



Suite 11, 36 Johnson Street Guildford WA 6055
PO Box 388 Guildford WA 6935
T: 08 6477 1144 | E: admin@bushfireprone.com.au

Our Ref: 250811
Your Ref: A1098
DFER REF: 2026/0245

19 March 2026

Erin Gower
Shire of Nannup
PO Box 11
Nannup WA 6275

Dear Erin,

Re: Response to DFES comments

Please find my response to the DFES comments, as requested, on the following pages.

If you wish to discuss these further, please do not hesitate to contact this office.

Yours sincerely



Mike Scott
Director
Bushfire Prone Planning

BPP RESPONSE TO DFES COMMENTS	
Relevant Authority and Reference Number:	Shire of Nannup A1098
Relevant Application:	60 Blackwood River Drive, Nannup
Relevant Document:	60 Blackwood River Drive (BMP) v1.0
DFES Comments - Date and Reference Number:	9 February 2026
DFES Comments – Subject Matter(s)	1. Policy Measures 7.1 ii c: Compliance with the BAL contour map 2. Policy Measure 7.1ii e: Compliance with the Bushfire Protection Criteria 8 3. Policy Measure 7.5.ii a) – g) Outcomes based approach 4. Policy Measure 7.1.iv and Section 9.4.2 of the Guidelines
Bushfire Prone Planning (BPP) – Response Date and Reference Number:	19 March 2026 / 250811

DFES Assessment Note:

- DFES acknowledges that the site currently accommodates a single residential building, and the proposed development includes the addition of three tiny homes for use as Short-Term Rental Accommodation (STRA) for up to two guests per cabin, and the hosting of community events with up to 30 guests.
- DFES notes that while the BMP appears to focus on the STRA, the letter from the proponent details additional day use, utilising two acres of flat meadow on the property for community events for up to 30 people, and that the existing tree cover and additional trees to be strategically added to the property, will provide privacy screening between the different uses.
- DFES also notes that the BMP contains some fundamental inaccuracies in addressing the appropriate Bushfire Protection Criteria (BPC) as per the Guidelines. In particular, comments relating to Element 2: Siting and Design addresses acceptable solutions that appear to apply to BPC 8: Development – Class 9 Buildings which are not applicable to this proposal.
- Specific requirements of SPP 3.7 and the Guidelines are to be further addressed in the BMP as outlined in the assessment below Tables 1-4.

BPP Comment:

Bushfire Prone Planning (BPP) acknowledges DFES's comments and input on the submitted Bushfire Management Plan. We appreciate the feedback provided and have carefully reviewed each point raised. The responses below outline how each comment has been addressed, with updates made to the BMP where appropriate to ensure consistency with the *Guidelines for Planning in Bushfire Prone Areas*.

Subject Matter 1		Policy Measure 7.1 (ii) c: Preparation of a BAL contour map	
DFES Comments			BPP Response
Issue	Assessment	Action	
Vegetation Classification Classified Area 3 Not Demonstrated	In Appendix A, Section A1.2: Vegetation Assessment and Classification of the BMP, the classification managed by kangaroos." The management of vegetation by kangaroos is not under the control of the landowner and the statement should be removed. The decision maker should be satisfied that the BMP provides vegetation management measures in accordance with AS 3959. If unsubstantiated, the vegetation should be classified as per AS 3959, or the resultant BAL ratings may be inaccurate.	Modification to the BMP required.	BMP updated to remove reference to kangaroos. The BMP appropriately classifies Cabin sites 1,2 & 3 Area's 3 and 4 vegetation in accordance with AS 3959:2018 Clause 2.2.3.2, with justification provided based on land use and management intent. Height stick demonstrates the vegetation height.
Vegetation Classification Classified Area 5 Not Demonstrated	There is limited photographic evidence to support the vegetation exclusion within all classifications of Area 5, including those located on adjacent lots. The decision maker should be satisfied that Section 6 of the BMP and the Landscape Management Plan provide a legal, enforceable mechanism for the management of neighbouring Lots 6 and 8 to a low-threat standard in perpetuity. This is required to provide certainty that the proposed management measures within the BMP can be enforced by the decision maker.	Modification to the BMP required.	Additional photos have been added of the neighbouring property. Photos cannot be added of the onsite dwelling or the dwelling to the south, as these are both tenanted. An accredited consultant has undertaken a site visit and verified the vegetation classifications, noting aerial imagery cannot be relied upon to undertake assessments under AS3959. There are individual trees within Area 5 that do not exceed 15% canopy cover. The satellite mapping throws the tree shadow longer than it exists.

