



## Environmental Protection Authority

**EPA REFERRAL  
FORM  
PROPONENT**

### **Referral of a Proposal by the Proponent to the Environmental Protection Authority under Section 38(1) of the *Environmental Protection Act 1986*.**

#### **PURPOSE OF THIS FORM**

Section 38(1) of the *Environmental Protection Act 1986* (EP Act) provides that where a development proposal is likely to have a significant effect on the environment, a proponent may refer the proposal to the Environmental Protection Authority (EPA) for a decision on whether or not it requires assessment under the EP Act. This form sets out the information requirements for the referral of a proposal by a proponent.

Proponents are encouraged to familiarise themselves with the EPA's *General Guide on Referral of Proposals* [see Environmental Impact Assessment/Referral of Proposals and Schemes] before completing this form.

A referral under section 38(1) of the EP Act by a proponent to the EPA must be made on this form. A request to the EPA for a declaration under section 39B (derived proposal) must be made on this form. This form will be treated as a referral provided all information required by Part A has been included and all information requested by Part B has been provided to the extent that it is pertinent to the proposal being referred. Referral documents are to be submitted in two formats – hard copy and electronic copy. The electronic copy of the referral will be provided for public comment for a period of 7 days, prior to the EPA making its decision on whether or not to assess the proposal.

#### **CHECKLIST**

Before you submit this form, please check that you have:

	Yes	No
Completed all the questions in Part A (essential).	X	
Completed all applicable questions in Part B.	X	
Included Attachment 1 – location maps.	X	
Included Attachment 2 – additional document(s) the proponent wishes to provide (if applicable).	X	
Included Attachment 3 – confidential information (if applicable).	N/A	N/A
Enclosed an electronic copy of all referral information, including spatial data and contextual mapping but excluding confidential information.	X	

Following a review of the information presented in this form, please consider the following question (a response is optional).

Do you consider the proposal requires formal environmental impact assessment?		
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Not sure
If yes, what level of assessment?		
<input type="checkbox"/> Assessment on Proponent Information	<input type="checkbox"/> Public Environmental Review	

**PROPONENT DECLARATION** (to be completed by the proponent)

I, Michelle Doak of Eco Logical Australia, declare that I am authorised on behalf of Michael Penson of City of Wanneroo (being the person responsible for the proposal) to submit this form and further declare that the information contained in this form is true and not misleading.

Signature <i>MDoak</i>	Name MICHELLE DOAK
Position SUPERVISING ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENTIST	Company ECO LOGICAL AUSTRALIA
Date 12 May 2014	

## PART A - PROPONENT AND PROPOSAL INFORMATION

(All fields of Part A must be completed for this document to be treated as a referral)

### 1 PROPONENT AND PROPOSAL INFORMATION

#### 1.1 Proponent

Name	City of Wanneroo
Joint Venture parties (if applicable)	Not Applicable
Australian Company Number (if applicable)	ABN: 64 295 981 165
Postal Address (where the proponent is a corporation or an association of persons, whether incorporated or not, the postal address is that of the principal place of business or of the principal office in the State)	City of Wanneroo Locked Bag 1 WANNEROO WA 6946
Key proponent contact for the proposal: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• name</li><li>• address</li><li>• phone</li><li>• email</li></ul>	Michael Penson Manager Property Services Address: Locked Bag 1, WANNEROO WA 6946 Ph: (08) 9405 5022 E:michael.penson@wanneroo.wa.gov.au
Consultant for the proposal (if applicable): <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• name</li><li>• address</li><li>• phone</li><li>• email</li></ul>	Michelle Doak Eco Logical Australia Suites 1 & 2, 49 Ord St WEST PERTH WA 6005 Ph: (08) 9227 1070 E: michelledoak@ecoaus.com.au

