

## Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure

Our ref: SSI-56980459

### Attachment B – Feedback received by the Department

---

Feedback received by the Department and supplied to the Applicant should be addressed within the response documentation, noting that it is separate from submissions that have been received and should be noted accordingly.

## **Thruppster Waste Management Objection**

The PMHC has misleadingly and cunningly progressed with their application for a “Thruppster” Wastewater Scheme and its impact to the surrounding homes and community

Due Process has not been fairly and honestly followed and the application should be refused and recommenced in its entirety... If the process is too far progressed than Odour mitigation, health impact mitigation from toxins and microflora dispersion and concentrated PFAS environmental contamination, contamination of bore water/surrounding pristine waterways in event of a flood where raw sewerage will be released into the local pristine waterway needs to be mandated to protect the health of immediate residents and the environment

Misleading

**Name** – Thruppster Wastewater Scheme

The proposed facility is located in the heart of Fernbank Creek miles away from Thruppster. This Name was obviously used to deceive the Fernbank creek residents that a waste water facility was to be built in this neighborhood

Misleading

### **Alternative Sites**

The Alternative sites that were chosen were obviously inappropriate from the start, there was no due diligence in actually considering feasible alternative sites

Sites offered

1 right in front of the airport flight path

2 across the Hastings River

3 across the A1 Highway

These sites are obviously not suitable due to the costs and difficulty in accessing and inherent danger

A look into FEASIBLE other options were not made making this site the only option that council offered there was no public engagement of possible alternative sites

Cunning and Deceitful

### **Surrounding Land**

In 2018 Council rezoned all the land around the proposed wastewater site as a protected wilderness –Biodiversity certification so that the facility is “stuck “ in the proposed site and cannot be moved further away from the nearby residences as this land is now protected. This has obviously been part of the long term plan to not allow consideration of alternative sites

Threats and Deceit

### **Access**

During the meeting in October 23 (First meeting with Residences) and after first notification of this proposed facility

During this meeting the residents were verbally informed that emergency access to this facility would be handled with helicopters boat access etc. in times of Flood / Bushfires which happen often

After this meeting our neighbor was threatened by Cameron the council general manager that if he doesn't give council access through his property that will just compulsorily acquire it

Misleading

### **Hunter Site Visit**

During the first meeting in October 23 we were informed that the facility would use the best practice most modern technology to reduce any nuisance or environmental impact

They offered a visit to a treatment plant with odour mitigation which is not what this project will include

Deceitfully not showing us a like for like facility, this one will have a 40 odour unit at its intake and still an average 1.8 odour units at the near residents giving a permanent noticeable toxic odor permanently at the residences

There is no Odour Mitigation or flaring of toxic gases and bioaerosols/microflora

Misleading

### **Asset**

During the first meeting it was described that the water treatment plant would be an asset to the surrounding neighbours as it will bring services to the area

The project does not give any extra services to the surrounding properties. There is no plan to connect our septic systems to the water treatment plant (this was flatly refused) there is no access to the improved internet services going to the plant there is no access to town water even when our water supply (catchment from our roofs as we are all on tank water) and bore water will be contaminated by bioaerosols and microflora and overflow release of raw sewerage

Deceitful and inaccurate and possibly fraudulent

### **Site Vist**

In August 24 Council offered an onsite visit to the proposed facility

They took us to the furthest corner of the facility from our homes to meet deceitfully making the location seem further away and only on specific insistent questioning showed the proximal boundary

On measuring the facility to my boundary I have measured approximately 350m distance which is not the 500m minimal distance required (520m in NT) in and depicted on their plan I assume that the council has deceitfully measured their proposed plant from the furthest corner or the middle of their site to our boundary to fraudulently quote the distances of our boundaries to the waste water management boundary

**Furthermore** the proposed site will be substantially raised from natural ground level (up to 4 meters) which will significantly increase the spread of Odour and bioaerosols this height increase seems to have been purposely neglected from the Odour and dispersion modelling making this report redundant

