

Environmental Protection Authority

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

Proposal title: Wangara to Neerabup Terminal 132 kV Overhead Transmission Line

Proposal description: The Proposal is for the construction of a 23-kilometre (km) 132 kV dual circuit transmission line from Neerabup Terminal in Pinjar to an existing transmission line at the intersection of Ocean Reef Road and Wanneroo Road in Woodvale. Enabling works comprise of the relocation and/or undergrounding of existing customer connections, distribution lines and utility assets to facilitate the construction and future operation of the new 132 kV transmission line, including the construction of 171 poles.

The Proposal forms a component of the Clean Energy Link North program, designed to alleviate transmission constraints and facilitate integration of renewable energy sources into the Southwest Interconnected System. The Proposal will create new circuits between Neerabup Terminal and the connecting zone substations to improve utilisation of the 330 kV and 132 kV networks in transferring electricity generated from the Mid-West to supply Perth's northern suburbs.

Proposal location: City of Wanneroo

APP number: APP-0035469

Date referral received: 06-05-2026 **Date more information received:** N/A

Referrer: Electricity Networks Corporation T/A Western Power

Proponent: Electricity Networks Corporation T/A Western Power

Potential significant effects:

There are potential impacts on: flora and vegetation from the clearing and disturbance, introduction of weeds, disease and pests; terrestrial fauna from clearing or modification of habitat; inland waters from changes to hydrological processes and potential impacts on conservation category wetlands; and social surroundings from construction noise, dust and vibration and from operation impact to amenity (visual).

Preliminary key environmental factors: flora and vegetation, terrestrial fauna, inland waters, social surroundings.

Public comment on referral information:

Do not assess:	0
Assess: a) Referral information	0
b) Environmental review - no public review	0
c) Public environmental review	15
<i>Total submissions:</i>	15

Decision: s. 38G(1) – Not assess

Summary of reasons pursuant to s. 38G(1)(c)

The Environmental Protection Authority (EPA) has decided not to assess the proposal because:

- The EPA considers the likely environmental effects of the proposal as not 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, management outlined in the Environmental Review Document and supporting attachments available on the [EPA's website](#)
- The EPA considers that the likely environmental effects of the proposal can be mitigated by statutory decision-making processes to achieve consistency with the EPA's factor objectives.

Flora and Vegetation

- The EPA acknowledges that the proposal requires clearing of up to 31.71 ha of vegetation which includes 13.34 ha of native vegetation and 18.37 ha of non-native vegetation. The EPA considers that impacts on all vegetation can be managed appropriately under other decision-making processes. The EPA is aware that impacts to native vegetation at a similar scale have been effectively managed by Native Vegetation Clearing Permits (NVCP) issued under Part V, Division 2 of the EP Act and that the proposal was determined to be a controlled action by the Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water (DCCEEW) on which basis requires an approval under the *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999* (EPBC Act).
- The EPA notes that the implementation of the proposal will not impact any flora listed as Threatened under *Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016* (BC Act) or native flora listed as Priority by the Department of Biodiversity, Conservation and Attractions (DBCA). However, the Proposed may impact DBCA listed Priority Ecological Communities (PEC) 'Banksia Woodlands of the Swan Coastal Plain' (Banksia Woodlands), Low-lying *Banksia attenuata* woodlands or shrublands PEC (floristic community type (FCT) 21c), 'Tuart Woodlands and Forests of the Swan Coastal Plain' (Tuart Woodlands), and vegetation within Bush Forever sites. The EPA considers that impacts on Flora and Vegetation can be managed to achieve the EPA's objectives through the proposed mitigation measures and under conditions imposed on legal instruments by other decision-making processes (see subsections below), such as:
 - avoid clearing of native Threatened and Priority flora
 - minimise clearing of:
 - Banksia Woodlands to 0.21 hectares (ha)
 - FCT 21c to 0.03 ha
 - Tuart Woodlands to 0.08 ha
 - Vegetation in Bush Forever sites to 0.65 ha
 - rehabilitation of temporarily cleared areas for construction activities.