#### 1.2 Proposal

Title	Flynn Drive and Mather Drive Industrial Development, Neerabup
Description	Resource extraction and industrial land development at Lot 9000 Flynn Drive, Lots 41 and 9003 Mather Drive and Part Lot 600 Wattle Avenue in Neerabup, Western Australia. The site is also referred to as the Meridian Business Park and is located within the larger Neerabup Industrial Area. The development of the site will involve vegetation clearing and some areas of resource extraction followed by the creation of industrial lots, construction of roads and drainage infrastructure, and installation of services.
Extent (area) of proposed ground disturbance.	The site is 210 ha in size. Approximately 160 ha of land will be disturbed for the Proposal, which includes 140 ha of vegetation and 20 ha of already disturbed land. A total of 50 ha of vegetation will be

	retained as a conservation area.
Timeframe in which the activity or development is proposed to occur (including start and finish dates where applicable).	Implementation of the Proposal will commence subsequent to all relevant approvals being received. Development of the site is expected to be a long-term project. Resource extraction will occur progressively over the next 20 – 30 years. Development of the entire site for industrial purposes will be dependent on demand.
Details of any staging of the proposal.	Staging details not confirmed.
Is the proposal a strategic proposal?	No
Is the proponent requesting a declaration that the proposal is a derived proposal? If so, provide the following information on the strategic assessment within which the referred proposal was identified: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• title of the strategic assessment; and</li> <li>• Ministerial Statement number.</li> </ul>	No
Please indicate whether, and in what way, the proposal is related to other proposals in the region.	The site is located within the larger Neerabup Industrial Area (NIA) which has been and will continue to be developed by a number of different proponents for similar resource extraction and industrial development uses. The NIA is subject to two separate Structure Plan proposals which were developed and approved in 2005.
Does the proponent own the land on which the proposal is to be established? If not, what other arrangements have been established to access the land?	Yes
What is the current land use on the property, and the extent (area in hectares) of the property?	The land is predominantly zoned Industrial, however is currently undeveloped. The majority of the site is open woodland over degraded pasture with some cleared land and disturbance from tracks. The site is 210 ha in size. Approximately 160 ha of land (the project area) will be disturbed for the Proposal, which includes 140 ha of vegetation and 20 ha of already disturbed land. A total of 50 ha of vegetation will be retained as a conservation area.

### 1.3 Location

Name of the Shire in which the proposal is located.	City of Wanneroo
For urban areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>street address;</li> <li>lot number;</li> <li>suburb; and</li> <li>nearest road intersection.</li> </ul>	<p>Lot 9000 Flynn Drive, Lots 41 and 9003 Mather Drive and Part Lot 600 Wattle Avenue, Neerabup.</p> <p>The main road intersection for the project area is Flynn Drive and Mather Drive, Neerabup.</p>
For remote localities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>nearest town; and</li> <li>distance and direction from that town to the proposal site.</li> </ul>	Not applicable
Electronic copy of spatial data - GIS or CAD, geo-referenced and conforming to the following parameters: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GIS: polygons representing all activities and named;</li> <li>CAD: simple closed polygons representing all activities and named;</li> <li>datum: GDA94;</li> <li>projection: Geographic (latitude/longitude) or Map Grid of Australia (MGA);</li> <li>format: Arcview shapefile, Arcinfo coverages, Microstation or AutoCAD.</li> </ul>	Enclosed: Yes

### 1.4 Confidential Information

Does the proponent wish to request the EPA to allow any part of the referral information to be treated as confidential?	No
If yes, is confidential information attached as a separate document in hard copy?	No

### 1.5 Government Approvals

Is rezoning of any land required before the proposal can be implemented? If yes, please provide details.		No. The majority of the site is zoned 'Industrial', however a portion of Lot 9003 Mather Drive is zoned 'Business'.	
Is approval required from any Commonwealth or State Government agency or Local Authority for any part of the proposal? If yes, please complete the table below.		Yes	
Agency/Authority	Approval required	Application lodged Yes / No	Agency/Local Authority contact(s) for proposal
Commonwealth Department of the	<i>Environment Protection and</i>	Yes	Mr Justin Williams

Environment	<i>Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999</i> Assessment/Approval		
City of Wanneroo	Extractive Industries Licence / Development Application	No	TBA
Western Australian Planning Commission	Subdivision application	No	TBA

## PART B - ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND PROPOSED MANAGEMENT

### 2. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

Describe the impacts of the proposal on the following elements of the environment, by answering the questions contained in Sections 2.1-2.11:

- 2.1 flora and vegetation;
- 2.2 fauna;
- 2.3 rivers, creeks, wetlands and estuaries;
- 2.4 significant areas and/ or land features;
- 2.5 coastal zone areas;
- 2.6 marine areas and biota;
- 2.7 water supply and drainage catchments;
- 2.8 pollution;
- 2.9 greenhouse gas emissions;
- 2.10 contamination; and
- 2.11 social surroundings.

