

Ms Sophie Butcher
Mining Projects
Department of Planning & Infrastructure
GPO Box 39
SYDNEY NSW 2001

Our Ref: R2637280 & MP09-0175
WB:JC

Contact: Mr Wayne Burgess
Telephone: (02) 6591 7222

8 May 2013

Dear Ms Butcher

RE: KARUAH EAST QUARRY PROJECT (09-0175)

I refer to your email dated 11 March 2013 regarding the above Project.

Council staff have considered the matter and I provide a copy of the following attachments:

1. Attachment 'A' Letter dated 5 May 2013 from Council's Senior Ecologist, Mr Mat Bell.
With respect to ecological matters, Council's Mr Bell raises issues with the appropriateness and reasonableness of impacts on the threatened plant, *Tetratheca juncea*, and which are associated with the clearing for the proposed site facilities (rather than the project itself). He queries whether it is a reasonable level of impact considering the current availability of site facilities on adjoining lands controlled by the Applicant.
Mr Bell also raises a concern with respect to the isolation of an area of bushland as a consequence of the proposal. He is concerned with the level of cumulative impact associated with the development and asks that Departmental staff further consider this issue.
Finally, Mr Bell asks that, should the DA be approved, that a range of effective conditions be applied, including conditions relating to Biodiversity Offset Strategy and Offset Area Management Plan, vegetation clearing procedures/protocols, pre-clearing fauna and flora surveys, ecological supervision of clearing, environmental management plans, nesting box program, threatened plant salvage plan and ecological monitoring and reporting.
Where plans and strategies are required in conditions of consent, Mr Bell asked that Great Lakes Council be charged with responsibility to review and endorse draft plans as part of the activation of any consent.
2. Attachment 'B' Letter dated 9 April 2013 from Council's Senior Engineering Development Officer, Mr Dean Hartmann.
With regard to access matters, Mr Hartmann raises concerns as to whether the existing haul road pavements, particularly Blue Rock Close, have been constructed to cater for the proposed truck movements generated by the proposal, or merely to provide residential access to Lot 11 DP 1024564 (Mr M Kiely).

Mr Hartmann's letter also provides draft conditions in relation to utility services, erosion, traffic management, bonds and works within the road reserve.

3. Attachment 'C' Additional draft conditions, including relevant Section 94 Contributions.

Please contact me on 6591 7292 should you have any further enquiries.

Yours faithfully

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Wayne Burgess". The signature is written in a cursive, slightly slanted style.

Wayne Burgess
Manager - Development Assessments
Planning & Environmental Services

Attachment 'A'

Department of Planning and Infrastructure
GPO Box 39
SYDNEY NSW 2001

Our Reference:
Your Reference: SS09 - 0175

Contact: Mr Mat Bell
Telephone: 6591 7243

5 May 2013

Dear Sir/ Madam,

Re: Comments to the Proposed Karuah East Hard Rock Quarry, North Karuah (SS09-0175)

Background and Intent of this Submission

This correspondence has been prepared in response to a request from the Department seeking comments to the proposed Karuah East Hard Rock Quarry at North Karuah, including any recommended conditions of consent, should the proposed quarry be approved.

This submission relates to ecological matters.

This submission seeks to comment on the appropriateness and reasonableness of the proposed development on local and sub-regional ecology, assess the manner in which the development potentially impacts regional and sub-regional connectivity and ecological resilience and discuss the cumulative impacts of the proposal in relation to biodiversity and ecology.

Brief Summary of the Proposal

The information below is summarized from the information contained in the provided EA and its supporting documents.

The proposal involves the "development of a stand-alone hard rock quarry ... on Lots 12 and 13 DP1024564 [and involves] the extraction of up to 1.5 million tonnes of andesite per annum from a total resource of approximately 29 million tonnes over a 20-year extraction period... There is an estimated 380,000m³ of overburden required to be removed and stockpiled on the site... processing and facilities area will be located entirely on Lot 13. The proposal will involve upgrade and extension works to Blue Rock Lane, realignment of the Andesite Road and Blue Rock Lane intersection" (EA Report, pp. 9 – 12). The subject land has an area of 74.31-hectares and disturbance is proposed for 34.96-hectares (of which 30-hectares is naturally-vegetated). The development is associated with projected economic and social outcomes associated with the extraction, processing and sale of quarry products.

A separate pre-existing quarry is operated by the Applicants of SS09-0175 and is located on adjoining lands.

