

REFERRAL OF A PROJECT FOR A DECISION ON THE NEED FOR ASSESSMENT UNDER THE *ENVIRONMENT EFFECTS ACT 1978*

REFERRAL FORM

The *Environment Effects Act 1978* provides that where proposed works may have a significant effect on the environment, either a proponent or a decision-maker may refer these works (or project) to the Minister for Planning for advice as to whether an Environment Effects Statement (EES) is required.

This Referral Form is designed to assist in the provision of relevant information in accordance with the *Ministerial Guidelines for assessment of environmental effects under the Environment Effects Act 1978* (Seventh Edition, 2006). Where a decision-maker is referring a project, they should complete a Referral Form to the best of their ability, recognising that further information may need to be obtained from the proponent.

It will generally be useful for a proponent to discuss the preparation of a Referral with the Department of Planning and Community Development (DPCD) before submitting the Referral.

If a proponent believes that effective measures to address environmental risks are available, sufficient information could be provided in the Referral to substantiate this view. In contrast, if a proponent considers that further detailed environmental studies will be needed as part of project investigations, a more general description of potential effects and possible mitigation measures in the Referral may suffice.

In completing a Referral Form, the following should occur:

- Mark relevant boxes by changing the font colour of the 'cross' to black and provide additional information and explanation where requested.
- As a minimum, a brief response should be provided for each item in the Referral Form, with a more detailed response provided where the item is of particular relevance. Cross-references to sections or pages in supporting documents should also be provided. Information need only be provided once in the Referral Form, although relevant cross-referencing should be included.
- Responses should honestly reflect the potential for adverse environmental effects. A Referral will only be accepted for processing once DPCD is satisfied that it has been completed appropriately.
- Potentially significant effects should be described in sufficient detail for a reasonable conclusion to be drawn on whether the project could pose a significant risk to environmental assets. Responses should include:
 - a brief description of potential changes or risks to environmental assets resulting from the project;
 - available information on the likelihood and significance of such changes;
 - the sources and accuracy of this information, and associated uncertainties.
- Any attachments, maps and supporting reports should be provided in a secure folder with the Referral Form.
- A CD or DVD copy of all documents will be needed, especially if the size of electronic documents may cause email difficulties. **Individual documents should not exceed 2MB.**

- A completed form would normally be between 15 and 30 pages in length. Responses should not be constrained by the size of the text boxes provided. Text boxes should be extended to allow for an appropriate level of detail.
- The form should be completed in MS Word and not handwritten.

The party referring a project should submit a covering letter to the Minister for Planning together with a completed Referral Form, attaching supporting reports and other information that may be relevant. This should be sent to:

Postal address

**Minister for Planning
PO Box 500
EAST MELBOURNE VIC 3002**

Couriers

**Minister for Planning
Level 17, 8 Nicholson Street
EAST MELBOURNE VIC 3002**

In addition to the submission of the hardcopy to the Minister, separate submission of an electronic copy of the Referral via email to ees.referrals@dpcd.vic.gov.au is encouraged. This will assist the timely processing of a referral.

PART 1 PROPONENT DETAILS, PROJECT DESCRIPTION & LOCATION

1. Information on proponent and person making Referral

Name of Proponent:	
Authorised person for proponent:	Stefan Borzecki
Position:	Director, Western Port Boat Harbour Pty Ltd
Postal address:	1 Lumeah Road, Somerville Vic 3912
Email address:	info@yaringa.com.au
Phone number:	5977 4154
Facsimile number:	5977 3156
Person who prepared Referral:	Ron Mason
Position:	Consultant
Organisation:	Mason Planning
Postal address:	44 Glyndon Road, Camberwell Vic 3124
Email address:	rmas9932@bigpond.net.au
Phone number:	Ph 03 98301216 Mob 0412 172 593
Facsimile number:	na
Available industry & environmental expertise: (areas of 'in-house' expertise & consultancy firms engaged for project)	Ron Mason has over 35 years planning and environmental experience. A range of specialist sub consultants has been engaged for specific studies/ investigations into the project effects. (Refer Attachment 1)