These features should be shown on the site plan, where appropriate.

For all information, please indicate:

- (a) the source of the information; and
- (b) the currency of the information.

#### 2.1 Flora and Vegetation

2.1.1 Do you propose to clear any native flora and vegetation as a part of this proposal?

[A proposal to clear native vegetation may require a clearing permit under Part V of the EP Act (Environmental Protection (Clearing of Native Vegetation) Regulations 2004)]. Please contact the Department of Environment and Conservation (DEC) for more information.

(please tick)

☒ Yes

**If yes**, complete the rest of this section.

☐ No

**If no**, go to the next section

2.1.2 How much vegetation are you proposing to clear (in hectares)?

The proposal will result in the clearing of approximately 140 ha of vegetation.

2.1.3 Have you submitted an application to clear native vegetation to the DEC (unless you are exempt from such a requirement)?

☐ Yes

☒ No

**If yes**, on what date and to which office was the application submitted of the DEC?

It is noted that a clearing permit was previously submitted to the Department of Environment and Conservation (now Department of Environment Regulation) in 2007 for the clearing of 175 ha of vegetation within the current project area (Permit application No.1795/1). However, this application was rejected.

2.1.4 Are you aware of any recent flora surveys carried out over the area to be disturbed by this proposal?

☒ Yes

☐ No

**If yes**, please attach a copy of any related survey reports and provide the date and name of persons / companies involved in the survey(s).

**If no**, please do not arrange to have any biological surveys conducted prior to consulting with the DEC.

Flora surveys carried out over the site are referred to in Section 3.4 of the attached Environmental Review document, and the following most recent reports have been appended to the attached Environmental Review document:

- Ground truthing of environmental values for Lot 4 Flynn Drive (ELA2012a)
- Targeted flora and fauna assessment of Lot 4 Flynn Drive (ELA 2013)

2.1.5 Has a search of DEC records for known occurrences of rare or priority flora or threatened ecological communities been conducted for the site?

☒ Yes

☐ No

If you are proposing to clear native vegetation for any part of your proposal, a search of DEC records of known occurrences of rare or priority flora and threatened ecological communities will be required. Please contact DEC for more information.

Refer to Appendix D of the attached Environmental Review document.

2.1.6 Are there any known occurrences of rare or priority flora or threatened ecological communities on the site?

☒ Yes

☐ No

**If yes**, please indicate which species or communities are involved and provide copies of any correspondence with DEC regarding these matters.

The TEC '*Banksia attenuata* woodland over species rich dense shrublands' SCP 20a occurs at the site. Refer to Sections 3.4 and 3.5 of the attached Environmental Review document for further information.



2.1.7 If located within the Perth Metropolitan Region, is the proposed development within or adjacent to a listed Bush Forever Site? (You will need to contact the Bush Forever Office, at the Department for Planning and Infrastructure)

☒ Yes

☐ No

**If yes**, please indicate which Bush Forever Site is affected (site number and name of site where appropriate).

The southern portion of the site intersects Bush Forever Site 295. Refer to Sections 2.1 and 3.4.4 of the attached Environmental Review document for further information.

2.1.8 What is the condition of the vegetation at the site?

The vegetation at the site ranges from Completely Degraded to Excellent condition. See Section 3.4.3 of the attached Environmental Review document for further details.

## 2.2 Fauna

2.2.1 Do you expect that any fauna or fauna habitat will be impacted by the proposal?

(please tick)

☒ Yes

**If yes**, complete the rest of this section.

☐ No

**If no**, go to the next section.

2.2.2 Describe the nature and extent of the expected impact.

The proposal will directly impact 140 ha of predominantly Banksia woodland which will reduce the extent of local habitat for fauna. Carnaby's Black-Cockatoo is present at the site and is the main species of conservation significant fauna likely to be impacted by the proposal. Refer to Section 4.2 of the attached Environmental Review document for further information.

