GOVERNMENT OF WESTERN AUSTRALIA

Environmental Protection Authority

Public record pursuant to s. 39 of the *Environmental Protection Act 1986*

Proposal title: Neerabup Resource Recovery Precinct - Stage 1

Proposal description: The proposal is for the construction and operation of Stage 1 of the Neerabup Resource Recovery Precinct (NRRP). Potential future stages of the NRRP are conceptual and viability still needs to be determined over the long term. The proposal will consist of a new community recycling centre (CRC), waste transfer station (WTS), material recovery facility (MRF) and supporting infrastructure to provide recycling and waste services for the City's residents and the broader northern metropolitan region. The proposal involves the clearing 9.3 ha of native vegetation within a Development Envelope.

Proposal location: Lot 600, 570 Wattle Avenue, Neerabup, approximately 39 km north of Perth CBD

APP number: APP-0036050

Date referral received: 10-03-2026 **Date more information received:** 10-06-2026

Referrer: Toxics Free Australia **Proponent:** City of Wanneroo

Potential significant effects:
There are potential impacts on: **flora and vegetation** from the clearing of 10.4 ha of remnant native vegetation; **terrestrial fauna** from the clearing of black cockatoo habitat; **inland waters** from potential discharges, leachate and spillages; **terrestrial environmental quality** from discharges and spillages; **air quality** from atmospheric emissions; **social surroundings** from construction and operation, including impacts to Aboriginal cultural heritage and amenity (odour, noise and dust).

Environmental factors: Flora and vegetation, terrestrial fauna, terrestrial environmental quality, inland waters, air quality and social surroundings.

Public comment on referral information:

Does the proposal need further assessment due to its potential significant impacts?	Yes	135	No	2
If the proposal requires further assessment, should the EPA include further opportunities for public review?	Yes	135	No	2
Total submissions:		137		

Decision: s. 38G(1) – Not assess

Summary of reasons pursuant to s. 38G(1)(c)
The EPA has decided not to assess the proposal because:

- The EPA considers the likely environmental effects of the proposal are not so significant or unmitigated to warrant formal assessment under Part IV of the *Environmental Protection Act* 1986 (EP Act).
- The EPA considers that the likely environmental effects of the proposal can be mitigated by other statutory decision-making processes to achieve consistency with the EPA's factor objectives.
- The EPA's decision has been made on the basis of the proponent implementing the proposal in accordance with the Proposal Content Document and management outlined in the referral supporting documents and attachments available on the EPA website. Changes to expected implementation content and/or management which are likely to result in significant environmental effects have not been considered as

part of the decision for this proposal, and may result in a new referral being required for that different proposal.

- The EPA notes that the proposal design comprises a development footprint of approximately 10.4 hectares. which will require clearing of native vegetation comprising degraded woodland. The EPA notes that no threatened flora, threatened ecological communities or priority ecological communities were identified within the development footprint. The conservation category wetland adjacent to the proposal will be avoided and the proponent has provided management measures. The EPA considers that the likely impacts to flora and vegetation can be effectively managed and regulated through the Native Vegetation Clearing Permit (NVCP) process under Part V Division 2 (Clearing) of the EP Act to be consistent with the EPA's objective for flora and vegetation.
- The EPA notes that the presence of small flocks of Carnaby's Black Cockatoo (*Zanda latirostris*; Endangered under the EPBC Act and BC Act) was recorded over the survey area for the proposal. The proposal will result in the clearing of up to 16 potential black cockatoo habitat trees and four foraging trees. Based on Carnaby's Black Cockatoo potential breeding habitat within the application area and the contribution to the cumulative loss of black cockatoo habitat on the Swan Coastal Plain, it is considered that the proposal may contribute to a significant impact on Terrestrial Fauna in the local area. However, the potential impacts could be mitigated through clearing permits under Part V Division 2 of the EP Act (Clearing) to be consistent with the EPA's environmental objective for terrestrial fauna.
- The EPA notes that groundwater occurs approximately 4 to 7 metres below ground level and a conservation wetland occurs adjacent to, but outside, the proposal development envelope. The application area is within the Wanneroo Groundwater Area proclaimed under the *Rights in Water and Irrigation Act 1914* (RIWI Act), where groundwater is used in general order of dominance for agriculture, public water supply, public recreational area irrigation and domestic gardens. The Gnangara Groundwater System, a source of public drinking water for Perth, is located approximately 250 m to the north of the proposal. The pathways for potential impacts from the resource recovery operations are contaminated stormwater run-off and migration of contaminated groundwater. The EPA notes that the facility has been designed to protect soil, surface water and groundwater through a design that includes enclosed and covered waste handling areas, impermeable hardstands, bunding, graded surfaces, dedicated leachate collection infrastructure, and separation of clean stormwater from potentially contaminated runoff. The design, combined with implementation and operational controls is considered suitable for management of leachate and containment of contaminated water in the location. DWER advised that the works approval and licensing processes under Part V (Division 3) of the EP Act provides sufficient regulatory mechanisms (works approval and licence) to control detail infrastructure design, operations, monitoring and compliance. In addition, stormwater and leachate risks are manageable, with containment systems and controls consistent with best practice for waste facilities. The EPA considers that potential impacts to Inland Waters and Terrestrial Environmental Quality can be regulated through the works approval and licensing processes under Part V (Division 3) of the EP Act to impose requirements for the

