



**Form for the referral of a proposal to the Environmental Protection Authority under Section 38 of the *Environmental Protection Act 1986***

Referrer information			
Who is referring this proposal?		<input type="checkbox"/> Proponent <input type="checkbox"/> Decision-making authority <input type="checkbox"/> Community member/third party	
Name (print)		Signature	
Position		Organisation	
Email			
Address	Street No.	Street Name	
	Suburb	State	Postcode
Date			
Does the referrer request that the EPA treat any part of the proposal information in the referral as confidential? <i>Provide confidential information in a separate attachment.</i>		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	
<b>Referral declaration for organisations, proponents and decision-making authorities:</b>  I, ....., (full name) declare that I am authorised to refer this proposal on behalf of..... and further declare that the information contained in this form is true and not misleading.			
Part A: Proponent and proposal description			
Proponent information			
Name of the proponent/s (including Trading Name if relevant)		5 Star Margaret River Pty Ltd and The Beach Village Pty Ltd, represented by Saracen Properties Pty Ltd., and referred to collectively as 'the proponent'.	
Australian Company Number(s)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	5 Star Margaret River Pty Ltd 636 849 271	
<b>OR</b> Australian Business Number(s)	<input type="checkbox"/>	The Beach Village Pty Ltd 638 200 450	

<p>Contact for the proposal (if different from the referrer)</p> <p><i>Please include: name, physical address, phone, and email.</i></p>	<p>✓ Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>Jason Hick Suite 4, 26 Railway Road SUBIACO WA 6008 jason.hick@emergeassociates.com.au</p>
<p>Does the proponent have the legal access required for the implementation of all aspects of the proposal?</p> <p><i>If yes, provide details of legal access authorisations / agreements / tenure.</i></p> <p><i>If no, what authorisations / agreements / tenure is required and from whom?</i></p>	<p>✓ Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>The land is held in freehold/fee simple tenure and the proponent has acquired the land in order to implement the proposal.</p>
<p><b>Proposal type</b></p>	
<p><b>What type of proposal is being referred?</b></p> <p>For a change to an approved proposal please state the Ministerial Statement number/s (MS No./s) of the approved proposal</p> <p>For a derived proposal please state the Ministerial Statement number (MS No.) of the associated strategic proposal</p>	<p>✓ significant – new proposal (*note below)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> significant – change to approved proposal (MS No./s: _____)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> proposal under an assessed planning scheme</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> strategic</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> derived (Strategic MS No.: _____)</p> <p>Information is being provided to support the proponent’s position that the proposal referred to the EPA is not a significant proposal.</p>
<p>For a significant proposal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Why do you consider the proposal may have a significant effect on the environment and warrant referral to the EPA?</li> </ul>	<p>As above, it is the proponent’s position that the proposal is not a significant proposal, and additional information is being provided to support this position.</p>
<p>For a proposal under an assessed planning scheme, provide the following details:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Scheme name and number</li> </ul> <p>For the Responsible Authority:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What new environmental issues are raised by the proposal that were not assessed during the assessment of the planning scheme?</li> <li>How does the proposal not comply with the assessed scheme and/or the environmental conditions in the assessed planning scheme?</li> </ul>	<p>N/A</p>
<p><b>Proposal description</b></p>	
<p>Title of the proposal</p>	<p>Gnarabup Tourism Development</p>
<p>Name of the Local Government Authority in which the proposal is located.</p>	<p>Shire of Augusta Margaret River</p>
<p>Location:</p> <p>a) street address, lot number, suburb, and nearest road intersection; or</p> <p>b) if remote the nearest town and distance and direction from that town to the proposal site.</p>	<p>The proposal involves tourism development involving two different components/areas:</p> <p>Resort site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>783 Mitchell Drive, Gnarabup</li> </ul> <p>Village site</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lots 501, 502 and 504 Reef Drive and Lot 503 Seagrass Place, Gnarabup</li> </ul> <p>These areas are referred to collectively as 'the site', as shown in <b>Figure 1</b> and <b>Figure 2</b>.</p>
<p>Proposal description – including the key characteristics of the proposal</p> <p><i>Provide as an attachment to the form</i></p>	<p>See <b>Table 1</b> and <b>Table 2</b> as attached.</p> <p>See <b>Attachment 1</b> (Resort design package), <b>Attachment 2</b> (Village design package) and <b>Attachment 3</b> (landscape design package).</p>
<p>Have you provided electronic spatial data, maps and figure in the appropriate format?</p> <p><i>Refer to instructions at the front of the form</i></p>	<p>✓ Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
<p>What is the current land use on the property, and the extent (area in hectares) of the property?</p>	<p>The property is currently vacant freehold land, but which is zoned appropriately for the proposed development.</p> <p>The land tenure/land parcels and surrounding public road network has been historically created through subdivision arising from the implementation of the Gnarabup Beach Development.</p> <p>The land parcels that the proposal is to be situated upon are already serviced by a reticulated sewer network that is owned and operated by the Water Corporation. The historic subdivision also created areas of open space already ceded to the Shire of Augusta-Margaret River for recreation and drainage purposes to the north and south of the Resort site and surrounding the Village site.</p> <p>A historically approved resort development on the Resort site was substantially commenced, however this development was not completed. The current proposal (and associated planning application) seeks to replace this approved development for the Resort site.</p>
<p>Have you had pre-referral discussions with the EPA at DWER Services? If so, quote the reference number and/or the DWER contact.</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Anthony Sutton Teresa Bryant Gerard O'Brien</p>
<p><b>Part B: Environmental impacts</b></p>	
<p><b>Environmental factors</b></p>	
<p>What are the likely significant environmental factors for this proposal?</p>	<p>While the proponent does not believe that the proposal is a significant proposal, additional information has been provided regarding the environmental factors nominated below to support this position.</p> <p>These nominated factors are considered the 'relevant' environmental factors for further consideration.</p>

