

Review of Document for SSD-30759158

Dam Dewatering Assessment: 268 & 278 Catherine Fields Road, Catherine Fields, NSW P2108320JR03V01 – April 2022 Prepared by Martens Consulting Engineers

This review is based solely on the specified above document and appendices.

2.2 page 8 refers to “site observations of the lot at 268 Catherine Fields Road from the walkover conducted on 19 November 2019 were....” This claim is likely false & misleading as the date is highly contentious.

At the time of the alleged walkover there was another large dam on the site that was dewatered and filled in, shortly before the property was taken possession of by the development proponents. If Martens had completed the site walkover and observations on the date claimed, then they should have observed the third dam which was the biggest of the three. This aerial Imagery date is 22/03/2018 The third dam is circled but all 3 dams were dry at the time as it was taken in a drought period.

At the time of removal, the third dam was about 1/3 to half full.



It should also be noted that the aerial photo on **p18 of the Martens Report**, whilst not date stamped appears to be taken just after the dam was dewatered as the ground where the dam was located is mostly bare as is the area to the north of the dam that was levelled and used to fill in the dam. I am unaware of exactly when this shot was taken but recent alterations to my pool area are showing and they were completed late December 2019

. Further to this the following claims were made in the same section:

-A site dam was located in the central portion of the site. The dam appears to have been constructed by excavating an elongated basin. No embankments were observed.

A second dam with an elongated shape had been filled with silt and was heavily vegetated

The reference to the second dam above is also currently not correct as the dam whilst partially silted currently has water in it.

“No embankments were observed.”

This statement is also false & misleading: There are embankments on the western end of both dams and there is a large embankment on the south side of dam 2.

-

3.1 Dam Water Volume Estimate: The numbers are not accurate as dam 2 currently has water in it and the depth in dam 1 exceeds the “*visual assessment depth of 0.75m* and a likely gradual deepening towards the dam centre.”. The reviewer measured the depth at 1.0m at approximately 1m from the dam edge so there is considerably more water in the dams than has been calculated in this report thus making the report false and misleading.

3.3 Sampling Methods – General states “*Sediment and water samples were placed in laboratory supplied jars, and placed into an esky with ice following collection and dispatched under chain of custody, to a NATA accredited laboratory the day of sampling*”. This excerpt from the document claims that all the samples (5 soil and 1 water) were placed in an esky with ice and despatched on the 22nd Nov. The chain of custody document listed in the appendices states that the samples of soil and water were placed in an esky with ice under chain of custody. There is no record of the water sample on the custody document. The chain of custody form also states the samples had no ice. – This is false & misleading and further to this the chain of custody form shows the delivery “by Courier”, was received by the laboratory of the 25th Nov. Where were the samples in the intervening period?

The chain of custody record makes no reference to a water sample being either despatched from site or received at the lab. No record of a water sample shows anywhere in the laboratory tests shown in the appendices. The claims associated with this operation are therefore false and misleading.

3.5.2 Dam Water

“Dam water sample contaminant levels were below their LOR and less than the ANZG 90% limit.

The laboratory certificate is provided in Attachment B”. There is no record of the dam water sample being on the chain of custody form or any laboratory testing records attached to the report so it must be concluded that the tests did not occur, so the report is again misleading and deceptive.

5.0 Discussion & Conclusion

I oppose application SSD-30759158 based on my conclusions noted in this report which cannot be relied upon as there are too many errors in the process, timing concerns, details wrong or missing and factually incorrect. This report should be discarded in its entirety and not form part of the approval process.