2. Project – brief outline

Project title: Yaringa Harbour Expansion
Project location: (describe location with AMG coordinates and attach A4/A3 map(s) showing project site or investigation area, as well as its regional and local context) 1 Lumeah Road Somerville (Refer Attachment 2) Land description: North of Lumeah Road: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lot 4 PS 336335 – 9.423 ha – Vol 10233 Fol 652 • Lot 5 LP 53675 – 2.111 ha – Vol 04842 Fol 251 South of Lumeah Road: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CA 31B Parish of Tyabb – 2.117 ha Existing Marina – Crown Lease
Short project description (few sentences): Expansion of the Yaringa Boat Harbour and associated facilities to include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A new marina basin providing berths for 180 boats • 400 berth dry storage facility for smaller vessels • Tourist accommodation (180 units) • Staff accommodation • Additional space and infrastructure for marine service industry.

3. Project description

<p>Aim/objectives of the project (what is its purpose / intended to achieve?): The aim of the project is to provide increased boat storage in wet and dry berths, introduce tourist accommodation and expand an already established marine service industry precinct in an area that is lacking support infrastructure.</p>
<p>Background/rationale of project (describe the context / basis for the proposal, eg. for siting): The proposed works constitute an expansion of an established marina, boat storage and marine service complex located on freehold and leased Crown land. The complex has good sealed road access and enjoys access to deep water in Western Port via an existing channel. No works are proposed in the existing marina basin or access channel to deep water.</p>
<p>Main components of the project (nature, siting & approx. dimensions; attach A4/A3 plan(s) of site layout if available): Scaled A3 plans of the proposed development are attached. (Refer Attachment 3)</p>
<p>Ancillary components of the project (eg. upgraded access roads, new high-pressure gas pipeline; off-site resource processing): The existing café and restaurant will be retained in the proposed expansion.</p>
<p>Key construction activities: Excavation of a new marina basin on freehold land. Construction of a new channel and lock on leased Crown land to control water levels within the inland basin and to provide all-tide access to the new basin. Erection of new buildings for dry boat storage, marine service industry and tourist accommodation.</p>
<p>Key operational activities: Apart from the management of tourist accommodation, no new operational activities will occur on the site. The development is simply an expansion of existing established activity at the marina.</p>
<p>Key decommissioning activities (if applicable): Not applicable</p>
<p>Is the project an element or stage in a larger project? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes If yes, please describe: the overall project strategy for delivery of all stages and components; the concept design for the overall project; and the intended scheduling of the design and development of project stages).</p>
<p>Is the project related to any other past, current or mooted proposals in the region? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes If yes, please identify related proposals.</p>

4. Project alternatives

<p>Brief description of key alternatives considered to date (eg. locational, scale or design alternatives. If relevant, attach A4/A3 plans): Alternatives were not considered as the location of the existing marina and adjoining land use predetermine the options for expansion. The current marina is based on an existing Crown lease and has an access to Western Port via an existing channel. Alternative solutions would be impractical and require new works in the waters of Western Port.</p>
<p>Brief description of key alternatives to be further investigated (if known): Nil</p>

5. Proposed exclusions

Statement of reasons for the proposed exclusion of any ancillary activities or further project stages from the scope of the project for assessment:

Not applicable

6. Project implementation

Implementing organisation (ultimately responsible for project, ie. not contractor):
Western Port Boat Harbour Pty Ltd trading as Yaringa Boat Harbour.

Implementation timeframe:

Construction will commence as soon as approvals are issued.

Proposed staging (if applicable):

The construction will occur in the following sequence:

- Construction of inland marina basin
- Construction of dry storage facility
- Tourist accommodation
- Marine service industry

7. Description of proposed site or area of investigation

Has a preferred site for the project been selected?

No Yes If no, please describe area for investigation.

If yes, please describe the preferred site in the next items (if practicable).