design and implementation of controls, and appropriate operation, monitoring and reporting.

- The EPA considers that potential impacts to Air Quality can be regulated through the works approval and licensing processes under Part V (Division 3) of the EP Act.
- The EPA notes the nearest sensitive receptor is a rural residential dwelling approximately 960 m north of the site boundary, and Aboriginal heritage places identified in the broader area occur more than 2 km from the development footprint. Noise, odour and dust impacts have been considered through technical assessments and proposed management controls. The Environmental Noise Impact Assessment concluded that the proposal could operate in compliance with the *Environmental Protection (Noise) Regulations 1997*, including under worst-case operational conditions.

  Odour modelling indicates offsite impacts are expected to be low to minimal, with the WTS fully enclosed and mechanically ventilated to minimise fugitive emissions. Offsite dust impacts are expected to be low due to the separation distance to sensitive receptors and proposed controls. The EPA considers noise, odour and dust emissions can be effectively regulated through the works approval, licensing and compliance framework under Part V of the EP Act, including the *Environmental Protection (Noise) Regulations 1997*. The EPA is satisfied that the mechanisms provided under the *Aboriginal Heritage Act 1972* (AH Act) are adequate to manage potential impacts to Aboriginal cultural heritage in a manner consistent with its objectives.
- The EPA has considered cumulative impacts within the region with other proposals, and considers that they are not likely extensive, and the proposal's cumulative environmental outcome is likely to be consistent with EPA objectives.
- The EPA does not consider that the proposal impacts will combine or interact in a holistic way which requires assessment by the EPA.
- Given the EPA's decision to 'not assess' this proposal, there will be further opportunity for the public to comment on aspects of the proposal during the public comment period for applications under Part V of the EP Act.

Taking into account decision-making processes under Part V Division 2 (Clearing) of the EP Act

- Vegetation clearing approvals have already been pursued through Clearing Permit 6359/3, issued in 2015 for the MRF area, and Clearing Permit 11059/1, issued in January 2026 for the remaining Stage 1 development area.
- In assessing the NVCP applications, DWER has considered the ten Clearing Principles outlined in Schedule 5 of the EP Act, and how the proponent has applied the mitigation hierarchy and whether any conditions should be prescribed to manage potential impacts. The NVCP process included opportunities for public input including an appeals process whereby anyone can appeal a decision to grant or refuse a NVCP or the conditions of a NVCP. Clearing Permit 11059/1 was appealed.

Taking into account decision-making processes under Part V Division 3 (Prescribed premises) of the EP Act, and the Environmental Protection Regulations 1987 (EP Regulations)

- The proposal will require a works approval and licence under Part V, Division 3 of the EP Act if the premise exceeds the production or design capacity specified in Schedule 1 of the EP Regulations.
- In assessing the works approval, DWER will consider how the proponent has applied the mitigation hierarchy, and what conditions should be prescribed in the licence to manage potential impacts to the environment from premise emissions and discharges.
- The process includes opportunities for public input including an appeals process whereby anyone can appeal the conditions of a works approval or licence.

