

Catherine Hill Bay Progress Association

Catherine Hill Bay Progress Association
PO Box 72
Swansea .NSW 2281
Website: www.catherinehillbay.org.au
22nd February 2015

Hugo Harmsdorf, Chief Executive Officer, IPART
PO Box K35
Haymarket Post Shop
NSW 1240

**SUBMISSION: CATHERINE HILL BAY WATER UTILITY PTY LTD'S
Network Operator Licence Application-
Review of Environmental Factors.
REF NO: 13/243**

The Catherine Hill Bay Progress Association has a number of serious concerns with this Review of Environmental Factors which claims to have “examined and taken into account to the fullest extent possible all matters affecting or likely to affect the environment by reason of the proposed activity”.

1. The waste water treatment plant will impact Catherine Hill Bay's waterways and beach.

Stages 6&7 lie above a creek which flows directly onto the Bay's beach. The area designated for spraying is on the northern side of Montefiore Street which slopes down to Catherine Hill Bay Creek which flows into the sea at the main swimming beach at Catherine Hill Bay. The local Dunecare group has worked along CHB Ck for over a decade removing weeds and planting endemic plants. Also, children swim in this creek!

This beach is the only patrolled beach in the area and will remain so as Moonee Beach is considered dangerous.

The existence of this creek and the impacts on it are not mentioned in the Review of Environmental Factors. The Association considers this to be a serious omission.

Also of concern is that the stormwater runoff for all of Stage 3 and the proposed shops is to be directed into a detention pond in the village green (located east of the houses on the sea side of Clarke Street in the heritage village). This stormwater runoff also flows directly into the same creek which exits onto the beach and then into the sea.

Why does the Review of Environmental Factors not consider the potential for possible contaminated (pollutants, minerals and fertilisers) surface water to flow into this creek and onto the beach, as well as into the ocean?

2. Contradictory height figures.

The Application states a number of times “No structure associated with the STP will exceed **7.2m** in height”.

Whereas the *Visual Impact Assessment, Catherine Hill Bay Development WWTP Site and Associated Infrastructure* prepared for Rosegroup Pty Ltd by Planit Consulting Pty Ltd, June 2014 states, “The physical structures located within the northern portion of the WWTP site consist of a shed (5.10m above pad level), and storage/treatment tanks with a maximum height of **6.0m**”.

This height of 6.0m is mentioned a number of times within this document and is used as the basis for shed analysis, “This height data has been used to generate a view shed analysis of the WWTP. Elevation data (Aster GDEM Elevation data 2012) has been used to determine the potential view shed for these elements” (Figure 5).

Such contradictory figures bring into question the accuracy of the view shed analysis.

3. Incorrect assessment of the potential visual impact on the State Heritage Listed Town of Catherine Hill Bay.

“The Area of investigation is located on the southern side of Montefiore Street at the western edge of the proposed development footprint ...The AOI is bounded to the south by the Munmorah State Conservation Area and to the east by the proposed residential lots of the CHB development (Stage 6&7)”

Stages 6 &7 are north, not east, and are overlooked by a high ridgeline further to the north that separates the two villages of Catherine Hill Bay.

This ridgeline is included in the heritage curtilage and yet views from this ridgeline are excluded from this Visual Impact Statement.

It is incorrect to say “The visual catchments for the CHB are made up of two distinct primary regions, VCA1 Catherine Hill Bay VCA and VCA2 Moonee VCA. These regions are defined largely through topography with the main site ridgelines acting as the perimeter of VCA2.’

It is acknowledged that there is “an additional VIA referred to as Middle Camp Landscape Unit ‘to the north of VC1. Given the distance of this VIA from the area of investigation (1.62km), coupled with the topographic features and existing vegetation

characteristics of the "Catherine Hill Bay VCA (VCA2) the VCA of Middle Camp is not investigated further in this report."

This is a convoluted way of saying that the heritage township which includes the 2 villages and the high ridge that separates them, itself part of the heritage township, is not worth examining. This analysis is incomplete. This should be one of the major areas of analysis in this study if it is to have any validity.

This Visual Impact Assessment is only looking at the visual impact on the Rosegroup residential development. It is completely ignoring the fact that this development is adjacent to a State Heritage Listed Township which has always sought to be visually separate from this new development.

The State Government approval for this new residential development makes it absolutely clear that there **must not be a visual impact on the Heritage Listed Town of Catherine Hill Bay.**

The proposed waste treatment plant dimensions show there will be a most noticeable visual impact on the heritage township.

Because of the potential visual impact of the proposed waste water treatment plant on the State Listed Heritage Town of Catherine Hill Bay, we ask that the Visual Impact Assessment prepared by Planit for Rosegroup Pty Ltd be forwarded to the Heritage Office for their consideration."

Yours faithfully

Suzanne Whyte,
President
Catherine Hill Bay Progress Association

cc: Michael Ellis, Heritage Office