General description of preferred site, (including aspects such as topography/landform, soil types/degradation, drainage/ waterways, native/exotic vegetation cover, physical features, built structures, road frontages; attach ground-level photographs of site, as well as A4/A3 aerial/satellite image(s) and/or map(s) of site & surrounds, showing project footprint):

The site is shown in the attached aerial photograph and maps (Refer Attachment 3 & 4). Additional information in relation to the site characteristics is contained in the following consultant reports:

- Flora and Fauna inc Net Gain Assessment **
- Coastal Acid Sulfate Soil **
- Economic Impact assessment **
- Aboriginal Archaeological Heritage **
- Environmental Management Plan**
- Hydrological Circulation **
- Built Form and Design
- Traffic Assessment
- Wildfire Hazard Assessment

** Copies of these reports are attached (Refer Attachments 6.1 - 6.5)

Site area: 13.65 (hectares)

Current land use and development:

Yaringa Boat Harbour, dry boat storage, marine service industry, boat chandlery and supplies, café and restaurant, 2 existing dwellings, boat launch facilities (for marina operations) and straddle lift for boat maintenance.

Description of local setting (eg. adjoining land uses, road access, infrastructure, proximity to residences & urban centres):

Yaringa Boat Harbour is located in an area of mixed use and occupies freehold land north and south of Lumeah Road and adjacent Crown land held under a 21-year lease. The land north of Lumeah Road is abutted by Crown land to the east (Western Port foreshore) rural land to north, a caravan park to the west and Lumeah Road to the south. Land south of Lumeah Road is abutted by Crown land to the east (Western Port foreshore), rural living uses to the west and south. All freehold land in the site and abutting the site is zoned Special Use. And the Crown land under lease is zoned Public Conservation and Resource Zone.

Planning context (eg. strategic planning, zoning & overlays, management plans):
Refer Attachment 5

Local government area(s):
Shire of Mornington Peninsula

8. Existing environment

Overview of key environmental assets/sensitivities in project area and vicinity

(cf. general description of project site/study area under section 7):

The existing Yaringa Harbour wet berths, restaurant and café are located on Crown land on the shores of Western Port south of Watsons Inlet. The new development involves construction of an access channel and lock within the existing lease area and development of a new inland marina basin, tourist accommodation and marine industry precinct on adjoining freehold land. A detailed flora and fauna assessment of the site has been carried out by Ecology Partners (Refer Attachment 6.1). Part of the land (generally north of Lumeah Road) contains remnant open woodland that is described as being of regional ecological significance (pg 6 - Ecology Partners). The most likely sensitivity with the proposed development is related to boating and associated activities on Western Port. However, as the proposal involves the expansion of an existing facility with established infrastructure and works, the impacts are significantly lower than a new green-fields proposal.

9. Land availability and control

Is the proposal on, or partly on, Crown land?

No Yes If yes, please provide details.

Current land tenure (provide plan, if practicable):
21 year Crown lease on foreshore land. Balance is freehold

Intended land tenure (tenure over or access to project land):
Crown lease

Other interests in affected land (eg. easements, native title claims):
Nil

10. Required approvals

State and Commonwealth approvals required for project components (if known):

- Planning and Environment Act 1987 – Planning Scheme Amendment and Town Planning Permit for building and works
- Aboriginal Heritage Act 2006 - Cultural Heritage Management Plan (CHMP)
- Coastal Management Act 1995 – Approval for works on coastal Crown land
- Environment Effects Act 1978 – Referral of EES
- Environment Protection biodiversity and Conservation Act 1999 - Referral (Commonwealth)

Have any applications for approval been lodged?

- No Yes If yes, please provide details.
- Planning Scheme Amendment and Town Planning Permit for building and works (combined approval sought via Section 96A Planning and Environment Act) –application lodged with Mornington Peninsula Shire 11.6.09. Referred to Minister for Planning and Community Development for authorisation to prepare the amendment 2.3.11. Authorisation No A01933 issued 16.3.11.
 - Cultural Heritage Management Plan lodged for approval 27.2.09. Approval issued 12.3.09. (Refer Attachment 7)

Approval agency consultation (agencies with whom the proposal has been discussed):

Mornington Peninsula Shire Council

DSE

AAV

Other agencies consulted:

DPCD

Port of Hastings

CFA

PART 2 POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

11. Potentially significant environmental effects

Overview of potentially significant environmental effects (identify key potential effects and comment on their significance and likelihood, as well as key uncertainties):

Pollution of Waterway – This is an existing risk that is managed in the Yaringa Boat Harbour through existing spill prevention procedures. In the event of a spill floating booms and dispersal equipment is available on site. Deployment of this infrastructure has not been required at the marina. The new harbour will be able to effectively contain any event by simply closing the lock until clean up is complete and all contaminants removed.