	<input type="checkbox"/> Benthic Communities and Habitat <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Coastal Processes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Marine Environmental Quality <input type="checkbox"/> Marine Fauna <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Flora and Vegetation <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Landforms <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Subterranean Fauna <input type="checkbox"/> Terrestrial Environmental Quality <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Terrestrial Fauna <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Inland Waters <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality <input type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Social Surroundings <input type="checkbox"/> Human Health
--	--

*For each of the environmental factors identified above, complete the following table, or provide the information in a supplementary report*

Potential environmental impacts		
1	<b>EPA Factor</b>	Coastal processes
2	<b>EPA policy and guidance</b> – What have you considered and how have you applied them in relation to this factor?	The site is situated in proximity to the coast. In order to understand any implications associated with coastal processes, the proponent engaged MP Rogers & Associates to undertake a coastal hazard assessment in accordance with <i>State Planning Policy 2.6: State Coastal Planning Policy</i> (WAPC 2013). This has been provided as <b>Attachment 4</b> .
3	<b>Consultation</b> – Outline the outcomes of consultation in relation to the potential environmental impacts	The proponent has consulted with the Shire of Augusta-Margaret River and the Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage as part of undertaking the coastal hazard assessment and formulating the proposal.
4	<b>Receiving environment</b> – Describe the current condition of the receiving environment in relation to this factor.	The coastal hazard assessment considered the relevant coastal processes in order to determine the extent of the coastal hazard allowance (i.e. the necessary setback distance from the Horizontal Setback Datum (HSD) to adequately contain the coastal processes) for both the sandy shoreline as well as that required from the exposed rock in proximity to the site. A total setback allowance of between 145 m and 180 m would be required to accommodate coastal processes in proximity to the site over the 100-year planning horizon (see <b>Figure 5</b> ).
5	<b>Proposal activities</b> – Describe the proposal activities that have the potential to impact the environment	If the proposal was situated too close to the shoreline, development could impact on coastal processes, as well as being impacted by coastal processes.
6	<b>Mitigation</b> – Describe the measures proposed to manage and mitigate the potential environmental impacts.	The proposal is located sufficiently far enough from the shoreline that impacts to or from coastal processes would be avoided.

7	<b>Impacts</b> – Assess the impacts of the proposal and review the residual impacts against the EPA objective.	There are not expected to be any residual impacts to or from coastal processes arising from the implementation of the proposal.
8	<b>Assumptions</b> – Describe any assumptions critical to your assessment e.g. particular mitigation measures or regulatory conditions.	Given that the coastal hazard assessment has been undertaken in accordance with the required methodology outlined in SPP 2.6, there are no assumptions around mitigation measures or regulatory conditions relevant for the conclusions on coastal processes impacts.
1	<b>EPA Factor</b>	<i>Marine environmental quality</i>
2	<b>EPA policy and guidance</b> – <i>What have you considered and how have you applied them in relation to this factor?</i>	In the context of the EPA’s objectives for marine environmental quality it is emissions and to a lesser extent degradation of the environment that are relevant considerations (EPA 2016).  Therefore, the areas of relevant consideration for marine environmental quality in relation to the proposal are wastewater and stormwater management.
3	<b>Consultation</b> – <i>Outline the outcomes of consultation in relation to the potential environmental impacts</i>	The proponent has consulted with the Shire of Augusta-Margaret River and the Water Corporation as part of formulating the proposal.
4	<b>Receiving environment</b> – <i>Describe the current condition of the receiving environment in relation to this factor.</i>	The proposal is situated approximately 200 m from the coastal shoreline, and therefore the marine environment. Groundwater beneath the site is expected to flow towards the coast (i.e. in a westerly direction) and is expected to be between approximately 8 m and 13 m below the ground surface within the site (JDSi 2021). The site is serviced by an existing Water Corporation owned and operated reticulated sewer network (see <b>Attachment 5</b> ).
5	<b>Proposal activities</b> – <i>Describe the proposal activities that have the potential to impact the environment</i>	The proposal will utilise (i.e. connect to) the existing Water Corporation sewerage reticulation system. There will be no wastewater treatment or disposal within the site as part of the proposal.  Stormwater management for the proposal will involve overland flow conveyance to capture/storage and infiltration areas located within the site. There will be no requirement to discharge stormwater from the site. There are no intensive or polluting activities proposed within the site that would be likely to materially affect the quality of stormwater.  Intensive landscaping treatments (i.e. turf) are limited in extent (see <b>Attachment 3</b> ), and the majority of the proposed landscape treatments would require low water and nutrient inputs, so the risk of material nutrient losses to groundwater over time would be low.

