Decision Report

Application for Works Approval

Part V Division 3 of the *Environmental Protection Act 1986*

Works Approval Number	W6514/2021/1
Applicant	Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage
File Number	DER2021/000044
Premises	GoGo Station Inert Landfill Part of 68 on Deposited Plan 238022 Certificate of Title Volume LR3051 Folio 959 As defined by the Premises maps attached to the issued works approval
Date of Report	1 April 2021
Proposed Decision	Works approval granted

Steve Checker
Digitally signed by Steve Checker
Date: 2021.04.01 17:19:23 +08'00'

Stephen Checker
MANAGER WASTE INDUSTRIES
an officer delegated under section 20 of the *Environmental Protection Act 1986* (WA)

Table of Contents

1. Decision summary

This Decision Report documents the assessment of potential risks to the environment and public health from emissions and discharges during the construction and Time limited operations under the Works Approval of the Premises. As a result of this assessment, Works Approval W6514/2021/1 has been granted.

It is noted that a Works Approval is required to construct the unlined inert landfill and that Asbestos Containing Material (ACM) is intended to be buried immediately under Time Limited Operations (TLO) authorized under the works approval. Once waste is buried, the cell will be capped, however the Applicant may need to apply for a Licence if any operations outside of the TLO period are likely.

2. Scope of assessment

2.1 Regulatory framework

In completing the assessment documented in this Decision Report, the department has considered and given due regard to its Regulatory Framework and relevant policy documents which are available at https://dwer.wa.gov.au/regulatory-documents.

2.2 Application summary and overview of Premises

On 18 January 2021, the Applicant submitted an application for a works approval to the department under section 54 of the *Environmental Protection Act 1986* (EP Act). The application is to undertake construction works for a single unlined containment cell Inert Landfill at the Premises. The Premises is approximately 450m south east of the Bayulu Aboriginal Community (BAC).

The Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage (DPLH) has undertaken an assessment at BAC to assess any potential contamination related risks to human health and the environment and a number of hazardous building materials (HBM) assessments to identify, document and recommend management of HBM.

DPLH has identified the presence of a significant quantity of Construction and Demolition (C&D) waste stockpiles, which includes ACM, to the south of the Community which requires disposal and burial to landfill. Surrounding licensed landfills in Fitzroy Crossing, Broome and Halls Creek do not have the capacity to accept this waste and therefore an inert landfill is proposed near BAC to dispose of the stockpiles.

Approximately 10,600m^3 of C&D and ACM waste will be buried in a single campaign and immediately capped. There will be no further burial of any waste post capping of the containment cell; the cell will have a permanent fence erected around the cell and the fence will be locked and signage installed to restrict access.

A geotechnical investigation was conducted in August 2019 to support the location and design of the containment cell. The investigation comprised 12 trial pits within the predefined area identified as likely for a suitable location for the containment cell. Representative soil samples were collected for laboratory assessment to determine suitability for the containment cell. The maximum depth of the trial pits was 2.3 mbgl and depth was restricted by the presence of bedrock. No groundwater was encountered in any test pit.

The majority of ACM observed at BAC is found within the in-situ C&D waste stockpiles located in the existing landfill area. The ACM was observed comingled with soil, gravels of natural rock,

concrete and other construction demolition type waste. No domestic or household putrescible waste will be buried in the containment cell. There will be no waste from outside BAC disposed at the containment cell.

The containment cell is proposed to be constructed as follows:

- Capacity of approximately 12,400 m^3 to accommodate an estimated volume of 10,600m^3 (12,400 tonnes) of waste.
- Maximum depth of 2.5 mbgl.
- Walls to be no steeper than 1V:2.5H and battered at 1.5m high with a minimum 0.5m bench.
- The maximum height of the capping layer is at or marginally above surface level as the final capping layer will be compacted and contoured to facilitate surface water run-off and minimise ponding.
- The capping layer will comprise a geotextile warning barrier and a minimum thickness of 0.5m of clean material sourced from the excavation of the containment cell. The capping layer will be compacted to a minimum 98% standard maximum dry density (SMDD) for cohesive capping soil and minimum 75% density index (DI) for cohesionless capping soil.

Waste deposited in the containment cell will be compacted to a minimum 95% SMDD for cohesive soil and maximum 70% DI for cohesionless soil. The material will be compacted to reduce potential void space and future subsidence.