2.2.3 Are you aware of any recent fauna surveys carried out over the area to be disturbed by this proposal?

☒ Yes

☐ No

**If yes**, please attach a copy of any related survey reports and provide the date and name of persons / companies involved in the survey(s).

**If no**, please do not arrange to have any biological surveys conducted prior to consulting with the DEC.

Refer to Section 3.6 of the attached Environmental Review document and the following reports that have been appended to the Environmental Review:

- Ground truthing of environmental values for Lot 4 Flynn Drive (ELA2012a)
- Targeted flora and fauna assessment of Lot 4 Flynn Drive (ELA 2013)

2.2.4 Has a search of DEC records for known occurrences of Specially Protected (threatened) fauna been conducted for the site?

☒ Yes ☐ No (please tick)

Refer to Appendix D of the attached Environmental Review document.

2.2.5 Are there any known occurrences of Specially Protected (threatened) fauna on the site?

☒ Yes ☐ No **If yes**, please indicate which species or communities are involved and provide copies of any correspondence with DEC regarding these matters.

A total of four vertebrate fauna species of conservation significance have been recorded, or are considered likely to occur, within the site:

- Carnaby's Black-Cockatoo (WC: Act S1, EPBC Act: Endangered)
- Rainbow Bee-eater (EPBC Act: Migratory)
- Western Brush Wallaby (Priority 4)
- Carpet Python (WC Act: S4).

Refer to Section 3.6.2 of the attached Environmental Review document for further information.

## 2.3 Rivers, Creeks, Wetlands and Estuaries

2.3.1 Will the development occur within 200 metres of a river, creek, wetland or estuary?

(please tick) ☐ Yes **If yes**, complete the rest of this section.

☒ No **If no**, go to the next section.

2.3.2 Will the development result in the clearing of vegetation within the 200 metre zone?

☐ Yes ☐ No **If yes**, please describe the extent of the expected impact.

2.3.3 Will the development result in the filling or excavation of a river, creek, wetland or estuary?

☐ Yes ☐ No **If yes**, please describe the extent of the expected impact.

2.3.4 Will the development result in the impoundment of a river, creek, wetland or estuary?

☐ Yes      ☐ No      **If yes**, please describe the extent of the expected impact.

2.3.5 Will the development result in draining to a river, creek, wetland or estuary?

☐ Yes      ☐ No      **If yes**, please describe the extent of the expected impact.

2.3.6 Are you aware if the proposal will impact on a river, creek, wetland or estuary (or its buffer) within one of the following categories? (please tick)

Conservation Category Wetland	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Unsure
Environmental Protection (South West Agricultural Zone Wetlands) Policy 1998	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Unsure
Perth's Bush Forever site	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Unsure
Environmental Protection (Swan & Canning Rivers) Policy 1998	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Unsure
The management area as defined in s4(1) of the <i>Swan River Trust Act 1988</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Unsure
Which is subject to an international agreement, because of the importance of the wetland for waterbirds and waterbird habitats (e.g. Ramsar, JAMBA, CAMBA)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Unsure

## 2.4 Significant Areas and/ or Land Features

2.4.1 Is the proposed development located within or adjacent to an existing or proposed National Park or Nature Reserve?

☐ Yes      ☒ No      **If yes**, please provide details.

2.4.2 Are you aware of any Environmentally Sensitive Areas (as declared by the Minister under section 51B of the EP Act) that will be impacted by the proposed development?

☐ Yes      ☒ No      **If yes**, please provide details.

Approximately 27 ha of the Threatened Ecological Community (TEC) '*Banksia attenuata* woodland over species rich dense shrublands' SCP 20a occurs within the site, as well as approximately 20 ha of Bush Forever Site 295. Both of these areas are classified as Environmentally Sensitive Areas (ESAs) under Section 51B of the EP Act.