Subject Matter 1		Policy Measure 7.1 (ii) c: Preparation of a BAL contour map	
DFES Comments			BPP Response
Issue	Assessment	Action	
	If unsubstantiated, the vegetation should be classified as per AS 3959, or the resultant BAL ratings may be inaccurate.		

Subject Matter 1		SPP 3.7 Appendix A – Bushfire Assessment Methodologies	
DFES Comments			BPP Response
Issue	Assessment	Action	
Bushfire Attack Level – BAL Contour Map	DFES acknowledges that the BAL assessment was undertaken based on the specific location of the proposed buildings, and individual BAL Contour Maps provided. Noting that the proposal includes day use for community events, a BAL Contour Map for the entire subject site may be more appropriate, to demonstrate the potential radiant heat impacts and associated indicative BAL ratings in reference to any classified vegetation within 150 metres of the subject lot. The information derived by this tool is useful in ensuring the entire proposed development is located in areas with the least possible risk of bushfire. On this basis, it helps decision makers and proponents determine the suitability of the location of the proposed buildings and ensure that the bushfire risk across the site (including the existing buildings) is also understood.	Comment only	Day use and events were not within the scope of 250811 – 60 Blackwood River Drive (BMP)_v1.0. Events and day use activities have been assessed under SPP 3.7 within the revised BMP. A BAL Contour map across the lot has been prepared (Fig 3.4)
Method 2	DFES notes that in Section 5.4, Outcomes Based Approach (OBA) for Element 3: Vehicular Access A3.5 – On-site shelter, a Method 2 calculation was undertaken. The BMP has determined that an onsite safer space (2kW/m²) is not achievable, however no evidence of the calculation or location of the proposed onsite safer space has been included in the BMP.	BMP to be modified. Method 2 outputs cannot be validated. Inputs to be included as per Table B1 of AS 3959.	The BMP has been updated and the Method 2 calculations added (Appendix E).

Subject Matter 1		SPP 3.7 Appendix A – Bushfire Assessment Methodologies	
DFES Comments			BPP Response
Issue	Assessment	Action	
	Notwithstanding, DFES notes that the requirement to consider an onsite safer space relates to BPC8: Development – Class 9 buildings. For this proposal, assessment relating to BPC8: Development – Vulnerable tourism land uses and day uses should have been undertaken, where the consideration for an on-site shelter is made, in cases where A3.2, A3.3a and A3.4 cannot be achieved. The BMP should be updated to apply and assess the proposal to the correct BPC, as per the Guidelines. The BMP should be updated to apply and assess the proposal to the correct BPC, as per the Guidelines.		

Subject Matter 1		Table 2: Policy Measure 7.1 ii. e. Compliance with the Bushfire Protection Criteria 8: Development – Vulnerable Tourism Land Uses and Day Uses	
DFES Comments			BPP Response
Issue	Assessment	Action	
Siting and Design – Asset Protection Zone (APZ)	A2.1b – not demonstrated The proposed habitable buildings are shown to be located in an area of BAL-FZ and require an APZ to be provided, as per the Guidelines. The BMP proposes APZs for cabins 2 and 3 that cannot be achieved within the lot boundary. It has not been demonstrated that a redesign to manage or mitigate the risk is not practical or appropriate. There appears to be an opportunity for the building footprint to be in an alternative and appropriate location within the lot.	Compliance with Siting and Design not demonstrated. Modification to the BMP is required to address the assessment advice.	No modification to the BMP required. The Cabins can achieve a BAL – 29 APZ within the lot. This location provides the most appropriate access whilst ensuring separation distance from each cabin.
Vehicular Access – Access Routes and No-through Roads	A3.2a and A3.3a – not compliant Blackwood River Drive is an existing gazetted public road maintained by the local government; however, access in two different directions to two different suitable destinations, in accordance with the acceptable solution of the Guidelines, is not available until Mowen Road, approximately 3 kilometres from the development site, which exceeds the acceptable maximum length of 200 metres for a no-through road. Additionally, the BMP should demonstrate that the section of the road in excess of 200 metres is wholly within BAL-LOW as per Figure 29 of the Guidelines. The BMP has proposed an outcomes-based approach and DFES provides comment in Table 3 below.	Does not comply. Modification to the BMP is required to address the Assessment advice.	No modifications required to the BMP. A3.2a and A3.3a have been correctly completed within the BMP. Blackwood River Drive is a public two-way road that links to Barrabup Road, and Mowen Road. An outcome based assessment has been completed for A3.2a Access routes.