6	<b>Mitigation</b> – Describe the measures proposed to manage and mitigate the potential environmental impacts.	The proposal will utilise the existing Water Corporation wastewater service. Stormwater will be captured and infiltrated within the development envelope. Intensive landscape treatments are limited.
7	<b>Impacts</b> – Assess the impacts of the proposal and review the residual impacts against the EPA objective.	There are not predicted to be any material impacts to marine environmental quality. Therefore, there would be no residual impact on marine environmental quality.
8	<b>Assumptions</b> – Describe any assumptions critical to your assessment e.g. particular mitigation measures or regulatory conditions.	It is assumed that the Water Corporation will continue to provide wastewater collection and treatment services in accordance with its water utility servicing and EP Act licence requirements.
1	<b>EPA Factor</b>	<i>Flora and vegetation</i>
2	<b>EPA policy and guidance</b> – What have you considered and how have you applied them in relation to this factor?	Historic flora and vegetation assessments have been undertaken to support previous similar proposals within the site. Notwithstanding this, the proponent engaged Emerge Associates to undertake a detailed flora and vegetation assessment in 2020 (see <b>Attachment 6</b> ) as part of progressing the current proposal.
3	<b>Consultation</b> – Outline the outcomes of consultation in relation to the potential environmental impacts	The proponent has consulted with the Shire of Augusta-Margaret River and the Department of Biodiversity Conservation and Attractions in relation to flora and vegetation as part of formulating the proposal.

4	<p><b>Receiving environment</b> – Describe the current condition of the receiving environment in relation to this factor.</p>	<p>The vegetation within the site is representative of the Kilcarnup vegetation complex that has circa 92% of its original extent remaining and circa 63% protected for conservation purposes.</p> <p>The proposal development envelope contains a single native/remnant plant community covering approximately 7.40 ha and the remaining approximately 0.68 ha being non-native/cleared areas (see <b>Figure 6</b>). From a vegetation condition perspective, 7.04 ha of the remnant vegetation within the site is in ‘Good’ or better condition, with the remaining 1.03 ha being in ‘Degraded’ to ‘Completely Degraded’ condition (see <b>Figure 7</b>).</p> <p>There were no Threatened Ecological Communities (TECs) identified within the site by Emerge Associates or any previous survey, and none are expected to occur. There were no Threatened or Priority flora species identified within the site by Emerge Associates or any previous survey, and none are expected to occur.</p> <p>The vegetation within the site and surrounding areas would provide fauna habitat and ecological linkage functions, but the site does not provide these functions exclusively or any differently to surrounding areas of native vegetation that are either within National Park or Parks and Recreation reserves under the local Town Planning Scheme.</p>
5	<p><b>Proposal activities</b> – Describe the proposal activities that have the potential to impact the environment</p>	<p>The proposal will involve the clearing of all the native vegetation within the site. In addition there will be areas outside of the site but within the identified Development Envelope that would also be fully or partially cleared to enable landscape treatments to facilitate public access and to ensure a managed interface between the proposal and surrounding areas from a bushfire risk perspective.</p>
6	<p><b>Mitigation</b> – Describe the measures proposed to manage and mitigate the potential environmental impacts.</p>	<p>The full extent of the site will be cleared to facilitate development which could not be further mitigated.</p> <p>The areas outside of the site but within the Development Envelope (within adjacent public reserves) will not be entirely cleared and will also be sensitively landscaped to enable public access and also to reduce bushfire risk. The extent to which this is required may be reduced which will be confirmed through the planning approval process.</p>

7	<p><b>Impacts</b> – Assess the impacts of the proposal and review the residual impacts against the EPA objective.</p>	<p>The proposal will result in the clearing of 7.40 ha of a native plant community, and 7.04 ha of remnant vegetation in ‘Good’ or better condition. This extent of clearing may be reduced.</p> <p>The Kilcarnup vegetation complex is regionally well represented, and the vegetation does not comprise any TECs or support any Threatened or Priority flora or associated habitat.</p> <p>The vegetation is not necessary to maintain ecological linkages in the area or maintain important fauna habitat.</p> <p>On this basis the residual impacts on flora and vegetation are not likely to be significant.</p>
8	<p><b>Assumptions</b> – Describe any assumptions critical to your assessment e.g. particular mitigation measures or regulatory conditions.</p>	<p>A native vegetation clearing permit is likely to be required to clear native vegetation within the Development Envelope. Notwithstanding this, it <u>has not</u> been assumed that a clearing permit would be necessary to resolve any significant residual impacts on flora and vegetation.</p>
1	<p><b>EPA Factor</b></p>	<p><i>Landforms</i></p>
2	<p><b>EPA policy and guidance</b> – What have you considered and how have you applied them in relation to this factor?</p>	<p>The proponent has utilised various existing information sources to understand the landforms upon which the proposal would be located and their regional context and likely significance.</p>
3	<p><b>Consultation</b> – Outline the outcomes of consultation in relation to the potential environmental impacts</p>	<p>The proponent has not undertaken any specific consultation in relation to landforms and their significance within the site on the basis that there was sufficient existing information that was already readily available.</p>