These areas will be retained within the site design and therefore no impact will occur.

2.4.3 Are you aware of any significant natural land features (e.g. caves, ranges etc) that will be impacted by the proposed development?

☐ Yes

☒ No

**If yes**, please provide details.

## 2.5 Coastal Zone Areas (Coastal Dunes and Beaches)

2.5.1 Will the development occur within 300metres of a coastal area?

(please tick)

☐ Yes

**If yes**, complete the rest of this section.

☒ No

**If no**, go to the next section.

2.5.2 What is the expected setback of the development from the high tide level and from the primary dune?

2.5.3 Will the development impact on coastal areas with significant landforms including beach ridge plain, cusped headland, coastal dunes or karst?

☐ Yes

☐ No

**If yes**, please describe the extent of the expected impact.

2.5.4 Is the development likely to impact on mangroves?

☐ Yes

☐ No

**If yes**, please describe the extent of the expected impact.

## 2.6 Marine Areas and Biota

2.6.1 Is the development likely to impact on an area of sensitive benthic communities, such as seagrasses, coral reefs or mangroves?

☐ Yes

☒ No

**If yes**, please describe the extent of the expected impact.

2.6.2 Is the development likely to impact on marine conservation reserves or areas recommended for reservation (as described in *A Representative Marine Reserve System for Western Australia*, CALM, 1994)?

☐ Yes

☒ No

**If yes**, please describe the extent of the expected impact.

2.6.3 Is the development likely to impact on marine areas used extensively for recreation or for commercial fishing activities?

☐ Yes

☒ No

**If yes**, please describe the extent of the expected impact, and provide any written advice from relevant agencies (e.g. Fisheries WA).

## 2.7 Water Supply and Drainage Catchments

2.7.1 Are you in a proclaimed or proposed groundwater or surface water protection area?

(You may need to contact the Department of Water (DoW) for more information on the requirements for your location, including the requirement for licences for water abstraction. Also, refer to the DoW website)

☐ Yes

☒ No

**If yes**, please describe what category of area.

2.7.2 Are you in an existing or proposed Underground Water Supply and Pollution Control area?

(You may need to contact the DoW for more information on the requirements for your location, including the requirement for licences for water abstraction. Also, refer to the DoW website)

☐ Yes

☒ No

**If yes**, please describe what category of area.

2.7.3 Are you in a Public Drinking Water Supply Area (PDWSA)?

(You may need to contact the DoW for more information or refer to the DoW website. A proposal to clear vegetation within a PDWSA requires approval from DoW.)

☐ Yes

☒ No

**If yes**, please describe what category of area.

2.7.4 Is there sufficient water available for the proposal?

(Please consult with the DoW as to whether approvals are required to source water as you propose. Where necessary, please provide a letter of intent from the DoW)

☐ Yes

☒ No

(please tick)

The DoW has advised that groundwater for POS or road verge/landscaping irrigation is unavailable in this area and an alternative source will need to be found or a water licence traded with a local licence holder.

2.7.5 Will the proposal require drainage of the land?

☒ Yes

☐ No

**If yes**, how is the site to be drained and will the drainage be connected to an existing Local Authority or Water Corporation drainage system? Please provide details.

Stormwater drainage will be required at the site, with specific details yet to be determined. A Drainage, Nutrient and Water Management Plan (superseded by relevant document required by *Better Urban Water Management guidelines*) is required to be prepared to manage hydrology issues at the site. This plan will incorporate the requirement for utilisation of best management practices to treat stormwater prior to

infiltration or discharge in line with the Stormwater Management Manual (DoW 2004-2007).

2.7.6 Is there a water requirement for the construction and/ or operation of this proposal?

(please tick)

☒ Yes

**If yes**, complete the rest of this section.

☐ No

**If no**, go to the next section.

2.7.7 What is the water requirement for the construction and operation of this proposal, in kilolitres per year?

Water required during construction is likely to include water for dust suppression. The water requirements for resource extraction and during lot development will be determined by future resource extraction companies and individual tenants, with all necessary licences obtained by these parties.

All potable water required for the development will be provided by the Water Corporation.

