

I refer to Section 6 of the application - issues of monopoly.

It is inconceivable that this licence does not refer to a monopoly situation. CW will install a sewer, potable water and recycled water network over the land that comprises Watagan Estate. To believe that if in the future one or a number of residents decides against using CW as their service provider and opts for Hunter Water the cost for Hunter Water, to duplicate the CW network for just a few residents who want a choice would be horrendous.

Without doubt the CW proposal produces a monopoly situation and if the licence (heaven forbid) is approved the service costs applied to its customers must be regulated by IPART to ensure CW do not exercise monopoly power.

It is interesting to note that the proponent, CW, in a public statement stated that the costs for their services in this instance will not exceed the equivalent services costs of Hunter Water. This in light of the proponents unwillingness to share their cost/benefit analysis publicly, or have received a price determination from IPART is simply PR spin and has proved to be indicative of CW's non-transparent approach to their project that has caused significant community stress.

Again I thank you for the opportunity to further comment

A large black rectangular redaction box covering the signature and name of the author.