

## Deputation Shire of Mundaring Meeting

My name is Mark Hancock, of Timbertop Way Stoneville and I am the Chairman of The Susannah Brook Catchment Group.

Tributaries of the Susannah Brook drain the northern region of the proposed North Stoneville development site and will directly impacting our waterways. Given this, the Susannah Brook Catchment Group is very concerned by the impact the development will have on the catchment's ecological health.

### **Motion:**

That Council recommends the Western Australian Planning Commission refuse Structure Plan 34 because:-

The water quality of Susannah Brook and Jane Brook would be seriously comprised with potential discharges of treated water, dam leaks and the subsequent change in water runoff into the two brooks from storm water.

The operators of the Sewage plant are unable to determine or measure if there are any leaks from the treatment holding Dams into the catchment and environment and is a concern.

The operators state verbally no water will be discharged into the creeks or waterways yet

In their original submission they acknowledged it is possible for a discharge of treated wastewater from the Recycled Water Plant to occur

In the recommendations to council it is noted that the operators have now recalculated the POS requiring irrigation and will use the water previous planned for discharge on the extra POS. This water maybe treated for certain bacterium (E Coli) but we understand treating for pharmaceuticals and other drugs will not occur.

Now it seems with their recalculation they want more lawns and exotic plants in the area so they can dispose of the treated water without discharging it directly into the waterways, [but we know what the soil has low drainage permeability.](#)

In community meetings we questioned why more water friendly options weren't considered such as rainwater tanks and individual household grey water systems. Their response was if grey water systems were used, they wouldn't have enough water for the POS and would need to use scheme water? Inconsistent answers or answers they thought the audience wanted to hear? How water sensitive will the design be given the amount of water they need to dispose of on POS

The use of endemic plants and even native grasses as a turf replacement throughout the development to help the wildlife and maintain the Hills environment wouldn't require as much water however it appears they need to dispose of their treated water on POS and can only recalculate the area needed to be irrigated so many times before approval.

The high volume of storm water which will be generated across the large areas of hard surfaces within the development will ultimately be directed into the Susannah Brook or Jane Brook catchments either directly or by seepage.

As part of the Local Water Management Strategy, they recommended increasing the capacity of the existing dams in the area and building Flood storage areas and potentially a central wetland being constructed. There is currently a wetland like area in the North Eastern portion of the site which (like a large part of the development) floods during periods of rain and drains into the Susannah Brook. The Dam in this area is full even during summer and is home to a number of aquatic species such as long neck turtles, gilgies and various other macro invertebrates. The area has aboriginal significance and has been acknowledged in their reports (Snappy Gums?) which recommended minimal disturbance of the area.

Yet they want to increase the capacity of this dam because it is already full, to receive more storm water runoff.

Details of this and possibly the centrally located wetland are sketchy at best.

Validating the source data in their reports is also of concern, the rainfall average that has been used of 1,079 mm was based on an average collected at Bickley since 1969, is this really realistic to use an average going back so far, we all know Perth's climate is changing. Last year I recorded only 545 mm from May to the end of the year which is half they have been using in their modellings. (this year I have recorded only 487 mm til 11 August) They have acknowledged that rainfall is likely to fall 10 – 20% over the next 30 years. So while the rainfall levels are likely to fall in the future, our streams will be topped up with increasingly contaminated water from road runoff, flood storage areas along with potentially nutrient and drug loaded water from the sewage plant.

How can it be said that the water flows into the catchment will be the same post development as predevelopment when their assumptions are so far out? Climate change doesn't appear to be mentioned in the developer's reports, if it isn't addressed because it isn't a specific requirement surely it is a moral obligation to mention the consequence of clearing so much natural vegetation

Some local councils are declaring a climate change emergency, we have a similar concept with The Shire of Mundaring's Local Biodiversity Strategy 2009 which prioritised the retention of existing remnant vegetation and encourages efforts to support wildlife corridors across the shire. It is disappointing that such a large parcel of land within the shire is exempt from clearing restrictions outlined in this strategy simply because the land was zoned prior to the strategy being completed.

The consideration and planning of SP34 was started in the 1990's but we have learnt a lot in the last 20 to 30 years of how our actions will affect our future climate and biodiversity. We want to ensure that we avoid the mistakes of the past, hiding behind a comment that it has been on the drawing board for years or it is government policy is no longer acceptable to the community. Let's not become climate change deniers instead lets protect our waterways and unique wildlife, say no to SP