An Ecological Assessment has been prepared and submitted with the Application (RPS, 2013)

Three vegetation community types are present in the disturbance area, namely Spotted Gum/ Grey Ironbark/ Grey Gum/ White Mahogany Moist Sclerophyll Forest, Smooth-barked Apple/ Red Bloodwood/ Brown Stringybark Dry Sclerophyll Forest and Grey Myrtle Dry Rainforest. Three threatened plants (*Tetratheca juncea*, *Grevillea parviflora* subsp *parviflora* and *Asperula asthenes*) were recorded, along with four threatened animals (Powerful Owl, Varied Sitella, Eastern Freetail-bat and Eastern False Pipistrelle). Additional threatened species are known from adjoining or proximal lands (eg. Stephens Banded Snake, Squirrel Glider). The proposal will disturb an area of approximately 30-hectares of naturally-vegetated lands. A 112-hectare conservation offset is

proposed, mitigating the impacts via a ratio of 3.7:1. The ecological offset is located at the study area at North Karuah (56-hectares) and at Tahlee (off-site) (56-hectares). A thorough analysis via BBAM has not been conducted for the offset package to determine its suitability. The Applicant has made certain assertions concerning offsetting, including surveys of the offset sites in accordance with OEH guidelines, management actions will be identified and the offset sites will be appropriately secured.

In relation to *Tetratheca juncea*, the proposed quarry will remove 2,742 clumps (42%) over 9.74-hectares of habitat from a total population within the study area of 6,567-clumps. Up to 54% of the total known population may be impacted when direct and secondary/ associated impacts are considered. A salvage program for this species is proposed. For *Grevillea parviflora* subsp *parviflora*, 32 stems (32%) were recorded on the proposed quarry area of 100 recorded stems. *Asperula asthenes* does not occur in the area proposed to be disturbed.

Tetratheca juncea and *Grevillea parviflora* subsp *parviflora* are nationally-listed threatened species. It is understood that a referral has been made to the Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities concerning whether the matter is a controlled activity under the EPBC Act 1999.

Assessments of significance prepared as part of the EA have concluded that the proposal would not cause a significant impact on threatened species, with the exception of *Tetratheca juncea*. Page 146 of the EA states that “the proposal has the potential to have a significant impact on the site (sub) population of [*Tetratheca juncea*]”. It further states however, that impacts on *Tetratheca juncea* will be mitigated through the implementation of a biodiversity conservation offset package.

The Ecological Assessment of RPS identifies and discusses the nature of potential ecological impacts of the proposal. This includes the isolation of an area of bushland as a consequence of the proposed development (RPS 2013, Figure 9).

A Quarry Closure and Remediation Plan has been prepared. The post-quarry landform is proposed to comprise mainly native open woodland vegetation, with the quarry floor comprising wetland type vegetation. The Applicant proposes a number of mitigation measures and protective safeguards, including a Salvage Plan for threatened plants, an EMP, a nest box program, vegetation protocols, pre-clearing surveys and monitoring.

Key Ecological Issues

The information referred to me as part of the assessment of the proposed Karuah East Hard Rock Quarry raised one key ecological concern to which the Department must thoroughly evaluate and, where required, seek and consider the opinion of experts within relevant agencies or independent bodies, such as the NSW Office of Environment and Heritage.

The key ecological matter relates to:

1. A potentially-significant and/ or unreasonable impact on *Tetratheca juncea*

The development proposed will directly disturb 2,742-clumps of *Tetratheca juncea*, being 41% of the subject population and may actually affect up to 54% of that population when secondary impacts are considered. This is an impact of significant scale for a State and Commonwealth-listed threatened species.

While there are no compelling legislated instruments that compel an Applicant to coordinate approvals under State and Commonwealth legislation relating to threatened species, there are obvious benefits in such voluntary coordination. This Applicant has apparently made separate referral to the Commonwealth regarding *Tetratheca juncea*, but the Commonwealth processes do not appear to have been commenced. Any future Commonwealth requirements may thus conflict with any decision-making from the State concerning the reasonableness and appropriateness of impacts on *Tetratheca juncea*. This is a less than optimal situation given the potential significance of *Tetratheca juncea* related impacts associated with this proposal.

