Nathan Stringer - Submission Woolgoolga to Ballina Pacific Highway Upgrade, SSI-4963

From:"Mark & Roxine Gittoes" <gittoesm@bigpond.net.au>To:<plan_comment@planning.nsw.gov.au>Date:1/02/2013 9:21 AMSubject:Submission Woolgoolga to Ballina Pacific Highway Upgrade, SSI-4963CC:smore@parliament.nsw.gov.au>

MARK & ROXINE GITTOES

Postal: PO Box 75 Broadwater NSW 2472 Residential: 1 Plenkovich Road Broadwater NSW 2472

Telephone

Mobile: Email: <u>gittoesm@bigpond.net.au</u>

Major Projects Assessment Department of Planning and Infrastructure GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

Dear Sir/Madam

Submission on the Impact of Flooding Woolgoolga to Ballina Pacific Highway Upgrade, SSI-4963

We have been following the impact of the upgrade proposal for a number of years as our properties are all affected one way or another.

Our current concern relates to the impact of increased flooding on our properties in Broadwater.

We have had a meeting with the Project Development Manager and other representatives of the project and have been provided with an assessment report on the expected increase to flood heights on our property at 1 Plenkovich Road Broadwater which states we could expect an increase of flood heights up to 33mm which to us is very significant and will be to other property owners within the Broadwater Woodburn area.

We object to how residents have been informed or more importantly not informed of the impacts the highway upgrade will have on their properties in the event of a flood event. A large flood event is well overdue in our area and most residents have not seen or understand the impact of a 1 in 20 let alone a 1 in 50 year flood event on their property and residence. I understand your department has identified some 600+ residences in Broadwater Woodburn area that would be affected please make the effort and notify each residence personally or by letter of your intent to increase the flooding levels.

Your EIS display at the local Library has been poorly patronised, we suspect a similar response to your other display sites. Your communication with flood affected residences and owners has failed.

Roads & Maritime Services has taken options to increase flood levels to protect a low grade Broadwater National Park.

High flood free ground away from villages and agriculture. Your decision to not take this better option instead taking the natural flood overflow pass to the Evans River has been at the expense of community safety and welfare. Then to reduce the discharge of water culverts under new highway between Woodburn & Langs Hill is concerning. An extra 33mm increased flooding may seem insignificant, however it is not if it means the difference between flood water entry to living areas or not, it is a major result for individuals.

Only this morning we listened to farmers' talk on the ABC Radio of their flood problems on the Clarence River which could quite easily be our River on the Richmond. Both farmers' that spoke had only millimetres of free board to their only ground free of flood water for their animals, equipment and fodder. Then he went on to mention how his neighbour had a few millimetres of water in their residence last night.

We would be in the exact same position if a flood of similar statistics came on the Richmond. We have a levee protecting our property a few millimetres extra water level will be the difference of loosing all crops and going broke or not. Your dismissal of only a few more millimetres of water won't matter is morally wrong.

Those extra few millimetres topping over the Banks Estate Levee that protects our property from most flood events will give us 3 or more meters of water over most of our farm. The rest of the farm will be inundated to a lesser level including our residence and rental property. Your assessment of our property suggests don't worry you would get water anyway an increase of 33mm wont worry you. This is definitely not true it could make a massive flood for us.

Failing to notify all affected community members of the increase of flooding is a poor reflection to your commitment to our communities' welfare. People not directly affected by the highway upgrade are not aware of the impact of increased flooding levels will have on their properties. They believe the highway upgrade doesn't affect them so there is no need to look at the EIS; this is a major failure of the community consultation process used.

We are aware of the increased flooding levels the highway upgrade will impose to our residence, our rental property and our agriculture property and the affects it will have on our farming business in the event of a flood be in a 1 in 20 year or a 1 in 50 year. The assurances we have received from your representations don't in any way help elevate the problems the highway upgrade will impose on us and other community members with increased flooding levels.

Yours faithfully

Mark & Roxine Gittoes