

Bushfire management plan/Statement addressing the Bushfire Protection Criteria coversheet

Site address:

Site visit: Yes No

Date of site visit (if applicable): Day Month Year

Report author or reviewer:

WA BPAD accreditation level (please circle):

Not accredited Level 1 BAL assessor Level 2 practitioner Level 3 practitioner

If accredited please provide the following.

BPAD accreditation number: Accreditation expiry: Month Year

Bushfire management plan version number:

Bushfire management plan date: Day Month Year

Client/business name:

| | Yes | No |
|--|-----|----|
| Has the BAL been calculated by a method other than method 1 as outlined in AS3959 (tick no if AS3959 method 1 has been used to calculate the BAL)? | | |
| Have any of the bushfire protection criteria elements been addressed through the use of a performance principle (tick no if only acceptable solutions have been used to address all of the bushfire protection criteria elements)? | | |

| Is the proposal any of the following (see SPP 3.7 for definitions)? | Yes | No |
|--|-----|----|
| Unavoidable development (in BAL-40 or BAL-FZ) | | |
| Strategic planning proposal (including rezoning applications) | | |
| High risk land-use | | |
| Vulnerable land-use | | |

None of the above

Note: Only if one (or more) of the above answers in the tables is yes should the decision maker (e.g. local government or the WAPC) refer the proposal to DFES for comment.

Why has it been given one of the above listed classifications (E.g. Considered vulnerable land-use as the development is for accommodation of the elderly, etc.)?

The information provided within this bushfire management plan to the best of my knowledge is true and correct:

Signature of report author or reviewer

Date