No clumps of *Tetratheca juncea* are impacted by the proposed quarry footprint itself and it is particularly concerning to me that the species is impacted by the proposed site facilities,

including access, handling and stock-piling areas. These facilities replicate those existing on the adjoining lands and associated with the stand-alone, existing Karuah Hard Rock Quarry, which is operated by the Applicant of this proposal.

It is thus questionable to me, whether the cumulative impacts of this development and sustainability principles have been appropriately considered by the Applicant and their consultants. I would urge that the Department considers this issue.

The questions that the Department needs to consider are:

- a) *Is the potentially significant impact on a large and important Tetratheca juncea population reasonable and appropriate?*
- b) *To what lengths has the Applicant pursued opportunities to avoid impacts on Tetratheca juncea by utilizing pre-existing site handling and access facilities on adjoining lands as part of their current operations rather than replicate site facilities in an ecologically significant landscape?*
- c) *If it is not unreasonable or inappropriate to replicate handling and access facilities on this site and thus cause harm to many thousands of clumps of Tetratheca juncea, are the proposed mitigation and offsetting strategies proposed valid and effective?*
- d) *To what extent do expert officers from the NSW Office of Environment and Heritage support the current proposal?*
- e) *To what extent may the Commonwealth support or reject this proposal under the terms of the EPBC Act 1999 relating to Tetratheca juncea and may this instruct decision-making?*

I do not propose to offer a view on the answers to these questions. It is critical that the Department satisfies itself (and if required, seeks the views of agency or independent experts) of the responses to such issues to demonstrate compliance with the relevant legislation and to deliver an adequate determination of this development proposal.

I am somewhat concerned about the isolation of bushland as identified on the Figure 9 of RPS (2013), which is again associated with the layout of the current proposal and replication of site access, handling and processing facilities, which in turn isolates an area of habitat from surrounding bushland. If the proposal was amended to reflect that material from the proposed quarry was handled at the current operation, then this bushland would not be so isolated.

Other than the above, I am reasonably satisfied that the development proposed is reasonable on ecological grounds and can be determined subject to conditions.

I am satisfied that the proposed offsets are adequately located. I would urge that a condition be adopted on any consent that, prior to the commencement of any works (and issuing of any CC), that a final Biodiversity Offset Strategy and Offset Area Management Plan be developed and approved by the relevant agencies, which should include Great Lakes Council.

The on-site offset appears to include a dwelling and areas of cleared lands. Such areas are not compatible with a reasonable offset area and strategies to remove and remediate such areas need to be developed.

The offset areas must be appropriately located, secured in a timely, effective manner, proactively managed for biodiversity restoration and conservation and maintained in-perpetuity. I support the dedication of offset lands to public land ownership and conservation management as this is the highest and best form of land conservation.

An Offset Area Management Plan that should be required as a condition on any consent should define and manage the offset area and be finalised only through involvement, input and endorsement by Great Lakes Council and the NSW Office of Environment and Heritage.

The purported Offset Area Management Plan should contain details relating to fencing, methods of active revegetation, management of weeds and pests, management of fire, signage and restrictions on access, as well as the introduction of habitat features such as hollows and logs. Performance measurement and monitoring is an important requirement. It should also deliver outcomes relating to compensating for a loss of natural hollows through clearing by way of the use of nesting boxes.

The Department also needs to be satisfied that sufficient, robust and effective administrative, financial and administrative mechanisms are identified, implemented, monitored and achieved for the proposed conceptual final landform rehabilitation. I am satisfied that native vegetation (woodland and a wetland on the pit floor are appropriate remediation targets). This could be achieved by way of a satisfactory condition on any consent. Final detailed and effective rehabilitation plans that demonstrate, cost and schedule restorative actions need to be developed by the company and submitted to and approved by the Council and agencies, ahead of formal commencement of any operations.

In any consent, there should be conditions of consent relating to vegetation clearing procedures/ protocols, pre-clearing fauna and flora surveys, ecological supervision of clearing, environmental management plans, nesting box program, threatened plant salvage plan, and ecological monitoring and reporting.

Where strategies or plan documents are required, the conditions should be prepared such that the Draft Plans are prepared and submitted to the relevant agencies, including Council, prior to the commencement of work and are approved for adoption. Conditions should embed, ensure and enforce all required ecological actions and safeguards throughout the life of the consent.

If any matters raised above require clarification or further comment, please contact the under-signed.

Yours faithfully

Mr Mat Bell
Senior Ecologist – Great Lakes Council

Attachment 'B'

ENGINEERING REPORT FOR DEVELOPMENTS

DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION: MP 09_0175

APPLICANT: KARUAH EAST QUARRY PTY.
LTD.