Construction will be undertaken in the Dry Season to minimise ingress of stormwater. The containment cell will be surveyed, and permanent fencing will be erected around the cell to restrict access and appropriate warning signage will be installed on the fence.

3. Risk assessment

The department assesses the risks of emissions from prescribed premises and identifies the potential source, pathway and impact to receptors in accordance with the *Guidance Statement: Risk Assessments* (DER 2017).

To establish a Risk Event there must be an emission, a receptor which may be exposed to that emission through an identified actual or likely pathway, and a potential adverse effect to the receptor from exposure to that emission.

3.1 Source-pathways and receptors

3.1.1 Emissions and controls

The key emissions and associated actual or likely pathway during premises construction which have been considered in this Decision Report are detailed in 3 below. Table 1 also details the proposed control measures the applicant has proposed to assist in controlling these emissions, where necessary.

Table 1: Proposed applicant controls

Emission	Sources	Potential pathways	Proposed controls
Construction			
Dust	*Excavation / earthworks of landfill cell and Vehicle movements.*	*Air/windborne pathway*	*Works in cooler Dry Season period. Waste stockpiles and excavation area will be kept wet throughout works. Water cart will be available. Works will consider wind direction. Excavation stockpiles limited to 2.5m height.* *Dust Management Plan (DMP).* *Monitoring for fine particles (PM_{10}) with the use of three portable aerosol particle counter dust monitor (DusTrak or equivalent) to triangulate the site. The National Environmental Protection (NEPM) for Ambient Air Quality (NEPC 1998) specifies a one-day average standard for PM_{10} of 50µg/m^3. The target criteria will be standard at the premises boundary. Site activity will be 10 hours per day so the Applicant has proposed to use a PM_{10} one hourly corrective action limit (CAL) of 100µg/m^3. The stop work level (SWL) will be set at 500µg/m^3.*
Noise	*Excavation / earthworks of landfill cell and Vehicle movements.* *Excavator, Dump truck, Loader and trucks.*	*Air/windborne pathway*	*Hours of operation in accordance with Environmental Protection (Noise) Regulations 1997.* *Hours of operations- 7am to 6pm Monday to Friday and 7am to 5pm Saturday.* *All onsite machinery fitted with silencers.*
Time limited Operation			
Dust	*Vehicle movements, burial of waste and lift-off from Cap.*	*Air/windborne pathway*	*Works in cooler Dry Season period. Waste stockpiles will be kept wet throughout works. Water cart will be available. Works will consider wind direction.* *DMP.* *Environmental Management Plan (EMP).* *Monitoring for fine particles (PM_{10}) with the use of three portable aerosol particle counter dust monitor (DusTrak or equivalent) to triangulate the site. The National Environmental Protection (NEPM) for Ambient Air Quality (NEPC 1998) specifies a one-day average standard for PM_{10} of 50µg/m^3. The target criteria will be standard at the premises boundary. Site activity will be 10 hours per day, so the Applicant has proposed to use a PM_{10} one hourly corrective action limit (CAL) of 100µg/m^3. The stop work level (SWL) will be*

Emission	Sources	Potential pathways	Proposed controls
			set at 500µg/m^3.
Noise	*Vehicle movements*	*Air/windborne pathway*	*Hours of operation in accordance with Environmental Protection (Noise) Regulations 1997.* *Hours of operations- 7am to 6pm Monday to Friday and 7am to 5pm Saturday.* *All onsite machinery fitted with silencers.* *EMP.*
Asbestos Fibres	*Movement and Burial of ACM*	*Air/windborne pathway*	*Asbestos airborne fibre monitoring undertaken in accordance with the National Occupational Health and Safety Commission 2005 Guidance Note on the Membrane Filter Method for Estimating Airborne Asbestos Dust (NOHSC: 3003). Airborne fibre monitoring assessed against DoH (2009) para-occupational limit for asbestos of 0.01 fibres per mL.* *Asbestos Removal Control Plan (ARCP).* *EMP.* *Works in cooler Dry Season period.* *Waste stockpiles will be kept wet throughout works.* *Water cart will be available.* *Works will consider wind direction.*
Contaminated Stormwater	*Landfill containment cell*	*Discharge over land to surface water bodies*	*Operations planned in the Dry Season when there is no rain.* *EMP.*
Leachate	*Landfill containment cell*	*Seepage to Groundwater*	*No putrescible waste will be buried, only inert waste will be buried which does not produce leachate.* *EMP.*

3.1.2 Receptors

In accordance with the *Guidance Statement: Risk Assessment* (DER 2017), the Delegated Officer has excluded employees, visitors and contractors of the applicants from its assessment. Protection of these parties often involves different exposure risks and prevention strategies and is provided for under other state legislation.

