.	See Action S6.NBC.B, S6.NBC.H and Table 5-1.
Coastal hazard mapping and private property impacts	Some submissions requested review or removal of properties from coastal hazard mapping, citing concerns about LiDAR accuracy, site-specific property levels, insurance implications and future development rights.	The mapping has been prepared using the best available regional-scale information and is appropriate as a strategic planning layer. Inclusion on a map does not mean that all parts of a lot are exposed to the same level of risk, and site-specific matters can be considered through future development assessment or detailed design.	No mapping changes made. See Table 5-1.
Pittwater waterway health, boating and marina impacts	Submissions raised concerns about water quality, boating impacts, mooring management, abandoned vessels, houseboat wastewater, marina operations, slipways, dry-stack storage, lithium battery risks and ecological restoration.	Many of these matters are addressed through existing system-wide and local actions relating to water quality, estuary health, aquatic vegetation, compliance, foreshore management and agency coordination. Some matters are primarily regulated through state agency processes or separate approval pathways.	Addressed through existing CMP actions. Some matters may inform future implementation.

Theme	What was raised	Response	Where addressed
Seagrass, mangroves, saltmarsh and biodiversity	Submissions requested stronger protection of Posidonia seagrass, mangroves, saltmarsh, riparian vegetation, endangered ecological communities, Bush Stone-curlew habitat and aquatic biodiversity.	The CMP includes actions relating to estuary health, aquatic vegetation, riparian rehabilitation, water quality, foreshore management and ecosystem resilience. The matters raised are consistent with the CMP objectives and will inform delivery of relevant actions.	Addressed through existing CMP actions.
Water quality, runoff and emerging pollutants	Submissions raised concerns about catchment runoff, stormwater, urban pollution, industrial areas, microplastics, sewerage system performance and treated wastewater discharges.	The CMP includes actions relating to water quality monitoring, catchment runoff, WSUD, stormwater management, estuary health and agency coordination. Emerging pollutants were raised in submissions and are relevant to future monitoring and management.	See report text edits in Table 5-1 and Table 5-2.
Dredging, sedimentation and navigation	Submissions raised sedimentation, dredging and navigation issues in several locations including Patonga, St Huberts Island, Sandbrook Inlet, Brooklyn, Careel Creek, Hardys Bay and Wagstaffe. Dredging was also raised as an issue to alleviate navigability issues un the upper Hawkesbury.	Sedimentation and dredging issues require location-specific assessment, including consideration of coastal processes, sediment quality, waterway access, ecological values, approvals, costs and long-term maintenance. Some locations are already addressed through existing actions, while one additional action was added.	See relevant actions and Table 5-1.
Hardys Bay, Pretty Beach and Wagstaffe	Submissions supported the Hardys Bay Foreshore Masterplan actions but requested corrections to location descriptions, wharf naming and foreshore treatment extents.	The requested clarifications are noted. The relevant action descriptions and supporting mapping were updated clearly reflect the intended locations and scope of future works.	See Actions S6.CCC.I and S6.CCC.K and Table 5-1.
Commercial fishing and working waterways	Submissions requested stronger recognition of the river as a working waterway, including fish habitat, sediment movement, salinity, treated wastewater volumes, dredging, seafood reputation and fisher involvement.	The CMP recognises the environmental, social and economic values of the river system. Matters relating to water quality, sediment processes, habitat protection, estuary health and stakeholder engagement are addressed through existing actions. Local observations from commercial fishers provide useful context for implementation.	Addressed through existing CMP actions.

5 SUMMARY OF CMP UPDATES

5.1 Overview

The submissions received during public exhibition have informed finalisation of the CMP. Many matters raised in submissions are already addressed through existing system-wide or local implementation actions. In these cases, no change to the CMP was made.

A number of submissions identified opportunities to improve clarity, correct action descriptions, refine priorities or better describe the intended scope of future implementation. These changes do not substantially alter the overall direction of the CMP, but improve its clarity, usability and responsiveness to community feedback.

The key updates to the CMP are summarised in Table 5-1. The updates are targeted refinements rather than major changes to the structure or strategic direction of the CMP. The public exhibition process confirmed that the overall CMP framework remains appropriate, but identified several areas where action wording, priorities, mapping notes and supporting discussion could be improved. The changes generally comprise:

- new or restructured actions;
- priority and timing changes;
- refinements to action scope or wording;
- mapping and location corrections;
- clarification of delivery, approval or agency responsibilities; and
- supporting text updates.