Subject Matter 1		Table 2: Policy Measure 7.1 ii. e. Compliance with the Bushfire Protection Criteria 8: Development – Vulnerable Tourism Land Uses and Day Uses	
DFES Comments			BPP Response
Issue	Assessment	Action	
Water Supply	A4.1 – not demonstrated The BMP proposes that a 20,000 litre water tank dedicated for firefighting purposes will be provided, however, it is unclear where the tank will be positioned. Figures 3.1.1, 3.1.2, 3.1.3, 3.2.1, 3.2.2, and 3.2.3 show the location to be within the subject lot, which is inconsistent with the 'Assessment Supporting Details'. This states the tank will be located to the south of the property, and that "This is offsite, however is owned by members of the same family and the tanks will service each lot. Costs are being shared between each property owner." Additionally, DFES notes that the BMP shows firefighting water tanks in areas of BAL-40 and BAL-FZ which may be impacted by bushfire. DFES as the Hazard Management Agency considers these tanks and adjacent hard-standing should achieve BAL-29 or below and be accessible to a type 3.4 appliance. Appendix B, Table 11 of the Guidelines requires that for each habitable building - 10,000 litres of water per 500m² of floor space, up to 50,000L is provided for vulnerable land uses. Noting that in addition to the three cabins, there is an existing dwelling on site, and the proposed 20,000L capacity does not meet the requirements of the Guidelines.	Modification to the BMP required	The BMP has been modified. The strategic water tank dedicated for fire-fighting capabilities has been relocated to an area onsite that has a BAL – 29 APZ. The Local Government has advised that they would accept a strategic dedicated water supply of 20,000 litres, based on the scope of 3 x cabins. The additional measures identified for sourcing water have been retained within the BMP as they may be useful for response authorities in a bushfire incident.

Subject Matter 1		Table 2: Policy Measure 7.1 ii. e. Compliance with the Bushfire Protection Criteria 8: Development – Vulnerable Tourism Land Uses and Day Uses	
DFES Comments			BPP Response
Issue	Assessment	Action	
	In addressing the acceptable solutions for this element, the BMP proposes back up water supply being a dam on the adjacent property and a standpipe at the North Nannup fire brigade shed located on Dean Road, 5.1 kilometers from Dragonfly Escapes. This is a deviation from the acceptable solutions of this element and should be removed from the BMP.		
Administrative Matters	Administrative matters The BMP contains administrative inaccuracies which should be amended for accuracy. - Section 3.1.3 – Site Assessment Data Applied to Construction of the BAL Contour Map(s) - Summary table states BAL Contour maps are figures 3.3, however these are labelled as 3.2.1, 3.2.2 and 3.2.3, duplicating the Figure references for Classified Vegetation & Topography (Post Development) Maps. - Section 5.3.3 – A4.1 Water Supply - Check box has been ticked, selecting “The planning proposal is for a camping ground’ vulnerable land use development. The required water supply dedicated to firefighting purposes is to be determined at the discretion of the local government and this will be complied with. Evidence is provided of the determined requirements and is presented as an Addendum in this BMP.”. This is inaccurate to the type of development and should be marked ‘Not Relevant’.		The BMP has been updated.

Subject Matter 1		Table 2: Policy Measure 7.1 ii. e. Compliance with the Bushfire Protection Criteria 8: Development – Vulnerable Tourism Land Uses and Day Uses	
DFES Comments			BPP Response
Issue	Assessment	Action	
	Section 5.4.2.2 – OBA Criterion B A3.4 is the incorrect reference for Element 3: On-site shelter and should be amended to A3.5.		

Subject Matter 1		Table 3: Policy Measure 7.5 ii. a) to g) Outcomes-based approach	
DFES Comments			BPP Response
Issue	Assessment	Action	
Vehicle Access – BMP Comment	An outcomes-based approach is applied (refer to BMP Section 5.4) to demonstrate (to the decision maker) that the relevant risks can be appropriately managed and/or mitigated to a tolerable or acceptable level and the required outcomes are achieved.	DFES acknowledges that due to circumstances outside the control of the landowner, vehicular access cannot be provided in two directions, to two different suitable destinations, which presents an unacceptable risk to vulnerable people during a landscape scale bushfire, and an outcomes-based approach is required as per SPP 3.7.	The BMP has been updated to include day use, which was not within the original scope of the BMP v1.0.