Terrestrial Fauna

- The EPA notes that most clearing will not involve broadscale ground-level clearing. Instead, clearing will establish a clearance zone by removing vegetation more than three metres above ground to maintain a safe distance between the transmission lines and canopy. As a result, most understorey vegetation and habitat up to three metres above ground will be retained, maintaining ecological linkages and avoiding habitat fragmentation. However, the EPA acknowledges that the proposal will affect foraging and/or breeding

habitat for conservation significant fauna, including three species of black cockatoos.

- The EPA also notes that, consistent with the *WA Environmental Offsets Policy (2011)* and the *WA Environmental Offsets Guidelines (2014)*, the proponent has identified an environmental offset to counterbalance significant residual impacts remaining after mitigation measures have been applied. The EPA notes that offset conditions may be imposed through the Part V Division 2 NVCP and the EPBC Act approval.
- The EPA considers that impacts on Terrestrial Fauna can be managed appropriately through the proposed mitigation measures and under conditions imposed on legal instruments by other decision-making processes (see subsections below):
 - Limiting clearing to 52 potential and one suitable black cockatoo nesting trees
 - Limiting clearing to 31.71 ha for Carnaby's cockatoo and Forest red-tailed black cockatoo (FRTBC), and 23.77 ha for Baudin's cockatoo, through conditions under the EPBC Act approval and the relevant black cockatoo native habitat clearing limits under the Part V Division 2 NVCP
 - Environmental offset to counterbalance significant residual impacts.

Inland Waters

- The EPA notes that the construction of power poles will not require sustained groundwater extraction and will therefore not result in and drawdown of the aquifer or hydraulic impact beyond the excavation footprint.
- The EPA further notes approximately 98 per cent of the disturbance footprint is mapped as having 'Moderate to Low' or 'No Known Risk' of acid-sulphate soils (ASS). Should ASS be identified within mapped 'High to Moderate risk ASS' areas during baseline testing, an ASS Management Plan be prepared and submitted as part of the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) with the Development Approval (DA) application.
- The EPA notes that the PDE occurs within Priority 2 and Priority 3 Public Drinking Water Source Areas (PDWSA). The EPA also notes that installation of energy powerlines is an acceptable land use within Priority 3 PDWSAs and a compatible land use within Priority 2 PDWSAs, subject to management conditions such as prohibiting refuelling and storage of hazardous materials, which form part of the CEMP.
- The EPA acknowledges that clearing of approximately 0.03 ha and 0.01 ha of vegetation within conservation category wetlands and resource enhancement wetlands, respectively is required which will require approvals under the *Rights in Water and Irrigation Act 1914* (RIWI Act). The EPA considers that impacts to Inland Waters can be managed through the assessment processes under the RIWI Act, Part V Division 2 of NVCP and mitigation measures including rehabilitation and offsets to achieve the EPA's objectives for Inland Waters.

Social Surroundings

- The EPA acknowledges that an Archaeological and Ethnographic Site Identification Heritage Survey was undertaken involving Whadjuk Aboriginal consultants. Based on the findings, a number of recommendations from the

Traditional Owners, such as avoiding impacts to the Tuart Woodlands and private landowners on the northern side of Ocean Reef Road, have been incorporated in the Proposal's design. The Proponent has committed to collaborate with the Whadjuk Aboriginal Corporation to ensure that the Proposal does not impact any Aboriginal heritage places and that all responsibilities under the *Aboriginal Heritage Act 1972* (AH Act) are complied with. The EPA considers that impacts to Social Surroundings (Aboriginal heritage) can be assessed and managed under the AH Act to meet the EPA's objectives.

- The EPA notes that electromagnetic field (EMF) modelling and investigation for the proposed transmission lines revealed that the highest simulated electric field at nominal human height (1.8m) near the proposed transmission line is 18.2% of the public exposure reference level endorsed by the Australian Radiation Protection and Nuclear Safety Agency. The highest simulated magnetic flux density at nominal human height near the proposed transmission line is 14% of the associated public exposure reference level. These results indicate a significant margin of safety between predicted EMF levels and EMF levels where adverse health effects may occur. The methodology used to predict EMF levels was reviewed by scientists within the Department of Mines, Petroleum and Exploration (DMPE) and was considered reasonable for accurately modelling EMF from transmission lines. The EPA acknowledges that despite the low modelled EMF emissions the proponent applied further measures mitigating EMF which include vertical construction arrangements for lower EMF at ground level and conductor arrangements that reduce EMF due to field cancellation.
- The EPA considered the potential noise, dust, vibration and visual amenity associated with construction and operation of the proposal. The EPA considers that potential impacts are not so significant as to warrant an assessment of the Proposal under Part IV of the EP Act and that the statutory requirement to implement the CEMP under the *Planning and Development Act 2005* (PD Act) could adequately address the impacts to the amenity of the local landscape to meet the EPA's objectives for Social Surroundings.