4	<p><b>Receiving environment</b> – Describe the current condition of the receiving environment in relation to this factor.</p>	<p>Both the resort and village sites vary in topography. The resort site ranges from 14 m Australian Height Datum (AHD) in the west to 20 m AHD in the east. The village site ranges from 18 m AHD in the north-west to 26 m AHD in the south-east. Both sites generally sit lower than the existing Gnarabup residential areas to the east and the coastal headland to the west.</p> <p>The soils and landscapes in the area have previously been described by Tille and Lantzke (1990) through soil-landscape system mapping which focussed on recurring patterns of landforms, soils and vegetation, consistent with the Department of Primary Industries and Regional Development (DPIRD) wider approach to land resource surveys. The site is within the Leeuwin Soil-Landscape Zone which is underlain by the Leeuwin Complex of granites and gneiss. Over this has formed the lateritic plateau of the Cowaramup Uplands system which has been dissected by a number of relatively shallow, undulating valleys collectively known as the Wilyabrup Valleys (Tille and Lantzke, 1990). There is one individual soil-landscape type covering the site, which is described as: <i>Kilcarnup exposed dunes (organic) Phase (216GrKPEf) - Steep dunes (sheltered from prevailing winds) on aeolian sands over granite in the coastal strip between Cape Naturaliste and Cape Leeuwin. Calcareous deep sands (with topsoils stained dark by organic matter). Principal vegetation is coastal heath.</i></p> <p>The topography and DPIRD soil-landscape mapping for the site and surrounds is shown on <b>Figure 8</b>.</p> <p>The site is located on the western extremity of the Leeuwin Naturaliste Ridge, approximately 150 to 200 m from the Indian Ocean. Whilst the ground surface is largely covered in calcareous sand that provides little interconnected void space the underlying caprock horizons may contain minor karstic features, depending upon the vertical extent of the caprock. The zones of depletion will contain extensive interconnected void spaces, however, due to the leaching of calcium carbonate from these zones they are extremely friable and subject to internal collapse resulting in some void space being filled with fine grained sand and other material near the base of these horizons (Invertebrate Solutions 2021).</p> <p>In the Margaret River region, caves are best developed in the older more-cemented dunes of the Tamala Limestone located in the centre and topographic high of the ridge and are of three types: linear caves formed by cave streams above an impermeable basement; the inclined fissure type, which also includes other breakdown forms; and the horizontal maze caves of the Augusta area (Eberhard, 2003) which are relatively rare in Western Australia.</p>
---	---	--

		The site does not support any dunes or dune fields and is unlikely to be situated above any substantial caves or cave systems.
5	<b>Proposal activities</b> – Describe the proposal activities that have the potential to impact the environment	The proposal will involve the clearing of the site and parts of the broader Development Envelope, and then earthworks to facilitate the construction of buildings and other associated facilities. While the extent of excavation is expected to be very minor within the Village site, it is expected to be up to three (3) to four (4) metres from the existing ground surface within the Resort site. This is to ensure that the Resort buildings are positioned lower in the site and therefore not as visually prominent and less visible from surrounding areas. This will result in the modification of the existing landform within the site.
6	<b>Mitigation</b> – Describe the measures proposed to manage and mitigate the potential environmental impacts.	A site-specific geotechnical investigation is currently being undertaken to understand the sub-surface ground conditions within the site. It is expected that there may be some limestone encountered, but major voids and groundwater is considered very unlikely within the extent of excavation (or immediately beneath the extent of excavation) within the site. The geotechnical investigation will inform the site earthworks approach to ensure that this is appropriate to support buildings and be stable during and beyond development works.
7	<b>Impacts</b> – Assess the impacts of the proposal and review the residual impacts against the EPA objective.	The proposal will involve the modification of an area of 8.07 ha that is situated within the Kilcarnup exposed dunes (organic) Phase, an extensive landform that occurs between Cape Naturaliste and Cape Leeuwin. On the basis that there are no dunes or dune fields within the site, unlikely to be caves or cave systems beneath the site, and no other significant landform features, there would not be any significant residual impacts to landforms.
8	<b>Assumptions</b> – Describe any assumptions critical to your assessment e.g. particular mitigation measures or regulatory conditions.	There are no assumptions that have been critical to this assessment of impacts on landforms in terms of mitigation measures or regulatory conditions.
1	<b>EPA Factor</b>	<i>Subterranean fauna</i>
2	<b>EPA policy and guidance</b> – What have you considered and how have you applied them in relation to this factor?	In order to understand any implications associated with subterranean fauna, the proponent engaged Dr Tim Moulds from Invertebrate Solutions to undertake a preliminary assessment for the presence of conservation significant subterranean invertebrates and communities, as well as the likelihood of suitable habitat for subterranean fauna occurring within the site (see <b>Attachment 7</b> ).
3	<b>Consultation</b> – Outline the outcomes of consultation in relation to the potential environmental impacts	The proponent has not undertaken any specific consultation in relation to subterranean fauna.