Subject Matter 1		Table 3: Policy Measure 7.5 ii. a) to g) Outcomes-based approach	
DFES Comments			BPP Response
Issue	Assessment	Action	
Outcome Based Approach – Address the acceptable solution to the greatest extent possible	For the subject planning proposal, the detailed assessment against each relevant element and each corresponding relevant acceptable solution is presented in Section 5.3. The assessment result is summarised in Section 5.2. Compliance with Element 2 and 4 has been demonstrated within these sections.	The BMP has not addressed acceptable solutions A3.2b, A3.3a, A3.3b, or A3.4 of the Guidelines, in the Element 3: Vehicular Access section, stating they are not applicable however, the proposal includes day use, and Blackwood River Road is essentially a no- through road. DFES disagrees with the statement that compliance has been demonstrated for Element's 2 and 4, as per comments in Table 2 of this response letter. Furthermore, the BMP has applied the incorrect BPC for Element 2: Siting and Design, which has resulted in the incorrect assessment of Element 3, A3.5 – On-site Shelter.	
Identify the non-compliance with the acceptable solutions and why these cannot be achieved.	For the subject planning proposal, the detailed assessment that identifies the non-compliance against any relevant acceptable solution is presented in Section 5.3. Identification of those relevant acceptable solutions for which compliance is not achieved is presented in the following table, along with a summary of why compliance cannot be achieved. A3.2a Multiple access routes: Barrabup Road provides access and egress in one direction to two different locations (Busselton and Nannup) and is accessed from the subject lot via Mowen Road and Vasse Highway.	Mowen Road provides access to Busselton to the west, however this is through extreme bushfire hazard vegetation. Comments relating to Gracillis Road, which is not a formally gazetted road, should be removed from the BMP as this is not under the control of the landowner and cannot be relied upon to justify compliance. DFES agrees that compliance to A3.2a – Access routes cannot be achieved in this location, as a result of a legacy subdivision layout.	The BMP has been updated to include the Method 2 calculation (Appendix E). The correct BPC has been used for the methodology in 250811 – 60 Blackwood River Drive (BMP) v1.0 The BMP details that A3.2 is not compliant, and the <i>Outcomes-Based Approach is Applied to Satisfy SPP 3.7 Required Outcomes</i> has been completed. The BMP has been updated to detail that Gracillis Road is currently trafficable by two way traffic and that it is purely a governance and regulatory upgrade within Government for the road to be approved as a public road. Recent work has been completed to Gracillis Road (grading and filling potholes) as ongoing maintenance.

Subject Matter 1		Table 3: Policy Measure 7.5 ii. a) to g) Outcomes-based approach	
DFES Comments			BPP Response
Issue	Assessment	Action	
	Barrabup Road provides the sole access/egress route for the subject lot to Mowen Road. Currently there are no other legal alternative access/egress options. This is due to a legacy layout when the subdivision was created. The Shire of Nannup, in consultation with DBCA, is in the process of upgrading Gracillis Road (see BEP Fig 2). In a practical sense, Gracillis Road is already trafficable (2 way in all weather conditions) but is yet to be formalised as a gazetted road by relevant agencies. When this road upgrade is completed, the subdivision will have a second legal access/egress, and three different locations (Margaret River, Nannup and Busselton) will be easily accessible from the development site. A3.4 On-site shelter: Calculations using Method 2 Flamesol have determined that an onsite safer space (2kW/m²) is not achievable. Separation distances required from Class A Forest is 160m (not achievable- closest is 58m), Class G Grassland is 90m (not achievable – closest is 58m). The location was on the northern boundary of the property. Early evacuation is the primary message in a bushfire emergency. Once Gracillis Road is formalised, the Bushfire Management Plan will be compliant with the technical requirements of the Planning for Bushfire Guidelines.	Blackwood River Drive is a looped road that connects directly to Barrabup Road to the north and again via Dean Road to the east. Barrabup Road is a no-through road to the west, and the subject lot is approximately three kilometers from Mowen Road, where two- way access is achievable. As per comments in Tables 1 and 2 of this response letter, it appears that the incorrect BPC has been used and the methodology for the Method 2 calculation is not provided.	Gracillis Road will not be a public road prior to the opening of the development, however is trafficable now to two suitable destinations.