Water quality in inland marina basin – Connell Wagner (now Aurecon) conducted a hydraulic assessment of the water quality performance of the inland marina basin. The report presents a solution to ensure adequate circulation occurs throughout the marina basin utilising a combination of water exchange through tidal and mechanical means. The report concludes that total harbour flushing will occur within a 30-day cycle. (refer attachment 6.1 pg. 3 Connell Wagner). In addition, the water levels in the inland marina basin will be maintained at a level that allows the lock to remain fully open for a period of up to four hours on each tide change. This will allow free flow of boats and water into and out of the marina basin during this period.

Loss of Vegetation/Wildlife habitat – A detailed consultant report by Ecology Partners (Refer Attachment 6.1) shows that the majority of the remnant vegetation is in moderate-good condition and is rated to be of regional significance. No national or state significant flora species or ecological communities were recorded during the consultant's assessment. Vegetation offsets will be provided on French Island. An allotment of 117.91 hectares has been acquired by the proponent and although partially cleared, retains a significant amount of native vegetation that has a high EVC rating. The land is located at the top northwest corner of French Island and contains coastal vegetation communities identical to those found at Yaringa, ranging from saltmarsh through to eucalypt woodland. This land is owned by the proprietor of Yaringa Boat Harbour and is within the Mornington Peninsula Biosphere.

Impact on RAMSAR wetland – The waters of Western Port north of the marina are included in the RAMSAR listed wetland. The presence of the existing marina has effectively excluded illegal vehicle access and rubbish dumping from the foreshore north of the harbour. Boating traffic normally doesn't enter the RAMSAR area as the water quickly shallows and fishing is restricted

by the existence of a Marine National Park.

Construction Impacts – Aurecon has prepared an Environmental Management Plan for the proposed development. The plan is designed to provide the tools and protocols to minimise impacts on the environment during construction. (Refer Attachment 8)

12. Native vegetation, flora and fauna

Native vegetation

Is any native vegetation likely to be cleared or otherwise affected by the project?

NYD No Yes If yes, answer the following questions and attach details.

What investigation of native vegetation in the project area has been done? (briefly describe)

A full flora and fauna assessment and a net gain analysis has been undertaken by Ecology Partners (Refer Attachment 6.1).

What is the maximum area of native vegetation that may need to be cleared?

NYD Estimated area 3.40 (hectares)

How much of this clearing would be authorised under a Forest Management Plan or Fire Protection Plan?

N/A approx. percent (if applicable)

Which Ecological Vegetation Classes may be affected? (if not authorised as above)

NYD Detailed assessment completed. If assessed, please list.

(refer pg 38 Ecology Partners)

2.39 ha Heathy Woodland (EVC 48)
0.69 ha Swamp Scrub (EVC 53)
0.32 ha Sedgy Swamp Woodland (EVC 707)

(A detailed species list is contained in the Ecology Partners report pg 62 – Appendix 2.1)

Have potential vegetation offsets been identified as yet?

NYD Yes If yes, please briefly describe.

Offset sites have been acquired on French Island that offer equivalent or better habitat value in the same biosphere.

Other information/comments? (eg. accuracy of information)

All assessments have been undertaken by Ecology Partners, a recognised specialist environmental consultancy based in Melbourne.

NYD = not yet determined

Flora and fauna

What investigations of flora and fauna in the project area have been done?

(provide overview here and attach details of method and results of any surveys for the project & describe their accuracy)

A detailed flora and fauna assessment has been carried out by Ecology Partners, who undertook desk-top analysis field inspections and aerial photo interpretation (Refer Attachment 6.1)

Have any threatened or migratory species or listed communities been recorded from the local area?

NYD No Yes If yes, please:

- List species/communities recorded in recent surveys and/or past observations.
- Indicate which of these have been recorded from the project site or nearby.

