

7 May 2026

NSW Dept of Planning, Heritage and Infrastructure

Attn: Caitlin Hopper

Re: SSD Application Number SSD-86456706 140-152 Narrow Neck Rd Katoomba

Dear Caitlin,

I write to both express my general objection to the above development and my specific concern that the sewerage system does not have capacity to accept such large a connection.

General Objection

I am a keen bushwalker with extensive experience walking in many parts of the Blue Mountains including down into the Kedumba Valley. I also find myself going to Katoomba relatively often and have attended many conferences there and am very familiar with the golf course location. For such a large development to be approved in a low density residential area such a long way from services is an affront to the enjoyment of the mountains for locals and visitors alike. The development will bring much increased traffic, noise and visual impact that can only be a significant downside given the very high density to be built that is out of character of the surrounding areas.

I also strongly object to the approval of a stark increase in development density several times what was already approved for the site due to the precedent it sets. As this developer has done, others likewise will submit ambit claims for over development to get the project price beyond the appropriate judgement of local Council and into the generic realm of the SSD approval process.

Sewerage System Capacity

Having worked in the water industry, I am somewhat aware of the substantial development already added to the sewerage catchment serving the proposed development site (I had inspected new pumping stations during the 1990's). Also it happens that I camped at Katoomba Tourist Park last year (for the Grand Cliff Walk) when there was a storm. It is clear that the sewer downstream of the proposed development appears to already overflow sewage into Kedumba River. Sydney Water's EPA licence for the sewerage system requires it to ensure wet weather overflows do not occur more than once a year on average (Clause L7.2, page 14, Environmental Protection Licence 1963). From what I saw, I doubt this requirement is being met currently and even more so were this proposed development to proceed.

In my view of the EIS, there seems to be no reference to or attempt to explain how all the extra sewage (at least 500 people) from this development is going to be handled without impact onto the environment. The apparent absence of such attention to wastewater impacts this EIS adds to my conclusion that this EIS is an ambit claim to trick the SSD process into approval.

I strongly urge your Department to not let this proposed development slip through to SSD approval to thereby make mockery of your Department's processes and the legislation it enacts.

Your diligent attention on this matter is appreciated.

Yours Sincerely,

XXX XXX BE (Civil)