2.7.8 What is the proposed source of water for the proposal? (e.g. dam, bore, surface water etc.)

All potable water required for the development will be provided by the Water Corporation.

## 2.8 Pollution

2.8.1 Is there likely to be any discharge of pollutants from this development, such as noise, vibration, gaseous emissions, dust, liquid effluent, solid waste or other pollutants?

(please tick)

☒ Yes

**If yes**, complete the rest of this section.

☐ No

**If no**, go to the next section.

See Section 4.1.2 of attached Environmental Review Document. The main emissions at the site will be dust from construction and waste including sewerage and general construction waste. The management hierarchy of avoid, reduce, reuse, recycle and recover waste will be applied in management of the site.

2.8.2 Is the proposal a prescribed premise, under the Environmental Protection Regulations 1987?

(Refer to the EPA's *General Guide for Referral of Proposals to the EPA under section 38(1) of the EP Act 1986* for more information)

☐ Yes

☒ No

**If yes**, please describe what category of prescribed premise.

The current site is not a prescribed premise, however, prescribed premises may be established at the site through industrial development. Future individual tenants will be responsible for obtaining all necessary licenses/permits.

2.8.3 Will the proposal result in gaseous emissions to air?

☐ Yes

☒ No

**If yes**, please briefly describe.

Minimal emissions from operations of site equipment may occur. Future industrial development may involve activities producing emissions, however the activities at the site are likely to be in line with general industrial practices and will not involve heavy industrial activities producing large quantities of gaseous emissions.

2.8.4 Have you done any modelling or analysis to demonstrate that air quality standards will be met, including consideration of cumulative impacts from other emission sources?

☐ Yes

☒ No

**If yes**, please briefly describe.

2.8.5 Will the proposal result in liquid effluent discharge?

☐ Yes

☒ No

**If yes**, please briefly describe the nature, concentrations and receiving environment.

Effluent discharge will be managed within the standard sewerage system.

2.8.6 If there is likely to be discharges to a watercourse or marine environment, has any analysis been done to demonstrate that the State Water Quality Management Strategy or other appropriate standards will be able to be met?

☐ Yes

☒ No

**If yes**, please describe.

No discharges to a watercourse or the marine environment are proposed as part of this proposal.

2.8.7 Will the proposal produce or result in solid wastes?

☒ Yes

☐ No

**If yes**, please briefly describe the nature, concentrations and disposal location/ method.

Solid waste from resource extraction will primarily be soil, vegetation/mulch. Minimal construction waste will be produced as part of the proposal. All solid waste will be subject to a management hierarchy of avoid, reduce, reuse, recycle and recover waste will be applied in management of the site.

2.8.8 Will the proposal result in significant off-site noise emissions?

☐ Yes

☒ No

**If yes**, please briefly describe.

There will be noise generated during construction of the proposal and potentially some during sand extraction and operation of industrial lots once established.

The closest receptors to the site are the residential suburbs of Carramar and Banksia Grove located approximately 300 m to the south-west, and 300 m to the south of the site respectively (at their closest points). These receptors are not anticipated to be affected by the development of the proposal as the Environmental Protection (Noise) Regulations 1997 will be complied with.

2.8.9 Will the development be subject to the Environmental Protection (Noise) Regulations 1997?

☒ Yes

☐ No

**If yes**, has any analysis been carried out to demonstrate that the proposal will comply with the Regulations?

Please attach the analysis.

An analysis has not been carried out to demonstrate the proposal will comply with the Regulations. However resource extraction and construction of the industrial lots will occur during normal operating hours of 7am-7pm Monday – Saturday. Any evening or work on Sundays will be the subject of a Noise Management Plan. Operational noise from General Industrial use will be subject to individual licensing if required.

2.8.10 Does the proposal have the potential to generate off-site, air quality impacts, dust, odour or another pollutant that may affect the amenity of residents and other “sensitive premises” such as schools and hospitals (proposals in this category may include intensive agriculture, aquaculture, marinas, mines and quarries etc.)?

☐ Yes

☒ No

**If yes**, please describe and provide the distance to residences and other “sensitive premises”.

2.8.11 If the proposal has a residential component or involves “sensitive premises”, is it located near a land use that may discharge a pollutant?