4	<p><b>Receiving environment</b> – Describe the current condition of the receiving environment in relation to this factor.</p>	<p>A list of conservation significant fauna subterranean invertebrate fauna for Leeuwin Naturaliste Ridge was compiled from the DBCA <i>Wildlife Conservation (Specially Protected Fauna – Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016) Notice 2019</i> (DBCA 2019) and the Department of Agriculture Water and the Environment’s Protected Matters Search Tool (PMST) within 30 km of the Project area. No subterranean species that are listed under the BC Act and/or the EPBC Act were considered likely to occur within the site or have known habitat within close proximity to the site (Invertebrate Solutions 2021).</p> <p>The PMST results listed three (3) TECs associated with subterranean fauna within 30 km of the site. All three of these TECs are located in caves that occur between five (5) and 13 km to the south of the site and will not be impacted in any way by the proposal. The occurrence of these root mat communities is well known throughout the Leeuwin Naturaliste Ridge from the continued exploration of caves by various speleological groups over the previous 60 years and it is highly unlikely that any similar root mat community occurs within or the local vicinity of the site (Invertebrate Solutions 2021).</p> <p>The likelihood of stygofauna and troglifauna being present within the site is considered to be Moderate to Low based upon the presence of Tamala Limestone, however, due to a very shallow vertical profile of limestone within the site, habitat is limited and extends well beyond the site boundary. The amount of stygofauna habitat is also likely to be limited by sea water incursions into the regional water table due to the relatively close proximity to the coast (Invertebrate Solutions 2021).</p>
5	<p><b>Proposal activities</b> – Describe the proposal activities that have the potential to impact the environment</p>	<p>The proposal will involve the clearing of all vegetation and varying levels of earthworks within the site, the most significant being excavation of up to four (4) m within the Resort site.</p> <p>The proposal will not require any dewatering or groundwater abstraction.</p> <p>Stormwater management and landscape treatments will involve some additional surface infiltration in some portions of the Development Envelope, and the prevention of surface infiltration in other locations (i.e. where buildings are constructed), but are not expected to cause extensive or material changes to the hydrological cycle in the local area that would impact on subterranean fauna habitat.</p>
6	<p><b>Mitigation</b> – Describe the measures proposed to manage and mitigate the potential environmental impacts.</p>	<p>There are no mitigation measures proposed to manage and mitigate the potential impacts on subterranean fauna.</p>

7	<b>Impacts</b> – Assess the impacts of the proposal and review the residual impacts against the EPA objective.	The proposal is not expected to impact upon any significant subterranean fauna or subterranean TECs. Although subterranean fauna may be present within the relatively spatially limited Development Envelope, there is potentially a Low likelihood of impact to stygofauna and troglafauna from virtually all aspects of the proposal due to no groundwater abstraction or dewatering, and only four (4) m of excavation in one part of the site. The absence of dewatering and groundwater abstraction removes any possibility of groundwater drawdown and associated loss of subterranean fauna habitat.  There is not expected to be any significant residual impacts to subterranean fauna.
8	<b>Assumptions</b> – Describe any assumptions critical to your assessment e.g. particular mitigation measures or regulatory conditions.	There are no assumptions that have been critical to this assessment of impacts on subterranean fauna in terms of mitigation measures or regulatory conditions.
1	<b>EPA Factor</b>	<i>Terrestrial fauna</i>
2	<b>EPA policy and guidance</b> – What have you considered and how have you applied them in relation to this factor?	Historic fauna assessments have been undertaken to support previous similar proposals within the site. Notwithstanding this, the proponent engaged Emerge Associates (in partnership with Greg Harewood Consulting Zoologist) to undertake a basic fauna and targeted western ringtail possum assessment in 2020 (see <b>Attachment 8</b> ) in order to progress the current proposal.
3	<b>Consultation</b> – Outline the outcomes of consultation in relation to the potential environmental impacts	The proponent has consulted with the Shire of Augusta-Margaret River and the Department of Biodiversity Conservation and Attractions in relation to terrestrial fauna as part of formulating the proposal.

4	<p><b>Receiving environment</b> – Describe the current condition of the receiving environment in relation to this factor.</p>	<p>The majority of the site supports relatively intact native vegetation (Heathland) which would support high fauna habitat values (see <b>Figure 9</b>), particularly where it is in ‘Good’ or better condition. Extensive areas of similar habitat of the same or higher quality are located adjacent to the site and the wider area, including vegetation associated with Leeuwin-Naturaliste National Park.</p> <p>A total of 25 native and two (2) introduced fauna species were directly or indirectly recorded in the site, including two species of conservation significance, namely Carnaby’s cockatoo and western ringtail possum.</p> <p>The site does not support suitable breeding or roosting habitat for the three threatened species of black cockatoo. The site contains scattered peppermint trees and shrubs which are foraging plants for Carnaby’s cockatoo but would only provide a small foraging resource.</p> <p>Four additional fauna of conservation significance were considered to have potential to occur within the site: osprey (migratory), Pacific swift (migratory), Peregrine falcon (migratory) and quenda (P4). The bird species (avifauna) would likely only fly above/over the site, while for the quenda similar or higher quality habitat is located adjacent to and in the wider area of the site.</p> <p>The intact native vegetation within the site provides potential habitat for western ringtail possum but is considered to be of marginal quality due to the limited extent of foraging resources and the low vegetation height. No western ringtail possum were encountered in the site during the spotlighting surveys. Secondary evidence of western ringtail possum was recorded in the site in the form of old scats. Western ringtail possum may occasionally use the intact native vegetation habitat for refuge, foraging and/or dispersal but the abundance of western ringtail possum within the site is likely to be low.</p>
5	<p><b>Proposal activities</b> – Describe the proposal activities that have the potential to impact the environment</p>	<p>The proposal will involve the clearing of all the native vegetation within the site and therefore fauna habitat within the site. In addition there will be areas outside of the site but within the identified Development Envelope that would also be fully or partially cleared to enable landscape treatments for public access and to ensure a managed interface between the proposal and immediately surrounding areas from a bushfire risk perspective. The landscape treatments are likely to provide some fauna habitat value.</p>