Subject Matter 1		Table 3: Policy Measure 7.5 ii. a) to g) Outcomes-based approach	
DFES Comments			BPP Response
Issue	Assessment	Action	
Detail how the design addresses bushfire risk and where additional bushfire risk management measures have been deemed necessary and included to minimise the risk.	BAL-29 requirements will be implemented to provide bushfire resilience to the proposed site. Additional measures include a commitment to manage and maintain in perpetuity the APZ around the cabin sites as per the Landscape Management Plan. Acknowledging the site's non-compliant access and the proposed intensification, an additional bushfire risk management measure (a Bushfire Evacuation Plan (BEP) has been developed. The BEP will ensure visitors are well informed of early evacuation procedures, providing an additional precautionary measure beyond standard bushfire planning requirements.	The demonstrated bushfire analysis should highlight any risks with the proposal design and level of proposed infrastructure. Once these issues are known, additional bushfire management measures can be identified to minimise these risks. An outcome-based approach requires a greater level of mitigation of the bushfire risk than that provided by the acceptable solutions of the Guidelines. The cabins (pre-development) are located in areas of BAL-FZ and there are existing acceptable solutions within the Guidelines, such as the provision of an APZ, to mitigate the risk. Additionally, section 8.3.1 of the Guidelines requires the preparation of a BEP for all vulnerable land uses and therefore these measures are not considered additional in this context. The BMP justifies the development in its current form without making any adjustment to increase hazard separation, beyond that required by the Guidelines. This is not considered in line with the intent of an outcomes-based approach. Once the actual risk has been determined and any additional bushfire management measures to minimise these risks have been identified there will be an element of residual risk. This is the level of risk considered acceptable by the decision maker.	The BMP has been updated to include: - Cabins 2 and 3 located within an area that can achieve a BAL - 29 onsite APZ. The outcome based assessment has been revised to incorporate greater detail of the road network and proximity to the town centre.

Subject Matter 1		Table 3: Policy Measure 7.5 ii. a) to g) Outcomes-based approach	
DFES Comments			BPP Response
Issue	Assessment	Action	
		It is considered that if the decision maker is inclined to approve the proposal based on the current version of the BMP, there would be an acceptance of a level of unknown bushfire risk to people and property at this location.	
Detail if there are any community net-benefits such as improvements to the public road network.	The proposal delivers more stringent vegetation management outcome for the subject site that reduces bushfire hazard while preserving mature vegetation. Surrounding landowners will directly benefit from lower bushfire hazards in the locality; recognising that broader community benefits are limited given the minor nature of the proposal.	While the development may offer some wider community benefit to the Nannup area, the BMP does not provide evidence of localised community net-benefits impacted by the development. The suggested net-benefits listed in the BMP should be more clearly explained and substantiated with relevant evidence. The proposal that more stringent vegetation management is reducing bushfire hazard that will benefit surrounding landowners is unlikely, given the size of the lot, and the minimal clearing of vegetation proposed.	The BMP has been modified to incorporate: Details relating to the strategic water tank dedicated for fire-fighting capabilities, and Road network and proximity to the town centre.
Include any fire engineering solutions or written evidence such as publications and State Administrative Tribunal decision to support the proposal (where available).			No modification to the BMP required

Subject Matter 1		Table 3: Policy Measure 7.5 ii. a) to g) Outcomes-based approach	
DFES Comments			BPP Response
Issue	Assessment	Action	
Outline how the policy outcomes have been achieved.	6.3: Ensure the design and capacity of vehicular access and egress provide: For efficient and effective evacuation to a suitable destination(s); and/or uses, an on-site shelter, where demonstrated appropriate, as a last resort option. The existing road network has been designed and established prior the implementation of bushfire planning requirements (SPP 3.7) in WA. To mitigate the impact of existing non-compliant access, a BEP has been developed to assist visitors staying at the property in evacuation procedures in the event of a bushfire.	No additional bushfire measures to those that are already required in the Guidelines for vulnerable land use, have been proposed in the BMP to mitigate the bushfire risk associated with the proposed development. As per comments in Table 4 of this response letter, Figure 2 of the BEP does not appear to have considered multiple bushfire scenarios for an efficient and effective evacuation of visitors who may be unfamiliar with the area and the various no-through roads. Additionally, as per comments in Tables 1 and 2 of this response letter, the BMP appears to have addressed the incorrect BPC, potentially missing an opportunity to achieve the acceptable solutions, in the first instance.	The BMP has been updated. The correct BPC was addressed for 250811 – 60 Blackwood River Drive (BMP) v1.0 Two scenarios for evacuation have been developed, one based on the existing road network, and the other via Greenwood Road to Blackwood River Drive.
Outline why approval is warranted by the decision-maker in this instance.	In a practical sense, Gracillis Road, including the portion not gazetted, is trafficable and is currently used by North Nannup residents as an egress road. Hence, once gazetted, this will be a public road to Mowen Road and full compliance will be achieved. The non-compliant two-way access roads are issues with the existing road network, designed and established prior the implementation of bushfire planning requirements (SPP 3.7) in WA, and are beyond the control of the individual landowner.	It is considered that the BMP lacks evidence to substantiate the claim that the bushfire risk has been reduced to an acceptable level. The reliance on neighbouring landowners to manage vegetation to low threat and/or APZ standard, shared firefighting water resources, non-gazetted roads, and standard mitigation requirements of the Guidelines are considered inadequate to warrant approval of this development in its current form.	DFES concerns / comments present as more of an opinion, as opposed to having a basis in State bushfire policy. DFES concerns have not necessarily recognised the following additional measures in place to manage risk to an acceptable level: The subdivision has a number of properties operating as short stay and Dragonfly Escapes has an existing Emergency Evacuation Plan. The Shire in partnership with DBCA are progressing the formalisation of Gracillis Road as a public road for the primary purposes of a second evacuation route from North