Cumulative Impacts

- The EPA considered cumulative impacts of the proposal with other activities within the local area. The proposed clearing of native vegetation represents a relatively small increase to the cumulative clearing within the local area and is not considered to cause any additional fragmentation given its location adjacent to existing vegetation and infrastructure. The EPA considers that the impacts from the proposal are unlikely to contribute to additional cumulative impacts which would undermine achievement of EPA's 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 Division 2 of the EP Act and EPBC Act.

- The EPA considers that potential environmental impacts associated with the construction and operation of the proposal can be regulated by other decision-making processes (see subsections below).

Taking into account decision-making process under the Part V Division 2 of the EP Act and the Environmental Protection (Clearing of Native Vegetation) Regulations 2004 (Clearing Regulations)

- Construction of the proposal requires clearing of up to 13.34 ha of native vegetation which includes habitat for conservation significant flora, fauna PECs and vegetation growing in association with CCWs.
- The impacts associated with clearing of native vegetation, including direct impacts on fauna habitat can be assessed and regulated under Part V Division 2 of the EP Act.
- In assessing the NVCP application, DWER will consider how the proponent has applied the mitigation hierarchy and the 10 Clearing Principles set out in Schedule 5 of the EP Act, and whether any conditions should be prescribed to manage potential impacts.
- The EPA notes that offsets can also be prescribed to counterbalance any significant residual impacts to biodiversity values.

Taking into account decision-making processes under the EPBC Act

- The proposal was determined to be a controlled action and will require assessment and approval under the EPBC Act before it can proceed.
- The assessment will consider impacts of clearing of native and non-native vegetation on matters of national environmental significance (MNES)
- Approval under the EPBC Act will include legally binding conditions to avoid, mitigate and protect matters of national environmental significance. These may include species-specific management measures, monitoring and reporting requirements, and offsets. The EPBC Act approval is expected to complement the Part V Division 2 native vegetation clearing permit assessment under the EP Act and support appropriate regulation of vegetation clearing within the PDE.

Taking into account decision-making process under the RIWI Act

- The proposal intersects Wanneroo, Gnangara and Perth Groundwater Areas and Swan Coastal Plain Surface Water Area proclaimed under the RIWI Act.
- If works obstruct, interfere or destroy the bed or banks of a watercourse or wetland within the Proclaimed Surface Water Area, a permit under section 11/17/21A of the RIWI Act (bed and banks permit) is required from DWER.
- If a Bed and Banks permit is granted, it will specify the scope and duration of the permitted activity and may include conditions relevant to the activities that will interfere with the bed and banks of the watercourse.
- The EPA objectives for inland waters can be met through assessment and approval process under the RIWI Act.

Taking into account decision-making processes under the PD Act

- The proposal requires a DA under Section 6 of the PD Act. Assessment of the DA gives regard to the Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015 (LPS Regulations).
- The EPA notes that under Schedule 2, Section 67(2) of the LPS Regulations, due regard must be given to the amenity of the locality, including environmental impacts, the character of the locality, and social impacts relevant to the proposal when considering an application for DA.
- These types of impacts on environmental, social and amenity values can be mitigated and managed through conditions of DA granted under the PD Act through the provisions of the LPS Regulations, which allow for consideration of any relevant environmental and social impacts as part of the DA process.
- The proposal includes clearing of 0.65 ha of vegetation within Bush Forever sites.
- The DA processes provide planning oversight through the State Planning Policy (SPP) 2.8 in addressing and mitigating impacts to bushland within the Metropolitan Region. In accordance with SPP 2.8, where impacts to regionally significant Bush Forever are not entirely avoided or suitably mitigated, offsets are required at a net gain rate of 2:1 for like-for-like vegetation values
- The Proposal's construction may disturb ASS and result in groundwater contamination. An ASS Management Plan is proposed to be part of the CEMP which will be reviewed through the DA application assessment.