6	<b>Mitigation</b> – Describe the measures proposed to manage and mitigate the potential environmental impacts.	The full extent of the site will be cleared to facilitate development which could not be further mitigated. The areas outside of the site but within the Development Envelope (within adjacent public reserves) will not be entirely cleared and will also be sensitively landscaped to enable public access and also to reduce bushfire risk and will also provide some fauna habitat values. The extent to which this is required may be able to be reduced further and will be confirmed through the planning approval process.
7	<b>Impacts</b> – Assess the impacts of the proposal and review the residual impacts against the EPA objective.	<p>The proposal will result in the clearing of 7.40 ha of the Heathland fauna habitat, and 7.04 ha of this is in ‘Good’ or better condition. This extent of clearing may be reduced slightly.</p> <p>The fauna habitat within the site is similar to large contiguous areas of fauna habitat in adjacent and surrounding areas, including within the Leeuwin-Naturaliste National Park.</p> <p>The fauna habitat within the site is not necessary to maintain habitat connectivity or ecological linkages through the wider local area.</p> <p>The habitat within the site is considered to be of marginal value for black cockatoo or western ringtail possum. While these species are likely to opportunistically utilise the site, the site would not support breeding and provides limited foraging resources.</p> <p>On this basis the residual impacts on terrestrial fauna are not likely to be significant.</p>
8	<b>Assumptions</b> – Describe any assumptions critical to your assessment e.g. particular mitigation measures or regulatory conditions.	A native vegetation clearing permit is likely to be required to clear native vegetation and associated fauna habitat within the site. Notwithstanding this, it <u>has not</u> been assumed that a clearing permit would be necessary to address any significant residual impacts on terrestrial fauna.
1	<b>EPA Factor</b>	<i>Inland waters</i>
2	<b>EPA policy and guidance</b> – What have you considered and how have you applied them in relation to this factor?	The proponent has utilised various existing information sources to understand the proposal’s context in relation to inland waters, particularly significant ecosystems, or beneficial uses. The detailed flora and vegetation assessment and the basic fauna assessment also provided context for the site’s likely inland water’s related values.
3	<b>Consultation</b> – Outline the outcomes of consultation in relation to the potential environmental impacts	The proponent has not undertaken any specific consultation in relation to inland waters and their significance within the site on the basis that there was sufficient existing information that was already readily available.

4	<b>Receiving environment</b> – Describe the current condition of the receiving environment in relation to this factor.	<p>The site does not support any known (mapped) wetlands, wetland vegetation, waterways or riparian vegetation.</p> <p>The site is approximately 200 m from the shoreline and any associated marine ecosystems.</p> <p>The site is expected to experience groundwater levels of between approximately 8 m and 13 m below the ground surface (JDSi 2021), and groundwater flow is expected to be towards the coast.</p>
5	<b>Proposal activities</b> – Describe the proposal activities that have the potential to impact the environment	<p>The proposal will involve the clearing of all vegetation and varying levels of earthworks within the site, the most significant being excavation of up to four (4) m within the Resort site. None of this is wetland or riparian vegetation.</p> <p>The proposal will not require any dewatering or ongoing groundwater abstraction.</p> <p>The proposal will be connected to the Water Corporation’s existing reticulated sewer network and there will be no onsite treatment and/or disposal of wastewater.</p> <p>Stormwater management and landscape treatments will involve some additional surface infiltration in some locations within the Development Envelope, and the prevention of surface infiltration in other locations (i.e. where buildings are constructed), but are not expected to be extensive or material changes to the hydrological regime.</p> <p>Intensive landscaping treatments (i.e. turf) are limited in extent (see <b>Attachment 3</b>), and the majority of the proposed landscape treatments will require low water and nutrient inputs, so the risk of material nutrient losses to groundwater would be low.</p>
6	<b>Mitigation</b> – Describe the measures proposed to manage and mitigate the potential environmental impacts.	<p>The proposal will utilise the existing Water Corporation wastewater service.</p> <p>Stormwater will be captured and infiltrated within the development envelope.</p> <p>Intensive landscape treatments are limited.</p>
7	<b>Impacts</b> – Assess the impacts of the proposal and review the residual impacts against the EPA objective.	<p>There are not expected to be any significant residual impacts to inland waters.</p>
8	<b>Assumptions</b> – Describe any assumptions critical to your assessment e.g. particular mitigation measures or regulatory conditions.	<p>There are no assumptions that have been critical to this assessment of impacts on inland waters in terms of mitigation measures or regulatory conditions.</p>
1	<b>EPA Factor</b>	Social surrounds

2	<p><b>EPA policy and guidance</b> – <i>What have you considered and how have you applied them in relation to this factor?</i></p>	<p>In order to understand the social surrounds context for the proposal the proponent has commissioned the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Heritage assessment (Brad Goode &amp; Associates Consulting Anthropologists and Archaeologists 2020) (see <b>Attachment 9</b>)</li> <li>• Visual impact assessment (Emerge Associates 2021) (see <b>Attachment 10</b>)</li> <li>• Economic benefit study (Urbis 2020) (see <b>Attachment 11</b>).</li> </ul>
3	<p><b>Consultation</b> – <i>Outline the outcomes of consultation in relation to the potential environmental impacts</i></p>	<p>The proponent has undertaken consultation with the following to understand the social surrounds context as part of formulating the proposal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Southwest Boojarah #2 Indigenous Land Use Agreement Group (see <b>Attachment 12</b>)</li> <li>• Shire of Augusta-Margaret River</li> <li>• Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage</li> <li>• Tourism WA</li> <li>• Preserve Gnarabup</li> <li>• Margaret River-Busselton Tourism Association</li> <li>• A range of local businesses.</li> </ul> <p>In addition to the above, the proponent undertook an open house (i.e. open to the public) Council briefing at Council Chambers at the Shire of Augusta-Margaret River.</p> <p>As part of the planning assessment process, the State Development Assessment Unit (SDAU) will undertake additional agency/authority consultation and public advertising.</p>