Refer Attachment 4 – summary from ecology Partners report

The Ecology Partners report contains a detailed species list (pg 67 Appendix 3.1) that lists all species recorded in the study area and within ten kilometres of the study area.

If known, what threatening processes affecting these species or communities may be exacerbated by the project? (eg. loss or fragmentation of habitats) Please describe briefly.

Loss of habitat is the primary threatening action. However, the location, extent of modification and scale of loss is insignificant in the context of the total remnant community.

Are any threatened or migratory species, other species of conservation significance or listed communities potentially affected by the project?

NYD No Yes If yes, please:

- List these species/communities:
- Indicate which species or communities could be subject to a major or extensive impact (including the loss of a genetically important population of a species listed or nominated for listing) Comment on likelihood of effects and associated uncertainties, if practicable.

Is mitigation of potential effects on indigenous flora and fauna proposed?

NYD No Yes If yes, please briefly describe.

- Limitation on access to the tourist accommodation for people with domestic pets.
- Retention of natural vegetated buffers around the perimeter of the tourist development precinct.

Other information/comments? (eg. accuracy of information)

13. Water environments

Will the project require significant volumes of fresh water (eg. > 1 GI/yr)?

NYD No Yes If yes, indicate approximate volume and likely source.

Will the project discharge waste water or runoff to water environments?

NYD No Yes If yes, specify types of discharges and which environments.

Discharges will include:

- Roof, hard stand and surface drainage
- Treated effluent

Are any waterways, wetlands, estuaries or marine environments likely to be affected?

NYD No Yes If yes, specify which water environments, answer the following questions and attach any relevant details.

The volume and location of discharge is unlikely to have any effect on Western Port, the only waterway potentially impacted by the project.

Are any of these water environments likely to support threatened or migratory species?

NYD No Yes If yes, specify which water environments.

Are any potentially affected wetlands listed under the Ramsar Convention or in 'A Directory of Important Wetlands in Australia'?

NYD No Yes If yes, please specify.

The northern (Watsons Inlet) section of Western Port is RAMSAR listed. No works or discharges are proposed to this area.

Could the project affect streamflows?

<input type="checkbox"/> NYD <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes If yes, briefly describe implications for streamflows.
Could regional groundwater resources be affected by the project? <input type="checkbox"/> NYD <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes If yes, describe in what way.
Could environmental values (beneficial uses) of water environments be affected? <input type="checkbox"/> NYD <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes If yes, identify waterways/water bodies and beneficial uses (as recognised by State Environment Protection Policies)
Could aquatic, estuarine or marine ecosystems be affected by the project? <input type="checkbox"/> NYD <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes If yes, describe in what way.
Is there a potential for extensive or major effects on the health or biodiversity of aquatic, estuarine or marine ecosystems over the long-term? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes If yes, please describe. Comment on likelihood of effects and associated uncertainties, if practicable.
Is mitigation of potential effects on water environments proposed? <input type="checkbox"/> NYD <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes If yes, please briefly describe.
Other information/comments? (eg. accuracy of information)

14. Landscape and soils

Landscape

Has a preliminary landscape assessment been prepared? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes If yes, please attach.
Is the project to be located either within or near an area that is: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Subject to a Landscape Significance Overlay or Environmental Significance Overlay? <input type="checkbox"/> NYD <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes If yes, provide plan showing footprint relative to overlay. • Identified as of regional or State significance in a reputable study of landscape values? <input type="checkbox"/> NYD <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes If yes, please specify. • Within or adjoining land reserved under the <i>National Parks Act 1975</i> ? <input type="checkbox"/> NYD <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes If yes, please specify. • Within or adjoining other public land used for conservation or recreational purposes ? <input type="checkbox"/> NYD <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes If yes, please specify. <p>On the shores of Western Port</p>
Is any clearing vegetation or alteration of landforms likely to affect landscape values? <input type="checkbox"/> NYD <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes If yes, please briefly describe.
<p>The proposed development site retains a vegetated buffer and is remote from public view. Access to the site is via Lumeah Road, which terminates at the existing marina basin. The site can only be viewed from Lumeah Road as it passes between the northern and southern development precincts.</p>
Is there a potential for effects on landscape values of regional or State importance? <input type="checkbox"/> NYD <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Please briefly explain response.
Is mitigation of potential landscape effects proposed? <input type="checkbox"/> NYD <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes If yes, please briefly describe.