Public advice

The EPA publishes the following public advice for the benefit of other decision-making authorities to ensure that their statutory decision-making processes achieve and assure environmental outcomes consistent with the EPA's environmental factor objectives:

- The proponent's Proposal Content Document specifications are material to ensuring the proposal is not likely to have a significant impact on the environment.
- The EPA supports the assessment and regulation under Part V Division 2 (Clearing) of the EP Act to ensure the environmental outcome to protect flora and vegetation and terrestrial fauna so that biological diversity and ecological integrity is maintained is achieved.
- The EPA supports the assessment and regulation under Part V (Division 3) of the EP Act to ensure the environmental outcome for inland water which is to maintain the hydrological regimes and quality of groundwater and surface water so that environmental values are protected, is achieved.
- The EPA supports the assessment and regulation under Part V (Division 3) of the EP Act to maintain the quality of land and soils so that the environmental outcome for terrestrial environmental quality is achieved.
- The EPA supports the assessment and regulation of air quality under Part V (Division 3) of the EP Act to ensure the environmental outcome to maintain air quality and minimise emissions so environmental values are protected.
- The EPA supports the assessment and regulation of social surroundings under Part V of the EP Act and provisions of the AH Act to ensure the objective to protect social surroundings from significant harm is achieved

Material information considered by the EPA in this decision

The EPA has considered the following material information in making its decision:

- Additional information and referral documentation received from the proponent (s38F Notice response received on 10 June 2026)
- Referral supporting documentation (dated 10 June 2026) and supporting appendices:
    - Supporting document
    - Proposal content document
    - Appendix A1_Lot 600 Neerabup Environmental Assessment - Portion 2
    - Appendix A2_Basic Fauna and Targeted Black Cockatoo_FINAL

  - Appendix A3_EAQ25025-NeerabupRRP+WksApp+OIA_Final
  - Appendix A4_TN25012-1 Neerabup RRRP Environmental Noise Assessment_4.0
  - Appendix A5_Targeted Black Cockatoo Habitat Survey_2.0_Redacted
  - Appendix B1_TW25033_01_Locality_RevA
  - Appendix B2_TW25033_02_DevelopmentArea_RevA
  - Appendix B3_TW25033_03_Easements_RevA
  - Appendix B4_TW25033_04_Zoning_RevA
  - Appendix B5_TW25033_05_SensitiveReceptors_RevB
  - Appendix B6_TW25033_06_Topography&Soils_RevA
  - Appendix B7_TW25033_07_SurfaceGeology_RevA
  - Appendix B8_TW25033_08_AcidSulfateSoils_RevA
  - Appendix B9_TW25033_09_GroundWater_RevA
  - Appendix B10_TW25033_10_SurfaceWater_RevA
  - Appendix B11_TW25033_11_VegetationUnits_RevA
  - Appendix B12_TW25033_12_VegetationCondition_RevA
  - Appendix B13_TW25033_13_TEC&ESA&Reserves_RevA
  - Appendix B14_TW25033_14_WetlandsExtent_RevA
  - Appendix B15_TW25033_15_ThreatenedPriorityFlora_RevA
  - Appendix B16_TW25033_16_ThreatenedPriorityFauna_RevA
  - Appendix B17_TW25033_17_BushfireProneAreas_RevA
  - Appendix B18_TW25033_18_Heritage_RevA
  - Appendix B19_TW25033_19_ClearingArea_RevA
  - Appendix B20_TW25033_20_FaunaHabitat_RevA
  - Appendix C1_Landscaping Plan
  - Appendix C2_TC25017_Concept-C-500_C_P-WTS_MRF n CRC Concept Layout
  - Appendix C3_TC25017-C-005_A_P-DBH 500 Eucalypt Tree Locations
  - Appendix D1_TW25033 - Neerabup RRP EAMP_2.0
  - Appendix D2_TW25033 - Neerabup RRP SWLMP_2.0
- Information and advice from DWER and DMPE about their statutory decision-making processes.
- EP Act s 3, s 4, Part IV, Admin Procedures, EPA factor and technical guidance.

Appeals: There are no rights of appeal under the EP Act in respect of this decision.



Darren Walsh
Chair
Delegate of the Environmental Protection Authority **Date:** 12 September 2026