Table 2 below provides a summary of potential human and environmental receptors that may be impacted as a result of activities upon or emission and discharges from the prescribed premises *(Guidance Statement: Environmental Siting* (DER 2016).

Table 2: Sensitive human and environmental receptors and distance from prescribed activity

Human receptors	**Distance from prescribed activity**
Closest residential receptor - BAC	*450m from north east of the Premises boundary*
Environmental receptors	**Distance from prescribed activity**
Specified Ecosystems	*None*
Fitzroy River	*6.5km west of the Premises boundary*
Underlying groundwater (non-potable purposes)	*7 to 11mbgl*
Aboriginal heritage site	*490m north of premises boundary.*

3.2 Risk ratings

Risk ratings have been assessed in accordance with the *Guidance Statement: Risk Assessments* (DER 2017) for each identified emission source and takes into account potential source-pathway and receptor linkages as identified in Section 3.1. Where linkages are in-complete they have not been considered further in the risk assessment.

Where the applicant has proposed mitigation measures/controls (as detailed in Section 3.1), these have been considered when determining the final risk rating. Where the Delegated Officer considers the applicant's proposed controls to be critical to maintaining an acceptable level of risk, these will be incorporated into the works approval as regulatory controls.

Additional regulatory controls may be imposed where the applicant's controls are not deemed sufficient. Where this is the case the need for additional controls will be documented and justified in Table 3.

Works Approval W6514 that accompanies this Decision Report authorises construction and time-limited operations. The conditions in the issued Works Approval, as outlined in Table 3 have been determined in accordance with *Guidance Statement: Setting Conditions* (DER 2015).

A licence is not required following the time-limited operational phase authorised under the works approval as the burial of the inert waste will be a single regime and then capped and no further waste will be disposed to the landfill. The risk assessment for the time-limited operations phase has been included in this Decision Report.

Table 3: Risk assessment of potential emissions and discharges from the Premises during construction, and time-limited operation

Risk Event					Risk rating[1] C = consequence L = likelihood	Applicant controls sufficient?	Conditions[2] of works approval	Justification for additional regulatory controls
Source/Activities	Potential emission	Potential pathways and impact	Receptors	Applicant controls				
Construction								
Construction of unlined inert containment cell including vehicle movements	*Dust*	*Air/windborne pathway causing impacts to health and amenity*	*Residences 450m north east*	*Refer to Section 3.1*	*C = Minor* *L = Possible* ***Medium Risk***	*Y*	*N/A*	*N/A*
	Noise			*Refer to Section 3.1*	*C = Minor* *L = Possible* ***Medium Risk***	*Y*	*N/A*	*N/A*
Time-limited-operations								
Removing and burial of inert waste stockpiles and vehicle movements	*Dust*	*Air/windborne pathway causing impacts to health and amenity*	*Residences 450m north east*	*Refer to Section 3.1*	*C = Minor* *L = Possible* ***Medium Risk***	Y	*N/A*	*N/A*
	Noise	*Air/windborne pathway causing impacts to health and amenity*	*Residences 450m north east*	*Refer to Section 3.1*	*C = Minor* *L = Possible* ***Medium Risk***	Y	*N/A*	*N/A*
	Asbestos Fibre	*Air/windborne pathway causing impacts to health and amenity*	*Residences 450m north east*	*Refer to Section 3.1*	*C = Severe* *L = Unlikely* ***High Risk***	*Y*	*Condition 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16 and 17.*	*Applicant requires Time limited operations to bury the inert and ACM waste and ACM waste is a high risk so it must be managed appropriately.*
	Leachate	Seepage to Groundwater	Groundwater 7-11 mbgl	*Refer to Section 3.1*	*C = Slight* *L = Rare*	Y	*N/A*	*N/A*

Risk Event					Risk rating[1] C = consequence L = likelihood	Applicant controls sufficient?	Conditions[2] of works approval	Justification for additional regulatory controls
Source/Activities	**Potential emission**	**Potential pathways and impact**	**Receptors**	**Applicant controls**				
					Low Risk			
	Sediment laden stormwater	*Overland runoff potentially causing ecosystem disturbance or impacting surface water quality*	*Fitzroy River 6.5km west of the Premises boundary*	*Refer to Section 3.1*	*C = Slight* *L = Rare* ***Low Risk***	*Y*	*N/A*	*N/A*

Note 1: Consequence ratings, likelihood ratings and risk descriptions are detailed in the *Guidance Statement: Risk Assessments* (DER 2017).