☐ Yes

☐ No

☒ Not Applicable

**If yes**, please describe and provide the distance to the potential pollution source

## 2.9 Greenhouse Gas Emissions

2.9.1 Is this proposal likely to result in substantial greenhouse gas emissions (greater than 100 000 tonnes per annum of carbon dioxide equivalent emissions)?

☐ Yes

☒ No

**If yes**, please provide an estimate of the annual gross emissions in absolute and in carbon dioxide equivalent figures.



2.9.2 Further, if yes, please describe proposed measures to minimise emissions, and any sink enhancement actions proposed to offset emissions.

## 2.10 Contamination

2.10.1 Has the property on which the proposal is to be located been used in the past for activities which may have caused soil or groundwater contamination?

☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ Unsure **If yes**, please describe.

2.10.2 Has any assessment been done for soil or groundwater contamination on the site?

☐ Yes ☒ No **If yes**, please describe.

2.10.3 Has the site been registered as a contaminated site under the *Contaminated Sites Act 2003*? (on finalisation of the CS Regulations and proclamation of the CS Act)

☐ Yes ☒ No **If yes**, please describe.

## 2.11 Social Surroundings

2.11.1 Is the proposal on a property which contains or is near a site of Aboriginal ethnographic or archaeological significance that may be disturbed?

☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ Unsure **If yes**, please describe.

2.11.2 Is the proposal on a property which contains or is near a site of high public interest (e.g. a major recreation area or natural scenic feature)?

☒ Yes ☐ No **If yes**, please describe.

Bush Forever Site 295 occurs within and to the south of the site and Barbagallo Raceway occurs to the north.

2.11.3 Will the proposal result in or require substantial transport of goods, which may affect the amenity of the local area?

☐ Yes ☒ No **If yes**, please describe.

### 3. PROPOSED MANAGEMENT

#### 3.1 Principles of Environmental Protection

3.1.1 Have you considered how your project gives attention to the following Principles, as set out in section 4A of the EP Act? (For information on the Principles of Environmental Protection, please see EPA Position Statement No. 7, available on the EPA website)

- |  |   |                             |
|--|---|-----------------------------|
| 1. The precautionary principle.  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| 2. The principle of intergenerational equity.  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| 3. The principle of the conservation of biological diversity and ecological integrity. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| 4. Principles relating to improved valuation, pricing and incentive mechanisms.        | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| 5. The principle of waste minimisation.  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |

3.1.2 Is the proposal consistent with the EPA's Environmental Protection Bulletins/Position Statements and Environmental Assessment Guidelines/Guidance Statements (available on the EPA website)?

☒ Yes      ☐ No

#### 3.2 Consultation

3.2.1 Has public consultation taken place (such as with other government agencies, community groups or neighbours), or is it intended that consultation shall take place?

☒ Yes      ☐ No      **If yes**, please list those consulted and attach comments or summarise response on a separate sheet.

Extensive public and stakeholder consultation has already been undertaken for the development of the Neerabup Industrial Area.

The North West Corridor Structure Plan released in 1992 first identified the site for industrial development. The Structure Plan identified Neerabup as a strategic industrial area for larger scale industrial activities centrally located to service the north-west corridor of Perth. The Structure Plan was prepared by the then Department of Planning and Urban Development and was subject to formal public consultation and workshops.

In 1994 the rezoning of the site to Industrial under the Perth Metropolitan Region Scheme was publically advertised under MRS Major Amendment No 948/33 prior to being adopted by the Western Australian Planning Commission.

In 1996 the rezoning of the site to Industrial under the City of Wanneroo District Planning Scheme No 2 was publically advertised prior to being adopted by the City of Wanneroo.

In 2005 the Neerabup Industrial Area Structure Plan was publically advertised prior to its adoption by the City of Wanneroo and the Western Australian Planning Commission. Extensive consultation was also undertaken between landowners in the development of the Structure Plan prior to being submitted for approval.

In the preparation of this current proposal City of Wanneroo has conducted follow up consultation with LandCorp.