PROPERTY: LOTS 12 & 13 DP 1024564
PACIFIC HIGHWAY KARUAH.

PROPOSAL: HARD ROCK QUARRY
EXTRACTION.

REPORT:

**Sect 88B
Instrument(s):**

There are no instruments associated with this DA

Access:

Access to the proposed development is from the extension of Blue Rock Close which is currently bitumen seal with gravel shoulders. Blue Rock Close connects to Andersite Road which then connects to the existing grade separated interchange at the intersection of the Karuah Bypass and The Branch Lane. Both Blue Rock Close and Andersite Rd. are service roads adjacent to The Pacific Highway and will provide access to the proposed quarry. Both roads are dedicated public roads for the existing constructed lengths.

In conjunction with the proposed development, Blue Rock Close is proposed to be realigned and widened on the existing constructed section as well as construction of the road extension. Of concern to Council is whether the existing haul road pavements, particularly Blue Rock Close, have been constructed to cater for the proposed truck movements generated by the proposal or merely to provide residential access to Lot 11 DP1024564 (Mr. M Kiely). Any required thickening to cater for the proposed quarry operation shall be included in the final civil plans. Council will be responsible for approval of the final design and construction supervision. Upon satisfactory completion of the road upgrade, the extension will be gazetted as public road under the control of Great Lakes Council.

Prior to approval for construction of the road extension, RMS shall assess / review the final civil plans to verify compliance with the existing highway alignment and to ensure that existing RMS assets located outside the formed pavement are not adversely affected by the proposed service road.

The existing intersection of Andersite Rd. and The Branch Lane is proposed to be upgraded with line marking and signposting to RMS standards in conjunction with the proposed quarry development.

Stormwater Management:

A water management plan incorporating retention and reuse of on-site runoff in accordance with water quality management guidelines is to be submitted for approval.

Services:

Any alteration to services to be at the developers cost.

Erosion Control:

An erosion and sedimentation control plan is to be submitted for approval.

Traffic:

A traffic control plan is to be submitted.

Any damage caused to public assets as a result of this development is to be repaired at the developers cost. Ordinarily an amount of 1% of the value of the development is required for payment of the damage bond for developments with a value greater than \$400,000 however given the overall development costs, discussions undertaken with Council's Director of Engineering have concluded that an amount of 10% of the cost of road rehabilitation would be acceptable in this instance. Accordingly an amount of \$33,000 plus an administration fee of \$341.55 shall be applied.

Road Haulage:

The applicant shall be required to pay a fee based on a levy of 3.6 cents per tonne per km on Council roads. The Planner is advised that this should be included in the Section 94 contributions.

Section 94

Contributions: By Development Planner.

Date:09/04/13

D HARTMANN,

The developer is required to do the following works-

CONDITIONS.....DA

GENERAL CONDITIONS

1. Adjustment to utility services

All adjustments to existing utility services made necessary by the development are to be undertaken at no cost to Council.

Reason: To ensure utility services remain in serviceable operation.

PRIOR TO THE ISSUE OF A CONSTRUCTION CERTIFICATE

The following conditions must be complied with prior to the issue of any Construction Certificate

2. Erosion and sediment control plan

Prior to the issue of a construction certificate, an erosion and sediment control plan prepared by a suitably qualified person in accordance with *"The Blue Book – Managing Urban Stormwater (MUS): Soils and Construction"* (Landcom) must be submitted to and approved by the certifying authority. Control over discharge of stormwater and containment of run-off and pollutants leaving the site/premises must be undertaken through the installation of erosion control devices including catch drains, energy dissipaters, level spreaders and sediment control devices such as hay bale barriers, filter fences, filter dams, and sedimentation basins.

Reason: To protect the environment from the effects of erosion and sedimentation.

3. Traffic management plan

Prior to the issue of a construction certificate, a traffic management plan including measures to be employed to control traffic (inclusive of construction vehicles) during construction of the development must be submitted to and approved by the certifying authority. The traffic control plan must be designed in accordance with the requirements of the Roads and Traffic Authority's Manual, *Traffic Control at Work Sites Version 2* and *Australian Standard AS 1742.3: Manual of uniform traffic control devices - Traffic control for works on roads*.