Table 5-1 identifies substantive changes affecting 19 CMP action IDs. This includes five new actions and substantive amendments to 14 existing action IDs. The amendments include the removal and replacement of the former S6.CCC.F scope and the amalgamation of two overlapping Sand Point Beach actions. Other minor editorial, administrative and technical changes are not individually listed.

5.2 CMP Action Updates

Table 5-1 summarises the substantive changes made in response to public submissions, Partner Council review and State agency engagement during and following public exhibition. It focuses on new actions and changes affecting action scope, location, priority, timing, delivery or classification. Minor wording, formatting, cross-reference and administrative updates are not listed individually.

Table 5-1 Summary of CMP updates by action

CMP action / report section	Location	CMP Change / update	Change type	Feedback link / origin of change
S2.CMP.A and S2.CMP.B	Entire HNRS, estuary-wide	Monitoring actions was restructured into separate review/design and implementation phases. Lead responsibility shifted from DCCEEW and the Partner Councils to the Partner Councils.	Delivery and governance	Partner Council and technical review during public exhibition finalisation
S3.CMP.G	Lower Estuary, Broken Bay and Pittwater	The action was updated to provide for CCC and NBC to progress Coastal Vulnerability Area planning proposals, while HSC will first undertake a review and gap analysis..	Council-specific delivery	Partner Council review, particularly HSC feedback
S6.CMP.C	Middle Estuary	New action for a combined coastal and catchment inundation study, including present-day, 0.4 m and 0.9 m sea-level-rise scenarios.	New action	HSC and CCC review concerning management responses to combined coastal and catchment flooding
S6.CCC.E	Phegans Bay	Raised from Medium to High priority and brought forward from Years 4 to 8 to Years 1 to 4.	Priority and timing	Reflects Public Exhibition submissions requesting more urgent attention to foreshore erosion and impacts to public land.
S6.CCC.F	Rip Road Reserve, Booker Bay	The former action for coastal protection works at Rip Road Reserve was removed because the project has been completed. The action identifier was subsequently reassigned to the new Empire Bay foreshore works.	Action removed and replaced	Central Coast Council review during public exhibition
S6.CCC.F	Empire Bay, Brisbane Water	Former Rip Road Reserve scope replaced – as project is now completed – has been replaced with works at Empire Bay Reserve and Ferry Wharf, including a stepped sandstone foreshore treatment.	Location and scope replacement	CCC review during public exhibition.

CMP action / report section	Location	CMP Change / update	Change type	Feedback link / origin of change
S6.CCC.I	Araluen Drive Reserve, Hardys Bay	The action description and supporting mapping were updated, including correction of the wharf name from Hardys Bay Wharf to Killcare Wharf and clarification of the intended foreshore stabilisation extent and its relationship with the Hardys Bay Foreshore Masterplan. The action was also changed from High to Medium priority and moved from Years 1 to 4 to Years 4 to 8.	Priority and timing	Reflects Public Exhibition submissions requesting correction of the wharf name, clearer mapping of the proposed stabilisation extent and clarification of the action's relationship with the Hardys Bay Foreshore Masterplan.
Action S6.CCC.K	Wagstaffe	Action wording clarified to better reflect treatment of the wharf revetment and adjacent sandy foreshore.	Clarification	Reflects Public Exhibition feedback that the action should better describe the foreshore treatment required at Wagstaffe Wharf.
S6.CCC.S	Patonga, Broken Bay	Raised from Medium to High priority and brought forward to Years 1 to 4. Crown Lands added as a support agency.	Priority and timing	Reflects the number of Public Exhibition submissions received and the level of community concern regarding siltation, navigation, erosion, water quality and creek condition.
S7.CCC.J	St Huberts Island canals, Brisbane Water	Changed from Low and opportunistic delivery in Years 8 to 10 to High priority delivery in Years 1 to 4.	Priority and timing	Responds to Public Exhibition submissions received regarding priority of works in St Huberts Island canals
S7.CCC.K	Woy Woy foreshore	New action supporting implementation of the Woy Woy Foreshore Masterplan, including seawall renewal, sandstone blockwork and tidal pool works.	New action	CCC review and alignment with the Woy Woy Foreshore Masterplan
S6.HSC.F	Bradleys Beach, Dangar Island	Now includes coastal engineering assessment of wave and sediment processes and preparation of a Review of Environmental Factors. Raised from Medium to High priority and brought forward to Years 1 to 4.	Investigations, approvals and priority	Public exhibition submissions and Hornsby Shire Council technical review