Subject Matter 1		Table 3: Policy Measure 7.5 ii. a) to g) Outcomes-based approach		
DFES Comments			BPP Response	
Issue	Assessment	Action		
			Nannup should the existing public road be compromised. Gracillis Road is currently a trafficable road and has recently been graded and pot holes filled. The upgrade of this road is simply a governance/documentation issue within Government agencies. The BMP details that the site will close on days of catastrophic fire danger, in acknowledgment of the extreme bushfire prone vegetation surrounding the site.	

Subject Matter 1		4. Policy Measure 7.7 Vulnerable land uses	
DFES Comments			BPP Response
Issue	Assessment	Action	
Bushfire Emergency Evacuation Plan (BEEP)	The referral has included a 'Bushfire Emergency Plan' for the purposes of addressing the policy requirements. Consideration should be given to the Bushfire Emergency Plan (BEP) Manual (as published by the Western Australian Planning Commission). This contains details of information that should be included in a BEP and will ensure the appropriate content is detailed when finalising the BEP to the satisfaction of the decision maker. Figure 2 of the BEP provides routes for a singular evacuation scenario only, which travels through large tracts of Class A Forest. Notwithstanding that two-way access is not available for more than three kilometres, there is opportunity to provide a secondary route should the initial route to the north be unavailable. This will support efficient evacuation of visitors who are unfamiliar with the various no-through roads in this locality.	Comment only	A BEEP has been developed, along with an evacuation poster. A second evacuation route to Blackwood River Drive has been added (Greenwood Road).
	- Noting extensive State Forest to the north, west and east of the proposed development. - Access route is only one way with Barrabup Road and Dean Road both no-through roads. Access is only available from Barrabup Road to the north. Gracillis Road is not gazetted or under the ownership of the developer. Also, the Department of Biodiversity, Conservation and Attractions (DBCA) maintenance requirements may not be in continuation. Location of the cabins must allow for all APZ and associated setbacks to be achieved on the parcel of land – especially given the overall size of the parcel of land.	Comment only	All cabins can achieve a BAL – 29 APZ. Gracillis Road is currently a trafficable road and has recently been graded and pot holes filled. The upgrade of this road is simply a governance/documentation issue within Government agencies. The dedicated water tank for fire-fighting capabilities has been moved onsite, and to an area within a BAL -29 APZ. The dam will be a backup water supply. The ground in the area is extremely sturdy and lacks vegetation cover in summer. There will be a

Subject Matter 1		4. Policy Measure 7.7 Vulnerable land uses	
DFES Comments			BPP Response
Issue	Assessment	Action	
	Suitable vegetation clearing should be undertaken to achieve APZ and/or setbacks from the Class A Forest vegetation. Location of all water supplies to be achieved on the parcel of land. Tank sharing across different parcels of land is not supported as there are different owners and no official binding of requirements should the land ownership change. If dam on the parcel of land is included in the plan, it will need to be usable all year, have suitable access and hardstand constructed to allow heavy duty fire vehicle/appliance access.		turn around area nearby (Cabin 2 location) therefore an additional hard stand next to the dam is not required.
DFES Land Use Planning	It is the responsibility of the proponent to ensure the proposal complies with relevant planning and building requirements. This advice does not exempt the applicant/proponent from obtaining approvals that apply to the proposal including planning, building, environmental health, or any other approvals required by a relevant authority under written laws.	Comment only	Noted.