The plan must incorporate measures to ensure that motorists using the road adjacent to the development and residents in the vicinity of the development are subjected to minimal time delays due to construction on the site or adjacent to the site.

The traffic control plan must be prepared by an accredited person trained in the use of the current version of *RTA Traffic Control at Work Sites manual*.

The approved Construction traffic management plan must be implemented prior to the commencement of work.

Reason: To ensure public safety during the construction of the development.

4. Bond required to guarantee against damage to public land

Prior to the issue of a construction certificate, a Damage Bond Application form together with payment of a bond in the amount of \$33,000 and a non-refundable administration fee of \$341.55 must be submitted to Council. The bond is payable for the purpose of funding repairs to any damage that may result to Council assets from activities/works associated

with the construction of the development and to ensure compliance with Council standards and specifications.

A final inspection will be carried out by the responsible Council officer and the bond (minus any fees required for additional inspections) will be considered for refund:

- a) once all works, including landscaping, driveway construction, etc, have been completed, and
- b) following issue of an occupation certificate by the certifying authority.

The damage bond is reviewed periodically and therefore the fee and bond amount payable will be determined from Council's current fees and charges document at the time of lodgement of the damage bond.

Reason: Protection of public assets.

5. Works within the road reserve

Prior to the issue of a construction certificate, an application for a Public Engineering Works Permit (PEWP) must be submitted to and approved by Council for the road reserve works listed in the table below. Each work must be carried out in accordance with the standard specified in the column opposite the work. All works must include the adjustment and/or relocation of services as necessary to the requirements of the appropriate service authorities.

Work	Standard to be provided
Kerb and gutter, where deemed necessary, road pavement and associated drainage construction, across the full frontage of the site (Lot 11 DP1024564).	Provision of concrete kerb and gutter, where applicable, and extension of the existing bitumen road (Blue Rock Close) to the southwestern corner of Lot 12 DP 1024564 in accordance with Austroads and RMS's adopted Engineering Standards. Pavement width 8m between kerbs. Pavement design shall address projected traffic movements.
Realignment and widening of Blue Rock Close from its intersection with Andersite Rd to the end of the existing Blue Rock Close.	Provision of widening and extension of the existing bitumen seal in accordance with Austroads and RMS's adopted Engineering Standards to the southwestern corner of Lot 11 DP 1024564. Pavement design shall address projected traffic movements.
Linemarking and signposting at the intersection of The Branch Lane and Andersite Rd.	Provision of linemarking and signposting to RMS standards.

Reason: To ensure works within Council's road reserve are constructed to a suitable standard for public safety.

PRIOR TO THE COMMENCEMENT OF WORK

The following conditions must be satisfied prior to the commencement of any building construction or subdivision work.

6. Public safety requirements

All care is to be taken to ensure the safety of the public in general, road users, and the adjoining property while the development is being constructed. Public liability insurance cover, for a minimum of \$10 million, is to be maintained for the duration of the construction

of the development. Council is not held responsible for any negligence caused by the undertaking of the works.

Reason: To ensure public health and safety during the construction of the development.

7. Erosion & sediment measures in accordance with approved plans

Prior to the commencement of work, erosion and sediment controls must be installed in accordance with the approved erosion and sediment control plan and must be maintained for the duration of the project.

Reason: To protect the environment from the effects of erosion and sedimentation.

CONDITIONS TO BE SATISFIED DURING DEVELOPMENT WORK

The following conditions must be complied with during any development work.

8. Maintenance of erosion and sediment control measures in accordance with approved plan

Erosion and sediment control measures must be maintained at all times in accordance with the approved erosion and sediment control plan until the site has been stabilised by permanent vegetation cover or hard surface.

Reason: To protect the environment from the effects of erosion and sedimentation.

9. Comply with traffic management plan

The approved traffic management plan must be implemented and maintained for the duration of the development works.

Reason: To ensure public safety during the construction of the development.

PRIOR TO THE ISSUE OF AN OCCUPATION CERTIFICATE

The following conditions must be satisfied prior to any occupation or use of the building

10. Inspections of engineering work.

Prior to the issue of a final occupation certificate, all engineering work must comply with Council's engineering guidelines, specifications and standards and must be inspected in accordance with Council's holding points. Upon completion of the public works a final inspection must be arranged with Council and a Certificate of Practical Completion must be issued by Council.

Reason: To ensure compliance with Council's specification for engineering works.

