

No.	NAME & ADDRESS	NATURE OF SUBMISSION	OFFICER COMMENT
Agency Submissions			
1.	Water Corporation	No objection	Noted.
2.	Main Roads	No objection	Noted.
3.	Department of Water – Now Department of Water, Environment and Regulation (DWER)	<p>Following a review of the Hydrological Assessment provided by the applicant on 31 May 2017 the following conditions are recommended:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Groundwater levels and quality are to be monitored monthly, and reported to the City of Busselton at the end of each winter, in accordance with Section 6.1 of the Hydrogeological Assessment (Water Direct Pty Ltd, 2017). b. Extractive activities should not occur below beyond 300 mm of the maximum seasonal groundwater level, estimated to be 0.1m to 0.3m AHD from the western to the eastern side of the site. c. If any interception of groundwater occurs at any time during the extractive industry operation, work shall cease immediately and an advice notice provided to the City of Busselton within 48 hours, followed by agreed remedial action and if necessary, a review of operational integrity. d. No hydrocarbons (fuels, oils, lubricants etc) shall be stored within the pit area. All refuelling and maintenance must be carried outside of the pit area in bunded areas. e. The pit to be rehabilitated with clean free draining fill overlain by topsoil to create a minimum separation to the MSGL (as proven by on-site monitoring during the operation of the pit) of 1.0m. 	<p>The City has recommended refusal based on concerns that the groundwater will be intercepted. Further information is required indicating the level to which extraction can occur.</p> <p>The applicant has been advised referral to Department of the Environment and Energy under the Environmental Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 is recommended due to the proximity of the extractive activities to the RAMSAR wetlands.</p>

	<p>Revised comments</p> <p>DWER's</p>	<p>DoW strongly supports the CoB's intent to condition any licence approval upon the provision of a 'Staging Plan' for the EI, whereby no more than 2 hectares is actively quarried at any one time.</p> <p>This proposal by virtue of its proximity to a RAMSAR wetland (Vasse Wonnerup) and the Tuart Forest National Park, carries risks that need to be cautiously addressed.</p> <p>DWER's advice that extractive activities should not occur below 300mm of the estimated MSGL is subject to a crucial factor that remains unknown.</p> <p>If the MSGL was determined with surety, it would be possible for the City to set a maximum pit depth, rather than proposing to maintain a minimum vertical separation between the MSGL and the pit depth, with all the uncertainty that the latter implies.</p> <p>Put simply, in the absence of surveyed pit floor levels, correlated with relevant groundwater level monitoring data, in this location the risk of intercepting groundwater is high.</p> <p>In this extent, on 8th June 2017 DWER (formerly DoW) recommended to the City of Busselton that given the implied uncertainty of the MSGL, any condition for approval should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · "If any interception of groundwater occurs at any time during the extractive industry operation, work shall cease immediately and an advice notice provided to the City of Busselton within 48 hours, followed by agreed remedial action and if necessary, a review of operational integrity". 	<p>The City has recommended refusal based on concerns that the groundwater will be intercepted. Further information is required indicating the level to which extraction can occur.</p>
--	---------------------------------------	--	---

		<p>This in essence was a safeguard to prevent quarrying below an MSGL that is unknown.</p> <p>To summarise the situation, with the lack of certainty about the MSGL, a precautionary approach must be taken to assessing the veracity of the proposal.</p>	
4.	Department of Parks and Wildlife	<p>Any development should aim to avoid impacts to the Ramsar Wetland, Threatened Ecological Community (TEC), poorly reserved native vegetation, potential threatened flora, the proposed Nature Reserve and National Park, minimise disturbance to Black Swan nesting sites and retain Western Ringtail Possum, black cockatoo and waterbird habitat trees.</p> <p>The proponent has advised that extractive to take place up with 1m in depth. This is likely to result in a depth of -0.25 to 0.5 AHD. These depths would likely be below average maximum ground water levels and therefore would be unacceptable. Detailed hydrological investigations to demonstrate that the proposal will not impact groundwater or the adjacent Ramsar wetland and TEC are to be provided.</p> <p>Sand berms can be important for hydrology and water quality of wetlands as even shallow lenses of sand provided a freshwater capture and seepage function which supports the wetland's ecosystem. Proponent to ensure no extractive occurs below 0.5m above the average maximum ground water level and the applicant to provide details of post extraction rehabilitation to ensure no long-term impact on wetland system.</p> <p>DPAW recommends this proposal is referred to Department of the Environment and Energy under the Environmental Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999. It is the responsibility of the proponent to refer the application.</p>	<p>Impact on nesting water birds, including Black Swan, have been addressed in the report.</p> <p>The City has recommended refusal based on concerns that the groundwater will be intercepted. Further information is required indicating the level to which extraction can occur.</p> <p>Applicant has been advised that DPAW recommends referral to Department of the Environment and Energy under the Environmental Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999.</p>

