ID	Q1. Please provide a	Q2. How would	Q3. You can	Q4. You can enter	IP	Date
	contact email address	you like to make	upload your	your submission	Hash	
		your submission?	submission			
1141464		I would like to write my		My family own property on		27 Oct 23 2:05PM
		submission		the		
				to the south of the		
				PSP. Melbourne Water		
				transferred water through a		
				600mm diameter pipe from		
				the Officer South drain to		
				the Gum Scrub Creek		
				without consulting myself		
				or, to my knowledge, any of		
				the other affected		
				landowners. The increase		
				in water flow had a		
				negative impact on my		
				property at		
				Due to the constant		
				inundation we had about		
				10ha of pasture badly to		
				moderately affected,		
				causing much of it to be		
				destroyed. At the time of		
				this flooding the actual		
				rainfall was not excessive		
				and would not have caused		
				any significant flooding.		
				The property		
				has also been		
				identified as a property of		

			 <u>. </u>		
			interest in the report titled		
			Engeny Water		
			Management presumably		
			because it is subject to		
			severe flooding and was		
			the area where we lost		
			most of our pasture when		
			the water from Officer		
			South drain was transferred		
			to the Gum Scrub Creek.		
			The property at		
			has a gap identified in		
			the southern levee as being		
			repaired. This is at a		
			crossing point originally put		
			in by the State Rivers and		
			Water Supply Commission		
			when they were the		
			responsible authority. In a		
			major flood in February		
			2010 it was washed out. I		
			indicated on a number of		
			occasions to Melbourne		
			Water it needed repairing.		
			It was only after another		
			moderate flood that		
			anything was done. I was		
			informed it was my		
			responsibility, even though		
			it was installed by the		
			drainage authority at the		
			time and I also indicated at		
			the time it was not installed		
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	-	-	<u> </u>	l .	

very well. We have an area
on the property where
Gum Scrub Creek crosses
Cardinia Road, identified in
the Jacobs Officer South
Employment Hydrological
Report on page 61 as
Waterway Dense
vegetation. This is an area
of about 2ha that has a
Conservation Covenant
placed on it with the Trust
for Nature. As the land
holder we are responsible
to maintain the area as per
our agreement with Trust
for Nature. Trust for Nature
were keen to covenant this
area because of its
significance as one of the
last remaining examples of
this type of Koo Wee Rup
swamp vegetation left in
the area. It also has
significance as in part of it,
the Gum Scrub Creek is still
in its natural state I.e. has
never been artificially
channeled. Some other
concerns I have. When the
Officer South Road drain
was being installed in the
early 1900s, the landholder

	of Jesmond Dene farm took	\neg
	the then responsible	
	authority, Berwick Shire	
	Council, to the Victorian	
	Supreme Court and got a	
	ruling in his favour, that the	
	normal flow of the Officer	
	South drain was to enter	
	the Cardinia Creek at the	
	Officer South outfall and	
	not to be transferred to the	
	Gum Scrub Creek. It	
	appears that Melbourne	
	Water are in contravention	
	of this ruling. Because of	
	the increased	
	environmental and	
	aesthetic values of not	
	piping or channeling water	
	in concrete structures,	
	building a man made	
	watercourse should be	
	avoided. Melbourne Water	
	have already piped water	
	from the Officer South	
	drain to the Gum Scrub	
	Creek. I don't believe this	
	sits well with the current	
	Melbourne Water strategy	
	as responsible asset	
	managers. The many	
	retarding basins/wetlands	
	throughout the Officer	
	1 10 111 111	

Court Fundament DCD
South Employment PSP
would appear to be going
to be developed as open
water areas as is the
current practice in the area.
More effort should be
made to develop some of
them as closed wetlands. I
would use the example of
the area we have a
covenant on at
as such a wetland.
This is much more
reminiscent of the original
vegetation of the area. The
environmental values of
this type of wetland are
different from the open
wetlands being developed
in the new estates in the
area. I wish to make it clear
that at no time have
Melbourne Water or their
consultants contacted me
or any member of my
family even though works
they have already
undertaken have had a
negative impact on our
operations.
Operations.