Inappropriate behavior, patronizing, and potential legal disaster

### **Odor and health impacts**

Our major concern of odour and health impacts morbidity and mortality were not taken seriously and responded by “if your anxiety of smelling an odour is high of course you will smell an odour”

There is no measurement of biological airborne hazards/bioaerosols, microbes fungal spores etc. that will be breathed in by the residents potentially lethal fungus like aspergillus aerosol PFAS ( Note PFAS will not be measured after waste water has been concentrated at the facility as the council does not want acknowledge its contribution to environmental or human harm from this toxin- mention that PFAS is negligible in the intake waste water is deceitfully portraying that there will be no PFAS in the concentrated waste

### **Health impact of WWTP borne aerosol on human**

During the process of propagation, migration, and diffusion, bioaerosols may induce respiratory illnesses (cough, asthma, phlegm, breathlessness, bronchitis, rhinitis, pneumonia), gastrointestinal and lung impairment in workers at WWTP as well as in the surrounding community (Gangamma et al., 2011; Masclaux et al., 2014; Kim et al., 2018; Hsiao et al., 2020). Particularly microbial allergens and endotoxin (lipopolysaccharide) formed by gram negative bacteria are known as the most serious threat <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemosphere.2021.132180>

There is no Odor mitigation or flaring of aerosol to protect the surrounding residents

Morbidity and mortality from exposure to these known toxins to the surrounding families would bring forward charges of industrial manslaughter

Misleading

### **Odour Fact sheet**

The Odour fact sheet that Council distributes deceitfully portrays that nearby residences will not be affected by Odour with 2 Odour units at the boundary

In fact, analysis of the odour reports show neighbours will be affected with an average 1.8 Odour Units and odour peaks obviously can be much worse leading to significant nuisance odour and health effects from deadly microflora toxins to headaches, mental health, unease, anger irritation and vomiting to prolonged exposure to odours

The Odour report (or what was given to us) does not mention the peak odour intensities or durations at our properties it also mentions that Temperature and rainfall will also affect the odour dispersion but hasn't informed how much more odour will be dispersed at these times

The report also states that Stability Class that affects Odour dispersion is classed F most frequently at 34% of the time **meaning that most of the time 66%** of the time there is less favorable conditions promoting greater dispersion over larger areas

EPA states that new Facilities should not affect the residents more than 44 hours a year (99.5% algorithm)

The proposed waste management system is obviously in clear breach of this to the sensitive receptors (neighbouring properties)

The whole project has not been presented or conducted truthfully with open disclosure. It hasn't held proper community discussion until the project concept was well on its way. Deceit, hidden facts and distortion of facts to mislead the affected neighbours, very well depicted above as well as disregard to the right of peaceful living without odour or health hazard from the new proposed facilities equates to the need to disregard this application in full, enquiry needs to be made into the fit to service of council personnel who have deceitfully prepared this document and threatened nearby residents with compulsory take over if they don't abide with their wishes

No compensation for financial loss incurred by the devaluation of the affected properties and mitigation of odour and micro toxins/bioaerosols have been refused to save cost

Raw Sewerage will be dumped into our pristine waterways/swamp to contaminate this area and bore water with dangerous toxins and PFAS that will not be measured at the site

If this Project in its entirety isn't refused then the mandating of Odour Mitigation and flaring of gases and compensation of property devaluation along with the right to clean water as we are not connected to town water collect off our roof which will be contaminated and use bore water which will also be contaminated in the event of a flood where they will release raw sewerage into our pristine waterway/natural mangroves which will contaminate our bore water. Connection of local resident's sewerage to the water treatment. Internal and External review must also be undertaken into the conduct of the council members that are involved in this misleading application so that this doesn't continue to occur or happen again

Yours Sincerely

Dr Adam King

## Nick Hearfield

---

**From:** Michael Potter [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, 4 September 2024 5:58 AM  
**To:** Nick Hearfield  
**Subject:** Requests/concerns from Mike and Lisa Potter 461 Fernbank Creek Rd re waste water site.