		<p>Bamford 1995 found that adjacent activities can disturb inactive (ie nesting) Black Swan at a distance of approximately 200m. To minimise potential disturbance to nesting Black Swan sites a minimum buffer of 300m between the proposed disturbance area of water bird nest sites is suggested.</p> <p>Vegetation on site to be retained on sites as it contacts potential WRP, black cockatoo and waterbird habitat.</p> <p>Proposed limestone crusher to be relocated to avoid disturbance to threatened fauna and waterbirds, the compaction of tree roots and lime dust coverage to foliage.</p>	<p>Applicant has advised that no clearing is to take place.</p> <p>Crusher has been located furthest from surrounding residents to minimise visual and audible impacts on surrounding neighbours properties.</p>
5.	Department of Aboriginal Affairs	No known Aboriginal Heritage sites within Lot 237.	
Community Submissions			
1.	Alasdair and Rhonda Jackson Lot 345 Forrest Beach Rd	<p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns regarding spill over of contaminated water into wetlands. Potential acid sulphate soils Proximity to swan breeding ground Concerns regarding noise impact on local residential across the lake. 	<p>Refer to Officer comment section of report for further discussion on impact on wetlands and swan breeding ground.</p> <p>Refer to Officer comment section of report for further discussion on proximity to ground water.</p>
2.	Roy And Suellen Payne 426 Forrest Beach Road Wonnerup	<p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns regarding noise Can hear current operations on site from their property across the wetlands Concerns regarding water taken and proximity of water table to the surface. 	Refer to Officer comment section of report for further discussion on proximity to ground water.
3.	Jamie Sullivan 434 Forrest Beach Road Wonnerup	<p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns regarding proximity to Wonnerup Conservation Area and Estuary wetlands. Full environmental assessment should be undertaken due to proximity to environmentally sensitive areas. 	<p>Refer to Officer comment section of report for further discussion on impact on wetlands and swan breeding ground.</p> <p>Concerns about noise and dust have been noted.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Considered to be significant impact people who living within the area, wider community as well as on birds and wild life. • Concerns regarding timeframe and potential of extension after 5 years. • Concerns regarding dust, noise and visual impact. There are minimal trees to hide provide visual screening on the proposed area. • No details on cultural or heritage impact surveys have been completed. • Concerns regarding noise and vibrations. 	
4.	Guy Kerrell-Vaughan	<p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns regarding potential impact on the Ramsar wetlands • Concerns regarding ground water being intercepted • Removing the material to lower than the current natural surface will, in this area particularly, lead to greater waterlogging, insect breeding & hydrological dysfunction. • Concerns regarding acid sulphate soils • Concerns regarding further removal of vegetation and impact on hydrological function of the wetlands • Concerns regarding noise and environmental degradation 	<p>Refer to Officer comment section of report for further discussion on impact on wetlands and ground water.</p> <p>Concerns about noise and dust have been noted.</p>
5.	Michael Brown Operator of Forest Adventures South West Pty Ltd	<p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Forest Adventures South West Pty Ltd has secured a 21-year lease with the Department of Parks and Wildlife for approximately 9 Ha of land. Ludlow park road which the proponent indicates is essentially a private road bisects our leased area, with activities on one side and car and bus parking on the other. • Concerns regarding potential contamination of wetlands • Concerns regarding impact of development on amenity of surrounding properties and tourism activities. • Concerns regarding trucks resulting in dust along Ludlow Park Road and impact upon their business 	<p>Refer to Officer comment section of report for further discussion on impact on wetlands.</p> <p>Refer to Officer comment section of report for further discussion on haulage route.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns regarding truck movements and pedestrian and vehicle safety. Patrons of the business will be required to cross the road from the car park to the high-rope activities. No details on water or pollution management has been provided. Concerns regarding vehicle movement figures provided in application being inaccurate. Concerns regarding state of existing road. 	The City has recommended refusal based on concerns that the groundwater will be intercepted. Further information is required indicating the level to which extraction can occur.
6.	Eden Gardiner Address not provided	<p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns regarding impacts on wetlands, RASMAR, Tuart Nation park. Concerns regarding haulage route and impact on other users of the roads within the area. Concerns regarding impact on nearby residential properties, including heritage properties, short stay accommodation premises and other tourist activities within the area. Concerns regarding compliance with parameters indicated within proposal. Concerns regarding traffic and figures provided being incorrect. 	<p>The applicant has been advised referral to Department of the Environment and Energy under the Environmental Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 is recommended due to the proximity of the extractive activities to the RAMSAR wetlands.</p> <p>Refer to Officer comment section of report for further discussion on haulage route.</p> <p>Refer to Officer comment section of report for further discussion on dust and noise management.</p> <p>Should the applicant fail to comply with conditions the City may take compliance action.</p> <p>Refer to Officer comment section of report for further discussion on haulage route.</p>
7.	Albert Tassone 512 Forrest Beach Rd Wonnerup 6271	<p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns regarding impacts on surrounding properties in terms of noise, dust and visual amenity. Concerns regarding impacts on nearby tourist attractions. 	Refer to Officer comment section of report for further discussion on dust and noise management.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not consistent with City of Busselton Wetlands Conservation Strategy & Local Planning Policy. • Significant environmental considerations due to the RAMSAR Wonnerup Estuary. • Currently experience dust from the current operations on the site. • Concerns regarding impact on swan breeding areas. 	<p>The City has recommended refusal based on concerns that the groundwater will be intercepted. Further information is required indicating the level to which extraction can occur.</p> <p>Refer to Officer comment section of report for further discussion on the proximity to Vasse-Wonnerup Ramsar Wetland System</p>
--	--	--	---