CMP action / report section	Location	CMP Change / update	Change type	Feedback link / origin of change
S7.HSC.C	McKell Park, Brooklyn	Now includes renewal of approximately 58 m of concrete seawall, incorporating environmentally sensitive design and improved water access.	Scope expansion and CPW	HSC asset and place-planning review
S7.HSC.F	Kangaroo Point, Brooklyn	Pump-out action broadened from an upgrade to consideration of management, improvement, replacement or decommissioning options.	Scope refinement	HSC operational review
S7.HSC.I	Sandbrook Inlet, Brooklyn Harbour and Parsley Bay	New action investigating dredging and beach nourishment opportunities.	New action	Responds to repeated submissions regarding sedimentation, navigation and waterway access.
S7.HSC.J	Lower Hawkesbury foreshore, focused on Brooklyn	New action for preparation of a Lower Hawkesbury foreshore infrastructure strategy.	New action	HSC review during public exhibition
S7.HSC.K	Crosslands Reserve	New action covering access, ecological and bank-management improvements.	New action	HSC review during public exhibition
S6.NBC.C	Sand Point Beach	Former Actions S6.NBC.B & S6.NBC.C combined for efficiency (and new combined action labelled S6.NBC.C).	Two actions amalgamated	NBC review during public exhibition
S6.NBC.H	Great Mackerel Beach, Pittwater	Masterplan action expanded to a whole-of-beach approach covering access, naturalisation, dinghy storage, utilities, NPWS coordination and encroachment matters. Sand redistribution linked to new Action S6.NBC.B.	Scope optimisation and coordination	Responds to submissions requesting clearer recognition of the beach as a connected system and as an important access corridor for residents, visitors and emergency services.

CMP action / report section	Location	CMP Change / update	Change type	Feedback link / origin of change
S6.NBC.B	Great Mackerel Beach, Pittwater	The Great Mackerel Beach actions were updated to adopt a whole-of-beach approach, linking sand redistribution, foreshore naturalisation, coastal protection, access and future master planning across the northern, central and southern sections of the beach. The revised actions also recognise the need for site-specific technical investigations, coordination with NPWS and consideration of safe community and emergency access.	Replacement action and scope expansion	Responds to submissions requesting clearer recognition of the beach as a connected system and as an important access corridor for residents, visitors and emergency services.
S6.NBC.J	Pittwater, including identified nourishment locations	Changed from a feasibility study to a phased design and pilot project. Now identifies potential beaches, consultation, funding, approvals and implementation of a nourishment pilot, with nourishment classified as coastal protection works.	Scope and delivery commitment	Northern Beaches Council review during and following public exhibition

In addition to changes to individual CMP actions, public exhibition feedback informed several updates to the supporting discussion, references and technical content of the CMP. Table 5-2 summarises the principal document-wide updates, including matters where the existing technical approach was reviewed and retained. Minor editorial and formatting changes are not individually listed.

Table 5-2 General document updates

CMP action / report section	Location	Update	Reason for update
Water quality discussion	Whole estuary	Add or strengthen reference to microplastics and emerging pollutants as relevant water quality considerations.	Responds to submissions requesting broader recognition of emerging water quality pressures.
Legislative, policy and technical references	Whole CMP	Review and update references where required.	Improves accuracy, currency and consistency of supporting references.
Groundwater discussion	Whole CMP / supporting discussion	Review groundwater-related wording for clarity and relevance to the CMP, including the distinction between groundwater decline, contamination risk and changes to recharge.	Responds to submission comments requesting clearer and more technically accurate groundwater discussion.
Coastal hazard mapping	Scotland Island and other mapped areas	Retain the proposed coastal hazard mapping. No changes to coastal inundation mapping are proposed in response to submissions requesting removal or site-specific amendment.	Mapping has been prepared using the best available regional-scale information and is retained as a strategic planning layer. Site-specific matters can be considered through future development assessment or detailed investigations.