Note 2: Proposed applicant controls are depicted by standard text. **Bold and underline text** depicts additional regulatory controls imposed by department.

3.3 Detailed risk assessment for Asbestos fibre

3.3.1 Description Asbestos fibre

Asbestos is a hazardous material that can cause mesothelioma, asbestosis or lung cancer. Asbestos was used extensively in Australian buildings and structures from the 1950's through to 1990.

The Applicant intends to move ACM contaminated C&D waste into the containment cell and bury the waste.

The waste handling and burial within the Premises have the potential to release asbestos fibres as asbestos is present within the existing stockpiles of C&D waste adjacent to the Premises.

3.3.2 Identification and general characterisation of emission

The frequency and time of exposure of receptors to asbestos fibres would vary depending on the degree of contamination of the waste materials accepted at the Premises, the activities carried out at the Premises, and weather conditions.

Asbestos fibre emissions potential pathway is air or wind dispersal. Prevailing winds (Halls Creek data) are east in the mornings and afternoons.

3.3.3 Description of potential adverse impact from the emission

Potential impacts from asbestos fibre emissions include health impacts such as asbestosis, mesothelioma and/or lung cancer at nearby residential premises located 450 north east from the activity area.

3.3.4 Criteria for assessment

Asbestos content in product is specified in the *Guidelines for the Assessment, Remediation and Management of Asbestos-Contaminated Sites in Western Australia (Department of Health WA, May 2009)* which specifies that the lean up goal is 0.001% asbestos in soil on a weight for weight basis for free fibre-related materials.

3.3.5 Applicant controls

The Applicant has advised in the Application that the Contractor will hold a valid Unrestricted Asbestos Licence and that all works are to be completed with a DMP an ARCP to manage ACM during operations at the premises.

This assessment has reviewed the controls set out in Table 4 below.

Table 4: Applicant's proposed controls for Asbestos

Controls for Asbestos Fibre (Time-limited operation)	
Control	**Description**
EMP and ARCP.	• Works in cooler Dry Season period. • Waste stockpiles will be kept wet throughout works. • Water cart will be available. • Works will consider wind direction. • Asbestos airborne fibre monitoring undertaken in accordance with the National Occupational Health and Safety Commission 2005 Guidance Note on the Membrane Filter Method for Estimating Airborne Asbestos Dust (NOHSC: 3003). Airborne fibre monitoring assessed against DoH (2009)

	para-occupational limit for asbestos of 0.01 fibres per mL.

3.3.5 Key findings

The Delegated Officer has reviewed the information regarding Asbestos fibre emissions and has found:

1. *The ACM stockpiles exist predominantly adjacent to the proposed containment cell,*
2. *Movement of ACM will be minimal, and exposure limited as it will be buried immediately in the adjacent cell.*
3. *The ACM cell will be capped and there will be no further disturbance. The works will be staged to reduce expose and ensure capping is immediate.*
4. *The cell will be fenced and secured so there is no access.*

3.3.6 Consequence

If Asbestos fibre emissions occur, then the Delegated Officer has determined that the impact of Asbestos fibre emissions will result in adverse health effects requiring a high level or ongoing medical treatment. Therefore, the Delegated Officer considers the consequence to be **Severe.**

3.3.7 Likelihood of Risk Event

The Delegated Officer has determined that impacts from Asbestos fibre emissions will only occur in exceptional circumstances. Therefore, the Delegated Officer considers the likelihood of Asbestos fibre emissions to be **Rare**.

3.3.8 Overall rating of Asbestos

The Delegated Officer has compared the consequence and likelihood ratings described above with DWER's risk rating matrix and determined that the overall rating for the risk of Asbestos fibre emissions is **High**.

4. Consultation

Table 4 provides a summary of the consultation undertaken by the department.