Other information/comments? (eg. accuracy of information)

The site is isolated and not within view from any main road or public thoroughfare. All buildings have been sited and designed to remain below the tree canopy surrounding the site. Views from the water are distant (over 1.2km) due to the tidal mudflats and are effectively screened by vegetation on the Crown land foreshore and retained vegetation on the development site.

Note: A preliminary landscape assessment is a specific requirement for a referral of a wind energy facility. This should provide a description of:

- The landscape character of the site and surrounding areas including landform, vegetation types and coverage, water features, any other notable features and current land use;
- The location of nearby dwellings, townships, recreation areas, major roads, above-ground utilities, tourist routes and walking tracks;
- Views to the site and to the proposed location of wind turbines from key vantage points (including views showing existing nearby dwellings and views from major roads, walking tracks and tourist routes) sufficient to give a sense of the overall site in its setting.

Soils**Is there a potential for effects on land stability, acid sulphate soils or highly erodible soils?**

NYD No Yes If yes, please briefly describe.

A preliminary assessment of Acid sulfate soils has been conducted by Environmental Earth Sciences, a recognised specialist (Refer Attachment 6.3) in accordance with Best Practice Guidelines for Assessment and Management of Acid Sulfate Soils. The assessment included field-testing and soil sampling. The report concludes ... "based on the information provided by laboratory analysis of soil samples, the site is not considered to represent a significant risk of CASS, (CASS = *coastal acid sulfate soils*) with the exception of soil in the area of BH1." (BH1 = borehole 1). It should be noted that soils in the vicinity of BH1 include introduced fill.

Are there geotechnical hazards that may either affect the project or be affected by it?

NYD No Yes If yes, please briefly describe.

Other information/comments? (eg. accuracy of information)**15. Social environments****Is the project likely to generate significant volumes of road traffic, during construction or operation?**

NYD No Yes If yes, provide estimate of traffic volume(s) if practicable.

A traffic analysis indicated that traffic volumes would be readily accommodated on the existing road network with minor modifications.

Is there a potential for significant effects on the amenity of residents, due to emissions of dust or odours or changes in visual, noise or traffic conditions?

NYD No Yes If yes, briefly describe the nature of the changes in amenity conditions and the possible areas affected.

Is there a potential for exposure of a human community to health or safety hazards, due to emissions to air or water or noise or chemical hazards or associated transport?

NYD No Yes If yes, briefly describe the hazards and possible implications.

Is there a potential for displacement of residences or severance of residential access to community resources due to the proposed development?

NYD No Yes If yes, briefly describe potential effects.

<p>Are non-residential land use activities likely to be displaced as a result of the project? <input type="checkbox"/> NYD <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes If yes, briefly describe the likely effects.</p>
<p>Do any expected changes in non-residential land use activities have a potential to cause adverse effects on local residents/communities, social groups or industries? <input type="checkbox"/> NYD <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes If yes, briefly describe the potential effects.</p> <p>Matters More Consulting has conducted an Economic Impact Assessment of the proposed development (Refer Attachment 6.4).</p>
<p>Is mitigation of potential social effects proposed? <input type="checkbox"/> NYD <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes If yes, please briefly describe.</p>
<p>Other information/comments? (eg. accuracy of information)</p>

Cultural heritage

<p>Have relevant Indigenous organisations been consulted on the occurrence of Aboriginal cultural heritage within the project area? <input type="checkbox"/> No If no, list any organisations that it is proposed to consult. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes If yes, list the organisations so far consulted.</p> <p>Matt Cupper (archaeologist) consulted relevant Aboriginal cultural groups during the preparation of the CHMP (Refer Attachment 6.5).</p>
<p>What investigations of cultural heritage in the project area have been done? (attach details of method and results of any surveys for the project & describe their accuracy)</p> <p>A Cultural heritage Management Plan has been completed and approved by AAV.</p>
<p>Is any Aboriginal cultural heritage known from the project area? <input type="checkbox"/> NYD <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes If yes, briefly describe:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any sites listed on the AAV Site Register • Sites or areas of sensitivity recorded in recent surveys from the project site or nearby • Sites or areas of sensitivity identified by representatives of Indigenous organisations
<p>Are there any cultural heritage places listed on the Heritage Register or the Archaeological Inventory under the <i>Heritage Act 1995</i> within the project area? <input type="checkbox"/> NYD <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes If yes, please list.</p> <p>Is mitigation of potential cultural heritage effects proposed? <input type="checkbox"/> NYD <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes If yes, please briefly describe.</p>
<p>Other information/comments? (eg. accuracy of information)</p>