<p>4</p>	<p><b>Receiving environment</b> – Describe the current condition of the receiving environment in relation to this factor.</p>	<p>The site sits within the policy area associated with <i>SPP No. 6.1: Leeuwin-Naturaliste Ridge Policy</i> (WAPC 2003). Under SPP 6.1 Gnarabup has been identified as a ‘Coastal Node’, inclusive of tourist facilities and the provision of reticulated water, sewerage and power.</p> <p>Under the recently finalised Leeuwin-Naturaliste Sub-regional Strategy (WAPC 2020), Gnarabup has been identified as a ‘Village’ with existing zoned land to be developed (which includes the site).</p> <p>There have been two (2) local structure plans prepared and endorsed for the Gnarabup locality, the first in 1993 (see <b>Attachment 13</b>) and the second more in 2006 (see <b>Attachment 14</b>). Both of these structure plans have incorporated tourism development at Gnarabup. The 1993 structure plan provided for Chalets and Tourism Development for the Resort site and residential development for the Village site. The 2006 structure plan didn’t specifically cover the Resort site but provided for tourism related development (but in a very similar format and footprint to residential development) for the Village site.</p> <p>A proposal involving the Gnarabup Beach Development (that was consistent with the 1993 structure plan) was referred to the EPA pursuant to s38 of the EP Act in 1992 (see <b>Attachment 13</b>). This proposal involved the entirety of the former Sussex Location 815, the extent of which is shown on <b>Figure 2</b>. Since this referral, there have been two separate Resort site planning approvals (one of which was substantially commenced), and a single Village site planning approval, all involving similar development to the proposal.</p> <p>The relevant planning and approvals history confirms that tourism development is not a recent or new proposition for the site, and proposed development has been referred to the EPA and also approved on both the Resort site and Village site and commenced under planning approvals on the Resort site.</p> <p>There are no Aboriginal heritage sites for the purposes of the <i>Aboriginal Heritage Act 1972</i> located within the site. There is a Heritage Place, known as Heritage Place ID 17093 Gnamma Hole that does occur within the site (see <b>Attachment 9</b> and <b>Attachment 12</b>). It is considered unlikely that there would be any additional ethnographic sites associated with the site given multiple historic surveys, although there is some potential for there to be archaeological materials within the site (Brad Goode &amp; Associates Consulting Anthropologists and Archaeologists 2020).</p> <p>The proposal is sited within a prominent location along the Leeuwin-Naturaliste coastline, within</p>
----------	---	---

		relative proximity to the Cape to Cape Track and also the existing Gnarabup townsite.
5	<b>Proposal activities</b> – Describe the proposal activities that have the potential to impact the environment	<p>Tourism development is proposed that is consistent with the existing regional and local planning framework. This includes building height and bulk/scale considerations.</p> <p>The proposal will provide public access through and within the site and improve the current public access from the existing Gnarabup townsite to the coast.</p> <p>The proposal has been modified to avoid impacts on Heritage Place ID 17093 Gnamma Hole.</p> <p>The proposal will result in development and structures that will be visible from a number of locations.</p> <p>The proposal is expected to generate a range of community benefits, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provision of additional public parking in the Ocean View Road public car park and along the access road</li> <li>• Upgrades to the shared path network and upgrading of the stairs which link the Ocean View Road car park to the beach</li> <li>• Provision of a clearly defined and accessible connection to the beach through the landscaped Mitchell Road reserve</li> <li>• Provision of an extensive dual use path network outside the site</li> <li>• Provision of access for fire and emergency vehicles through the Mitchell Drive road reserve</li> <li>• Provision of food and beverage facilities accessible to the general public</li> <li>• Provision of useable public parkland facilities</li> <li>• Significant direct and indirect employment generation</li> <li>• Introduction of employment/cadet training opportunities.</li> </ul>
6	<b>Mitigation</b> – Describe the measures proposed to manage and mitigate the potential environmental impacts.	<p>The proposal would be progressed in accordance with historic expectations and planning requirements established over the years since 1993 and involving public consultation at various stages.</p> <p>The proposal would avoid impacts to Heritage Place ID 17093 Gnamma Hole, based on the advice of Southwest Boojarah #2 Indigenous Land Use Agreement Group (see <b>Attachment 12</b>).</p> <p>The proposal has been designed to minimise visual impacts and ensure that the visual amenity impacts are consistent with the existing planning framework and suited to its location. These requirements would be considered and adopted through the planning approval process (see <b>Attachment 10</b>).</p>

7	<b>Impacts</b> – Assess the impacts of the proposal and review the residual impacts against the EPA objective.	There are not expected to be any significant residual impacts to social surrounds.
8	<b>Assumptions</b> – Describe any assumptions critical to your assessment e.g. particular mitigation measures or regulatory conditions.	There are no assumptions that have been critical to this assessment of impacts on social surrounds in terms of mitigation measures or regulatory conditions.  It is important to note that Aboriginal heritage requirements and visual amenity will be addressed through other legislative requirements and key considerations during the planning approval process.