**Categories:** Green Category

Get [Outlook for Android](#)

---

**From:** Michael Potter [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 3, 2024 8:21:54 pm  
**To:** Andrew Maytom <Andrew.Maytom@pmhc.nsw.gov.au>  
**Subject:** Re: Thrumster Wastewater Treatment Plant: invitation to visit the proposed site

Hi Andrew.

Ali said I should document my requests regarding the construction of the sewerage plant. So I'm not sure if the email should be directed to you or elsewhere but here is a summary of the concerns I shared with you last Friday.

In this email I refer to the road alongside our eastern property border as Partridge Creek Road.

1. Issues during construction - given the project is likely to take 2+ years to complete, the impact in terms of noise, traffic and privacy will be quite high.

Any measure that can be taken to mitigate these impacts would be welcome. As you mentioned the intersection of Fernbank Creek Road and Hastings River Drive is very dangerous and needs addressing prior to the construction.

2. Long term noise, traffic and privacy concerns. My conversation with Ali on Friday allayed some concerns regarding noise of the plant itself. Noise and privacy infringements along the access road could be mitigated by the provision of a tree line either inside or outside our eastern boundary. Ideally the trees would be of a relatively low bushy profile such as the 6 metre Lillipili etc. Such a planting would presumably be of environmental benefit and offset the tree life losses incurred in the project proper.

3. Flooding - Our lower paddocks are susceptible to flooding and as such we request regular maintenance of the drain that runs alongside Partridge Creek.

4. Access to our property from Partridge Creek Road could also be improved which may have certain benefits to both us and the site operators. We are the closest people in case of emergency on the wastewater site or the roadway and it may be beneficial for the existing east facing gate on our property to have access to the road.

5. Potable water and sewerage. We request consideration be given to connecting us to the water mains. Ali has told me of the plan to bring fresh water from the plant in a ring of piping to service

us and our neighbours. This has enormous potential to mitigate our bushfire risk and give us some drought proofing which has been an issue in the past. As we are the closest people to the site, not having connected water and sewerage would be particularly galling.

6. Cattle management. Given the substantial changes to the road traffic on our eastern border we request assistance improving the shared fenceline. Our cows are both drawn to and occasionally spooked by passing traffic and people on foot. Our existing fencing has proven sufficient in the quiet environment that exists currently but will need to be upgraded when construction begins.

This will reduce delays and interference from unruly bovines on your site.

7. Property values and perception. Needless to say there is a detrimental effect on peoples perception of an area adjacent to a waste water plant. This is likely going to have a material impact on our property resale values and closes certain doors in terms of future property use eg appeal of tourism , wedding venue hire etc. We would ask that signage be kept to a minimum and that care is taken to adequately screen the facility visually. We will not pursue direct financial compensation for these potential losses but simply hope that they are considered when assessing our fairly modest requests in the items 1-6 above.

Thanks for your assistance.

Michael and Lisa Potter  
461 fernbank creek road.

---

**From:** Andrew Maytom <Andrew.Maytom@pmhc.nsw.gov.au>

**Sent:** Wednesday, 21 August 2024 8:48 AM

**To:** [REDACTED]

**Subject:** Thrumster Wastewater Treatment Plant: invitation to visit the proposed site

Dear Michael Potter,

Council would like to invite you to a site meeting to show the Fernbank Creek Road residents the proposed location of the wastewater plant and answer questions related to the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and the project.

- **Date:** Thursday 22 August 2024
- **Time:** 3.30pm
- **Meeting point:** The meeting point will be the start of the driveway at [433 Fernbank Creek Rd.](#)

**Further engagement:**

We are open to feedback on whether additional engagement sessions are needed for the Fernbank Creek Road residents to review the EIS and address any queries or concerns. We would be happy to arrange further sessions either on-site or at the council office. Please indicate your preference via return email if you would like to request additional sessions.