5.3 Matters for Future Implementation

A number of submissions raised matters that are important but cannot be fully resolved through finalisation of the CMP alone. These matters will require further consideration during implementation, including detailed design, technical investigation, funding applications, landholder engagement, environmental assessment, agency approvals and procurement.

This is particularly relevant for actions involving dredging, foreshore stabilisation, coastal protection works, sand management, access improvements and ecological restoration. In these cases, the CMP provides the strategic basis for future action, but does not replace the need for more detailed site-specific assessment before works are approved or delivered.

5.4 Matters Not Resulting in CMP Changes

Not all matters raised during public exhibition have resulted in changes to the CMP. This does not mean those matters were dismissed or considered unimportant. Rather, it reflects the role of the CMP as a strategic, whole-of-system management framework, and the need to distinguish between matters that require changes to the CMP itself and matters that are more appropriately addressed through future implementation.

In many cases, submissions raised issues that are already addressed through existing CMP actions, either at a system-wide level or through location-specific implementation actions. Other matters will require further

detailed assessment before a specific management response can be confirmed. This includes issues involving technical feasibility, environmental impacts, land tenure, approvals, funding, detailed design, procurement, ongoing maintenance and agency responsibilities.

Some matters raised in submissions did not result in changes to the CMP. This includes matters that:

- are already addressed by existing CMP actions;
- relate to detailed design or future implementation;
- require further site-specific assessment outside the CMP finalisation process;
- are regulated through separate planning, environmental, maritime or development assessment processes;
- require action by state agencies or private landholders rather than the partner councils alone; or
- are outside the statutory scope of a coastal management program.

Where no change is proposed, the reasons are provided in the thematic responses in Section 4. These matters may still be relevant to future implementation and may inform action scoping, stakeholder engagement, grant funding applications, detailed design, approvals and future reviews of the CMP.

6 NEXT STEPS

Following consideration of submissions received during public exhibition, the CMP has been updated where appropriate to improve clarity, refine action wording, update priorities and respond to specific matters raised by the community and stakeholders.

The final CMP will now proceed through the relevant council review, adoption and certification process. Subject to adoption by the partner councils, the CMP will be submitted for certification under the *Coastal Management Act 2016*.

Once certified, implementation will occur progressively over the 10-year life of the CMP. Delivery will depend on available funding, staff resourcing, grant opportunities, agency partnerships, land tenure, statutory approvals and the outcomes of further technical investigations. Some actions may be delivered in the short term, while others will require further planning, design and coordination before works can proceed.

The submissions received during public exhibition will continue to be relevant during implementation. Local knowledge provided through submissions will assist councils and agencies to refine scopes, identify site-specific constraints, understand community priorities and target future engagement.

WATER TECHNOLOGY
WATER, COASTAL & ENVIRONMENTAL CONSULTANTS

Melbourne
15 Business Park Drive
Notting Hill VIC 3168

Melbourne – CBD
Suite 904, Carlow House, 289 Flinders Lane
Melbourne VIC 3000

Brisbane
Level 5, 43 Peel Street
South Brisbane QLD 4101

Brisbane – Camp Hill
2a/4 Newman Avenue
Camp Hill QLD 4152

Sydney
Suite 3, Level 1, 20 Wentworth Street
Parramatta NSW 2150

Ballina
Unit 1b/1 Hogan Street
Ballina NSW 2478

Adelaide
2/39-40 Greenhill Road
Wayville SA 5034

Perth
Level 1, 21 Adelaide Street
Fremantle WA 6160

New Zealand
4 Williamson Avenue
Ponsonby New Zealand 1021

Wangaratta
First Floor, 40 Rowan Street
Wangaratta VIC 3677

Geelong
1/5 Bridge Street
Newtown VIC 3220

Wimmera
597 Joel South Road
Stawell VIC 3380

Gold Coast
Suite 37, Level 4, 194 Varsity Parade
Varsity Lakes QLD 4227

Darwin
Unit 40/29 Woods Street
Darwin City NT 0800

Sunshine Coast
4C ‘Regatta Corporate’, 2 Innovation Parkway
Birtinya QLD 4575

1300 198 413

watertech.com.au