Table 4: Consultation

Consultation method	Comments received	Department response
Application advertised on the department's website (4/03/2021)	*None received.*	*N/A*
Local Government Authority advised of proposal (3/03/2021)	*None received.*	*N/A*
Department of Health (DoH) advised of proposal (3/03/2021)	*Comments received 19 March 2021.* *DoH considers that the asbestos containment cell proposal as outlined is a suitable method for addressing the management of the asbestos*	*DWER has bought DoH comments to the Applicants attention.*

	contamination associated with the Bayulu Community and GoGo Statin. *However, there are two issues that are not clear in the Remedial Action Plan:* 1. *For the asbestos remediation associated with the residential areas, this seems to primarily consist of surface emu pick ups with no proof that contamination does not potentially extend deeper than this. Although this may be partly addressed by post remediation validation sampling, this also is not sufficiently explained.* 2. *The presence of asbestos cement fragments is mentioned in relation to the buried waste adjacent to the water treatment plant (Subclass A). It is proposed that its remediation is also by surface picking, and then reinstallation of the capping material. As it is evident that this area is prone to erosion and the level of asbestos cement contamination is not known there, it would be reasonable to use some of the excess excavated clean material from the containment cell to better cap that area.*	
Applicant was provided with draft documents on (30/03/2021)	*Comments received 1 April 2021* *Refer to Appendix 1*	*Refer to Appendix 1*

5. Conclusion

Based on the assessment in this Decision Report, the Delegated Officer has determined that a works approval will be granted, subject to conditions commensurate with the determined controls and necessary for administration and reporting requirements.

References

1. Department of Environment Regulation (DER) 2016, *Guidance Statement: Environmental Siting*, Perth, Western Australia.
2. DER 2017, *Guidance Statement: Risk Assessments*, Perth, Western Australia.
3. DER 2015, *Guidance Statement: Setting Conditions*, Perth, Western Australia.
4. DER, August 2016. *Guidance Statement: Licence duration.* Department of Environment Regulation, Perth.
5. DER, November 2016. *Guidance Statement: Risk Assessments*. Department of Environment Regulation, Perth.
6. DWER, June 2019. *Guideline: Industry Regulation Guide to Licensing.* Department of Water and Environmental Regulation, Perth.
7. DWER, June 2019. *Guideline: Decision Making.* Department of Water and Environmental Regulation, Perth.

Appendix 1: Summary of applicant's comments on risk assessment and draft conditions

Condition	Summary of applicant's comment	Department's response
16	A Project Officer from Department of Communities attended meetings with the Bayulu Board of Directors on 17 and 18 March 2021 to discuss this project. The Bayulu Board of Directors are keen for works to commence and agreed Community endorsed working hours of 7.00 to 17.00 on Saturdays. Please could the hours of operation be extended to 5pm on Saturdays in accordance with the endorsed working hours agreed with the Community?	Hours amended on Saturday for 7am to 5pm according to request.
Prescribed premises table and condition 8	In the draft Works Approval documentation the " assessed capacity " is 15,000 tonnes. Merit has expressed that they would feel more comfortable if this was increased to 20,000 tonnes based on i.e. 11,000 m3 at 1.6 T per metre. Is it possible to get this amended within the final Works Approval?	Prescribed premises Table Production and Design Capacity and condition 8 Table 2 amended from 15,000 to 20,000 tonnes as requested
8	Page 5 Table 2 Merit propose to use a Moxi to shift the waste with water controls. Merit are unable to Envirotarp these machines. Should a request to amend this be submitted or can this methodology be deviated from with appropriate justification in the ECR?	Condition amended to remove need for tarps. The stockpiles are required to be kept in a damp state under condition 11 and condition 12 requires a water cart at the premises. Condition amended to: Waste and waste stockpiles to be kept damp in accordance with condition 11 such that discharge of visible dust or fibres from transport trucks is not able to occur Waste disposed into the containment cell will only come from the immediate area surrounding the premises and a few spots in the north of BAC – there will be no waste brought to the cell from outside of the Bayulu Community