Kind regards,



**Andrew Maytom**  
Engagement Officer  
Liveable Communities  
P 02 6581 8263



---

**Port Macquarie Hastings Council**

Birpai Country  
Call 6581 8111 or visit [pmhc.nsw.gov.au](http://pmhc.nsw.gov.au)  
Socials @pmhcouncil

---

*We acknowledge the Birpai people, the traditional owners of the land in which we work and live, and pay our respects to Elders past, present and emerging. We extend our respect to all Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people who choose to call Port Macquarie-Hastings home.*

---

DISCLAIMER - This electronic mail message is intended only for the addressee and may contain confidential information. If you are not the addressee, you are notified that any transmission, distribution or photocopying of this email is strictly prohibited. The confidentiality attached to this email is not waived, lost or destroyed by reasons of a mistaken delivery to you. The information contained in this email transmission may also be subject to the Government Information (Public Access) Act, 2009.

---



**From:** Elizabeth Dancet [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Thursday, 5 September 2024 5:14 PM  
**To:** majorprojectsupport@planning.nsw.gov.au  
**Subject:** Ref: Major project submissions - Thrumster Waste Water Scheme

Dear Sir/Madam

I am emailing my submission directly as I was unable to upload it to the portal. I have discussed this issue with Andrew Maytom, Engagement Officer, at Port Macquarie Hastings Council.

Concerns about the project as currently proposed.

1. Odour and Air Quality (impact of Bioaerosols)

- a. The planned site is under 500 metres from our home. According to the information it is 470 metres away, although I can't see where in the facility that measurement was taken. As atmospheric stability affects odour dispersal it seems we will be affected by odour emissions. Although the report details that very stable atmospheric conditions occur 34% of the time, limiting odour dispersal, moderately stable or moderately unstable atmospheric conditions appear to occur somewhere around 22% to 27% of the time, which would result in the dispersal of odour and bioaerosols in the surrounding area.
- b. In Spring and Summer, in particular, the most common winds in this area are north easterly. These breezes and winds would move odour and bioaerosols to the residences on Fernbank Creek Rd.
- c. Guidelines for situating water treatment plants are updated based on newer or more recent scientific information. The most recent state or territory update was in the Northern Territory where 500 metres is now the minimum distance a plant can be situated from residences. This still seems a short distance, however, is it possible to move the plant further east to ensure the western edge of the plant is no less than 500 metres from any residence?
- d. Our drinking water is collected from our roof and stored in tanks. We have a filtration system for our household water, however reduced air quality will likely affect the quality of the water we collect on our roof. Bioaerosols emitted from the plant can affect air quality because they can contain microorganisms such as viruses, bacteria, and fungi. This is a serious health consideration for us.
- e. Connection to 'town water'. There have been discussions at Community Engagement Meetings about connecting Fernbank Creek residents to Port Macquarie water system. I request this connection is provided to us at no charge other than a yearly access fee.

2. Safety on Fernbank Creek Rd during construction.

- a. During construction there will be greatly increased traffic, especially heavy vehicles, along Hastings River Drive and Fernbank Creek Rd. I understand there will be a traffic management system implemented for safety, however I believe Fernbank Creek Rd needs to be upgraded and widened to the Plant access road to ensure the safety of pedestrians, bike riders and motorists.
- b. Construction of the plant will cause noise and potential dust pollution. What strategies will be used to reduce the impact on the closest residents?

3. Loss of enjoyment of our homes and devaluation.

The residents on Fernbank Creek Rd will be adversely affected by the decision to build the plant at Fernbank Creek. As well as reducing our enjoyment of our homes because of odour and reduced air quality, we are also being affected by the reduced value of our properties. I believe from discussions

with two local real estate agents that this is already a reality. Will there be any compensation for the affected residents?

Thank you for considering this submission.

Yours sincerely

Elizabeth Dancet

[REDACTED]

Fernbank Creek

Get [Outlook for Android](#)