## Part C: Other approvals and regulation

### State and Local Government approvals

Is rezoning of any land required before the proposal can be implemented? If yes, please provide details.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
If this proposal has been referred by a decision-making authority, what approval(s) are required from you?	

Please identify other approvals required for the proposal:

Proposal activities e.g. clearing, dewatering, mining, processing, dredging	Land tenure/access e.g. Crown land, Mining lease, specify legislation for access if relevant	Type of approval e.g. Native Vegetation Clearing Permit, licence, mining proposal,	Legislation regulating the activity e.g. EP Act 1986 – Part V, RiWI Act 1914, Mining Act 1979
Tourism development	Private/freehold land	Planning (development) approval	Planning and Development Act 2006
Clearing	Private/freehold land	Native Vegetation Clearing Permit	Environmental Protection Act 1986 – Part V

### Commonwealth Government approvals

Does the proposal involve an action that may be or is a controlled action under the <i>Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999</i> (EPBC Act)?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No  * Note that the proponent has been in discussions with the Department of Water Agriculture and Environment to order to determine whether an EPBC Act referral is required. While there is no clear basis to suggest that significant impacts are likely, a referral will provide transparent certainty and would be resolved in parallel with the planning approval process.
Has the proposed action been referred? If yes, when was it referred and what is the reference number (EPBC No.)?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Date: _____ EPBC No.: _____

## Part C: Other approvals and regulation

### State and Local Government approvals

If referred, has a decision been made on whether the proposed action is a controlled action? If 'yes', check the appropriate box and provide the decision in an attachment.

Yes

No

Decision – controlled action

Decision – not a controlled action

If the proposal is determined to be a controlled action, do you request that this proposal be assessed under the bilateral agreement or as an accredited assessment?

Yes – Bilateral

No

Yes – Accredited

Is approval required from other Commonwealth Government/s for any part of the proposal?

*If yes, describe.*

Yes

No

Approval:

**Table 1: Summary of the Proposal**

<b>Proposal title</b>	Gnarabup Tourism Development
<b>Proponent name</b>	5 Star Margaret River Pty Ltd and The Beach Village Pty Ltd.
<b>Short description</b>	<p>The proposal includes the development the Westin Margaret River Resort and Spa and Gnarabup Beach Village, in the locality of Gnarabup as shown in <b>Figure 1</b>. The proposal is part of the Gnarabup Beach Development that was referred to the EPA in 1992 (see <b>Figure 2</b> and <b>Attachment 13</b>).</p> <p>The Westin Margaret River Resort and Spa includes a 121 room five (5) star resort hotel with various associated facilities. Surrounding and incorporated into the Westin Margaret River Resort and Spa development is landscaping and public realm works to provide public access from the existing Gnarabup locality through to the beach, from the beach to the resort facilities and to integrate the facility into its surrounds.</p> <p>The Gnarabup Beach Village includes short-stay accommodation, unrestricted stay residential dwellings and commercial premises. Surrounding and incorporated into the Gnarabup Beach Village development provide public access from the existing Gnarabup locality through the site to the coast, to use the commercial/hospitality services and to integrate the Village development into its surrounds.</p>

**Table 2 Location and proposed extent of physical and operational elements**

<b>Element</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Proposed extent</b>
<b>Physical elements</b>		
Westin Margaret River Resort and Spa.	783 Mitchell Drive, Gnarabup, See <b>Figure 3</b> and <b>Figure 4</b> .	2.35 ha
Resort site surrounding landscape and public realm works.	Surrounding and existing open space reserves created through the historic subdivision of Gnarabup Beach Estate. See <b>Figure 3</b> and <b>Figure 4</b> .	0.35 ha
Gnarabup Beach Village villas, apartments, and commercial premises.	Lots 501, 502 and 504 Reef Drive and Lot 503 Seagrass Place, Gnarabup. See <b>Figure 3</b> and <b>Figure 4</b> .	4.32 ha
Village site surrounding landscape and public realm works.	Surrounding and existing open space reserves created through the historic subdivision of Gnarabup Beach Estate. See <b>Figure 3</b> and <b>Figure 4</b> .	1.06 ha
<b>Operational elements</b>		
Ongoing operation of the Westin Margaret River Resort and Spa and management of immediately surrounding landscaped areas..	783 Mitchell Drive, Gnarabup, See <b>Figure 3</b> and <b>Figure 4</b> .	2.70 ha
Sale of individual Gnarabup Beach Village beach villas, apartments, and commercial premises.	Lots 501, 502 and 504 Reef Drive and Lot 503 Seagrass Place, Gnarabup. See <b>Figure 3</b> and <b>Figure 4</b> .	4.32 ha
Generation of wastewater from the Westin Margaret River Resort and Spa and Gnarabup Beach Village.	Discharged to the existing Water Corporation owned and operated/maintained sewerage reticulation system including the Gnarabup	N/A

	Beach (Prevelly) Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP) that operates under Part V EP Act licence L6640/1994/11	
--	--	--