Attachment 'C'

ADDITIONAL DRAFT CONDITIONS

1. Compliance with Building Code of Australia

All building work must be carried out in accordance with the requirements of the *Building Code of Australia* as in force on the date the application for the relevant construction certificate or complying development certificate was made.

Reason: Prescribed condition under the *Environmental Planning & Assessment Regulation 2000*.

2. On-site sewage management system - Section 68 application

Prior to the issue of a construction certificate, an application under Section 68 of the *Local Government Act 1993* to install an on-site sewage management system must be obtained from Council. The application for Section 68 approval must be accompanied by a report prepared by a suitably qualified professional with demonstrated experience in effluent disposal matters. The report must address the site specific design of sewage management in accordance with the requirements of the *Local Government Act 1993*, the *Local Government (General) Regulation 2005* and Guidelines approved by the Director General.

Reason: To ensure suitable onsite sewage disposal is provided to the development to protect public health and the natural environment.

3. Access and facilities for people with disabilities

Prior to the issue of a construction certificate, plans and specifications detailing access to and within the development and facilities for persons with disabilities must be submitted to and approved by the certifying authority. The development must be in accordance with *Australian Standard AS 1428.1 - Design for access and mobility* and Part D3 of the *Building Code of Australia*.

Reason: To ensure the development provides equitable and dignified access and facilities for people with disabilities.

4. S94 contributions

Prior to the issue of a construction certificate, a monetary contribution must be paid to Council in accordance with Section 94 of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979*. The services and facilities for which the contributions are levied and the respective amounts payable under each of the relevant plans are set out in the following table:

Code	Contributions Plan	Facility	quantity	unit		rate		amount
GLW-07	Great Lakes Wide	Headquarters Building	\$5,000,000	\$1 non res	@	\$0.001	=	\$5,000.00
Total								\$5,000.00

Contribution rates are subject to indexation. The rates shown above are applicable until 30 June following the date of consent. Payment made after 30 June will be at the indexed rates applicable at that time.

The Contributions Plan and the Standard Schedule for Section 94 Plans may be viewed on [Council's web site](#) or at Council's offices at Breese Parade, Forster.

Reason: Statutory requirement to be paid towards the provision or improvement of facilities and services.

5. S94 contributions

At the completion of each calendar year, a monetary contribution must be paid to Council in accordance with Section 94 of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979*. The services and facilities for which the contributions are levied and the respective amounts payable under each of the relevant plans are set out in the following table:

Code	Contributions Plan	Facility	rate
GLW-08	Great Lakes Wide	Road Haulage Levy	\$0.036/tonne/km hauled

Contribution rates are subject to indexation. The rates shown above are applicable until 30 June following the date of consent. Payment made after 30 June will be at the indexed rates applicable at that time.

The Contributions Plan and the Standard Schedule for Section 94 Plans may be viewed on [Council's web site](#) or at Council's offices at Breese Parade, Forster.

Reason: Statutory requirement to be paid towards the provision or improvement of facilities and services.

6. Construction certificate required

Prior to the commencement of any building or subdivision construction work (including excavation), a construction certificate must be issued by a certifying authority.

Enquiries regarding the issue of a construction certificate can be made to Council's Customer Service Centre on 6591 7222.

Reason: Statutory requirement under the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979*.

7. Works to be completed

The building/structure or part thereof must not be occupied or used until an interim occupation/final occupation certificate has been issued in respect of the building or part.

Reason: To ensure compliance with the development consent and statutory requirements.

8. On-site sewage management system - approval to operate

Prior to the issue of an occupation certificate, the on-site sewage management system must be completed in accordance with the approved plans and current specifications and standards. The system must not to be used and/or operated until it has been inspected by a Council Officer and an approval to operate the system has been issued.

Reason: To ensure public health and safety.

9. Provide chemical storage area

Prior to the issue of an occupation certificate, a covered impervious bunded area must be provided for storage of chemicals, oils or fuel (for example a bunded chemical cabinet). The volume of the bunded area must be at least 110% of the volume of the largest container.

Reason: To reduce the risk of environmental pollution from chemical or fuel spills.

10. Provide spill kit

Prior to the issue of an occupation certificate, a spill kit must be provided for use of emergency equipment if there is a leak or spill of chemicals or oils. The spill kit must be clearly labelled and include items such as rags, brooms and mops to stop any spill from entering the drainage system.

Reason: To reduce the risk of environmental pollution from chemical or fuel spills.