16. Energy, wastes & greenhouse gas emissions

<p>What are the main sources of energy that the project facility would consume/generate?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Electricity network. If possible, estimate power requirement/output <input type="checkbox"/> Natural gas network. If possible, estimate gas requirement/output <input type="checkbox"/> Generated on-site. If possible, estimate power capacity/output <input type="checkbox"/> Other. Please describe. <p>Please add any relevant additional information.</p>
<p>What are the main forms of waste that would be generated by the project facility?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Wastewater. Describe briefly – treated sewage effluent from tourist accommodation <input type="checkbox"/> Solid chemical wastes. Describe briefly.

Excavated material. Describe briefly – Excavated waste from the inland marina basin has been identified as suitable construction fill and will be reused on-site or supplied to Council works in agreement with Council engineers.

Other. Describe briefly.

Please provide relevant further information, including proposed management of wastes.

What level of greenhouse gas emissions is expected to result directly from operation of the project facility?

Less than 50,000 tonnes of CO₂ equivalent per annum

Between 50,000 and 100,000 tonnes of CO₂ equivalent per annum

Between 100,000 and 200,000 tonnes of CO₂ equivalent per annum

More than 200,000 tonnes of CO₂ equivalent per annum

Please add any relevant additional information, including any identified mitigation options.

17. Other environmental issues

Are there any other environmental issues arising from the proposed project?

No Yes If yes, briefly describe.

18. Environmental management

What measures are currently proposed to avoid, minimise or manage the main potential adverse environmental effects? (if not already described above)

Siting: Please describe briefly

The inland siting of the marina basin avoids landscape and visual impacts as well as providing a safe aquatic environment through the incorporation of a lock. Substantial areas of vegetation are retained in buffers and setbacks around the perimeter of the site.

Design: Please describe briefly

The main tourist accommodation facility is designed to levels that remain below the general tree canopy that surrounds the site.

Environmental management: Please describe briefly.

A detailed Environmental Management Plan has been prepared and submitted with the proposed development approval. This plan accommodates both the construction and operational phases of the project (Refer Attachment 8)

Other: Please describe briefly

Add any relevant additional information.

19. Other activities

Are there any other activities in the vicinity of the proposed project that have a potential for cumulative effects?

NYD No Yes If yes, briefly describe.

20. Investigation program

Study program

Have any environmental studies not referred to above been conducted for the project?

No Yes If yes, please list here and attach if relevant.

Storm surge impact assessment, based on identifying land below 5 AHD.

Has a program for future environmental studies been developed?

No Yes If yes, briefly describe.

Consultation program

Has a consultation program conducted to date for the project?

No Yes If yes, outline the consultation activities and the stakeholder groups or organisations consulted.

The project has received broad publicity on several occasions in the local press. In addition, the Shire's independent Design Review Panel has reviewed the proposed tourist accommodation.

Council has been briefed on several occasions since the inception of the project and other Government Agencies, such as DSE, DPCD, and Port of Hastings have been consulted and conducted site inspections.

Has a program for future consultation been developed?

NYD No Yes If yes, briefly describe.

Authorised person for proponent:

I, Stefan Borzecki (full name),

Director, Western Port Harbour Pty Ltd (position), confirm that the information contained in this form is, to my knowledge, true and not misleading.

Signature _____

Date 22.3.2011

Person who prepared this referral:

I, Ronald Walter Mason (full name),

Consultant (position), confirm that the information contained in this form is, to my knowledge, true and not misleading.

Signature _____

Date 22.3.2011