Appendix 2: Application validation summary

SECTION 1: APPLICATION SUMMARY (as updated from validation checklist)					
Application type					
Works approval	☒				
Licence	☐	Relevant works approval number:		None	☐
		Has the works approval been complied with?		Yes ☐ No ☐	
		Has time limited operations under the works approval demonstrated acceptable operations?		Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A ☐	
		Environmental Compliance Report / Critical Containment Infrastructure Report submitted?		Yes ☐ No ☐	
		Date Report received:			
Renewal	☐	Current licence number:			
Amendment to works approval	☐	Current works approval number:			
Amendment to licence	☐	Current licence number:			
		Relevant works approval number:		N/A	☐
Registration	☐	Current works approval number:		None	☐
Date application received		18/1/2021			
Applicant and Premises details					
Applicant name/s (full legal name/s)		Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage			
Premises name		GoGo Station landfill			
Premises location		Part of Lot 68 on Plan 238022			
Local Government Authority		Shire of Derby West Kimberley			
Application documents					
HPCM file reference number:		DER2021/000044			
Key application documents (additional to application form):		Application Form Remedial Action Plan			
Scope of application/assessment					
Summary of proposed activities or changes to existing operations.		Construction of ACM Inert landfill. There will be no putrescible waste disposal. It will be ACM waste from Community buildings. Time-limited operations requested to bury the waste in a single regime and then subsequent capping. No further waste to be buried at the premises.			

Category number/s (activities that cause the premises to become prescribed premises)

Table 1: Prescribed premises categories

Prescribed premises category and description	Assessed production or design capacity	Proposed changes to the production or design capacity (amendments only)
Category 63: Inert Landfill	12,5000 tonnes	

Legislative context and other approvals

Has the applicant referred, or do they intend to refer, their proposal to the EPA under Part IV of the EP Act as a significant proposal?	Yes ☐ No ☒	Referral decision No: Managed under Part V ☐ Assessed under Part IV ☐
Does the applicant hold any existing Part IV Ministerial Statements relevant to the application?	Yes ☐ No ☒	Ministerial statement No: EPA Report No:
Has the proposal been referred and/or assessed under the EPBC Act?	Yes ☐ No ☒	Reference No:
Has the applicant demonstrated occupancy (proof of occupier status)?	Yes ☒ No ☐	Certificate of title ☒ General lease ☐ Expiry: Mining lease / tenement ☐ Expiry: Other evidence ☐ Expiry:
Has the applicant obtained all relevant planning approvals?	Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A ☒	Approval: Exempt as Public works Expiry date: If N/A explain why?
Has the applicant applied for, or have an existing EP Act clearing permit in relation to this proposal?	Yes ☒ No ☐	CPS No: Clearing is proposed. Application submitted independently.
Has the applicant applied for, or have an existing CAWS Act clearing licence in relation to this proposal?	Yes ☐ No ☐	Application reference No: N/A Licence/permit No: N/A No clearing is proposed.
Has the applicant applied for, or have an existing RIWI Act licence or permit in relation to this proposal?	Yes ☐ No ☒	Application reference No: Licence/permit No: Licence / permit not required.

Does the proposal involve a discharge of waste into a designated area (as defined in section 57 of the EP Act)?	Yes ☐ No ☒	Name: N/A Type: Proclaimed Groundwater Area/Surface Water Area Has Regulatory Services (Water) been consulted? Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A ☐ Regional office: Swan Avon / Mid-West Gascoyne / Kwinana Peel / North West / South West / Goldfields / South Coast
Is the Premises situated in a Public Drinking Water Source Area (PDWSA)?	Yes ☐ No ☒	Name: N/A Priority: P1 / P2 / P3 / N/A Are the proposed activities/ landuse compatible with the PDWSA (refer to WQPN 25)? Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A ☐
Is the Premises subject to any other Acts or subsidiary regulations (e.g. *Dangerous Goods Safety Act 2004, Environmental Protection (Controlled Waste) Regulations 2004, State Agreement Act xxxx*)	Yes ☐ No ☒	
Is the Premises within an Environmental Protection Policy (EPP) Area?	Yes ☐ No ☒	
Is the Premises subject to any EPP requirements?	Yes ☐ No ☒	
Is the Premises a known or suspected contaminated site under the *Contaminated Sites Act 2003*?	Yes ☐ No ☒	Classification: N/A / possibly contaminated – investigation required (PC–IR) / not contaminated – unrestricted use (NC–UU) / contaminated – restricted use (C–RU) / remediated for restricted use (RRU) / contaminated – remediation required (C–RR) / decontaminated (Decon) Date of classification: N/A