



## Office of Water

14 April 2011

Ms Christine Chapman  
Major Development Assessment  
Department of Planning  
GPO Box 39  
SYDNEY NSW 2001

c: Janne Grose  
t: 02 4729 8262  
f: 02 4729 8141  
e: Janne.Grose@water.nsw.gov.au

Our ref : ER21037  
Your ref: MP10\_0065

Dear Ms Chapman

**MP10\_0065 Kimbriki Resource Recovery project, Kimbriki Road, Terry Hills –  
Environmental Assessment**

Thank you for your letter of 29 October 2010 seeking comment from the NSW Office of Water (NOW) on the Environmental Assessment (EA) for the above major project proposal.

The NOW's key issues with the EA are outlined in Attachment A.

**Contact Details**

Should you have any queries in relation to this matter please contact Janne Grose on telephone (02) 4729 8262.

Yours sincerely

**Mark Mignanelli**  
Manager Major Projects and Assessment

## NSW Office of Water Comments

### Kimbriki Resource Recovery project Environmental Assessment

---

#### **Waterways and Riparian Land**

NOW notes that Warringah Council's *Warringah Creek Management Study* has identified the site as situated in the upper catchment of Deep Creek and the catchment has very high ecological value. Warringah Council has identified that a waterway and wetland occur on the eastern portion of the lot which is the proposed location of the Resource Recovery Facility Output Maturation site (see Volume 2, Appendix B).

Reference is made to NOW's Test of Adequacy (ToA) submission dated 17 December 2010. In this submission the NOW sought clarification as to whether any watercourses as defined under the Water Management Act occur on the site and if the proposal will affect these watercourses, riparian areas and groundwater dependent ecosystems (GDE's). NOW recommended the Environmental Assessment (EA) include a series of photos looking upstream and downstream along the drainage lines on the site and a map showing the point from which the photos were taken.

The EA states "*the drainage line within the site comprises overland flow and is not a 'defined channel'*" and it concludes "*no river as defined under the Water Management Act 2000 occur on the site*" (see Section 12.2, Volume 1). Photographs included in Section 12.2 of the EA and Volume 3 (Appendix L, Archaeological Investigation report, plate 6.14) appear to show the presence of a watercourse on the site. While under S75U of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act, major projects are exempt from the need for a controlled activity approval from the NOW, it is important that any proposed disturbance and removal of this watercourse / drainage line on the site does not adversely impact and degrade the downstream environment, particularly as Deep Creek catchment has high ecological value and Garigal National Park is located downstream.

#### **Groundwater Dependent Ecosystem**

The EA notes there is "*one small swampy area in the drainage line south of the proposed amenities building*" and this is "*considered to be consistent with the definition of groundwater dependent ecosystem*" (see Section 12.2, page 12-8). Section 4.2.3 of Flora and Fauna Survey Impact Assessment indicates the small swamp ecosystem "*is likely to be at least partially dependent on groundwater that is fed by natural flows down the drainage line running north to south through the subject site where the proposed maturation building is located.*"

In the ToA submission, NOW recommended that the EA provide details on the location of the groundwater dependent ecosystem (GDE) in relation to the site boundary and the location of the proposed buildings and areas of disturbance. The Flora and Fauna Assessment notes the swampy area is located in the drainage line immediately south of the proposed Amenities building (see Section 4.2.3, page 95, Volume 2) but no further details have been provided which show the location of the swamp and drainage line.

NOW notes *“the construction of the proposed maturation/final processing building and amenities building over the existing drainage flow path that feeds the swampy area and downstream channel would alter the natural flow path”* (Section 12.2 of the EA, page 12-8). While Section 8.3.2 of the EA notes this area would be retained and protected in a managed offset area (see section 8.3.2, Volume 1) the locating of the proposed maturation building over the drainage line is likely to affect the downstream swamp unless the project adequately minimises disruptions to natural water flows.

Section 8.3.2 of the EA states that Figure 6.6 (figure 6.5 ?) illustrates that *“up-gradient overland flow runoff that currently enters the site would be diverted past the new operational areas and continue its natural flow path”* but it is not clear where the downstream swamp and natural flow paths are located in relation to the proposed flow diversion. Section 12.2 of the EA states the overflow from roof rainwater tanks would also be directed to this area and indicates this would ensure that natural flows down-gradient of the site are replicated as closely as possible.

The project needs to ensure the volume, velocity, frequency of flow and water quality etc entering the swamp and downstream drainage lines replicates natural conditions so that the proposal does not adversely effect the downstream environment and does not cause bed and bank instability, especially as the Water Management Report states that the large hardstand and roofed area would increase the yearly average volume of runoff at the downstream site boundary by approximately 70% over the existing conditions if discharged directly to the receiving environment. (Volume 3, Appendix J, Section 2.3.3, page 6). It is noted in Section 12.6.2 of the EA that the annual overland flow to the south eastern retained vegetation area would increase by less than 10% and additional volume of stormwater entering the eastern drain and the existing eastern sedimentation dam is expected to increase by approximately 30 ML/year (see page 12-14, Volume 1).

Section 8.4 of the EA includes as a mitigation measure that a detailed drainage plan would be prepared to minimise disruptions to natural water flows and control the quality of water runoff into the natural drainage lines and offset areas (see Volume 1, page 8-14). It is recommended this mitigation measure is included as a Statement of Commitment.

If the proposal is approved, it is recommended the monitoring requirements (Tables 18.1 and 18.2 in the EA) monitor the impact of the proposal on the GDE during construction and operation.

**End Attachment A**  
**14 April 2011**