Taking in considerations the decision-making processes under the Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016 (BC Act)

- The construction and operation of the proposal have the potential to impact on terrestrial fauna, including fauna species listed as threatened under the BC Act.
- The impacts associated with the potential mortality of threatened fauna species, including three species of black cockatoo, can be regulated under the BC Act through a s.40 authorisation to take and disturb threatened fauna.

Taking in considerations the decision-making processes under the Aboriginal Heritage Act 1972

- No registered ACH sites have been recorded in the proposal DE.
- The proponent has taken reasonable steps to consult with the Traditional Owners, through engagement with the Whadjuk Aboriginal Corporation. Archaeological and ethnographic heritage surveys are being finalised, with the mitigation measures recommended by Traditional Owners applied in the proposal's design.
- The proponent has adopted chance finds processes for Aboriginal Cultural Heritage is in place throughout the Proposal life-cycle. Should any heritage site is found during the project life, it will be administered in consultation with the TO.
- The EPA is satisfied that the processes provided for under the AH Act can mitigate potential impacts to any registered Aboriginal cultural heritage sites to be consistent with the EPA's objectives.

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 EPA supports the assessment and regulation of the native vegetation clearing under Part V Division 2 (Clearing) of the EP Act to ensure the environmental outcome of maintaining biological diversity and ecological integrity is achieved. The EPA expects that this process will minimise the extent of flora and vegetation and terrestrial fauna habitat impacted by the proposal and adequately address the significant residual impacts.
- To mitigate the loss of fauna habitat in the form of native and non-native vegetation, the EPA is supportive of the DCCEEW's decision that the proposal requires assessment and approval under the EPBC Act before it can proceed to avoid significant impacts on MNES, including but not limited to, Carnaby's cockatoo and FRTBC.
- The EPA expects that the Bed and Bank permit required under the RIWI Act to disturb wetlands will include adequate management conditions to ensure that the implementation of the proposal will not result in altered hydrology of the wetlands
- The EPA expects that the DA processes under the PD Act will minimise impacts from construction emissions and maintain amenity of the local landscape. EPA supports conditions to implement management actions in accordance with an approved CEMP as a component of the approval under the DA.

The EPA publishes the following public advice about the state of the environment in the proposal area for the benefit of future proponents and the community.

Material information considered by the EPA in this decision

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

- The Referral (5 May 2026)
- Referral supporting documentation (2023-2026) and appendices
 - Appendix 1 - Flora Vegetation and Fauna survey (2026)
 - Appendix D1 - Flora Vegetation and Fauna survey (2026)
 - Appendix D2 – Flora Vegetation and Fauna survey (2024)
 - Appendix D3 – Flora Vegetation Fauna and Black Cockatoo survey (2026)
 - Appendix D4 - Flora and Vegetation Assessment – Joyce and Mulga Rd (2026)
 - Appendix D5 – Flora vegetation and Fauna Assessment (2023)
 - Appendix D6 – Dieback Survey (2026)
 - Appendix D7 – SER Desktop Assessment (2026a)
 - Appendix D9 – Part 1 -7 – Geotech Survey (2026)
 - Appendix E1 – Flora and Vegetation (2026)
 - Appendix E2 – Fauna and Fauna Habitat EMP (2026)
 - Appendix E3 – Dieback Management Plan (2026)
 - Appendix 10 – EMF Study (2026)

- Appendix 11 – Turkey Road Memo (2026)
- Advice from DCCEEW about their statutory decision-making processes
- Advice from DMPE on the EMF study supplied
- EP Act s 4, Part IV, Admin Procedures, EPA factor and technical guidance
- EP Act Part V Division 2
- The Environmental Protection (Clearing of Native Vegetation) Regulations 2004 (Clearing Regulations)
- Comments received during the 7-day public comment period.

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:** 22 July 2026