

s.100B 'Subdivision'

Lot 1 DP958100 54 Luchetti Avenue, Hazelbrook

Prepared for Williams Consulting Engineers Australia Pty Ltd



November 2015

**Prepared by Terence O'Toole** B.App.Sc Environmental Health Grad.Dip Design in Bushfire Prone Areas





.01 Building T2A Warawara Circuit Quakers Hill, NSW 2763

T: (02) 9853 3266 M: 0417 483 438 terrvo@advancedbps.com.au www.

Advanced Bushfire Performance Solutions P/L

www.advancedbps.com.au



#### Terms & conditions of use

Advanced Bushfire Performance Solutions Pty Ltd retains the copyright on all reports it produces, and thus the information contained therein shall not be reproduced, in part or in whole without the prior expressed permission of the copyright holder. The information contained in this report is for the sole use of the intended recipients and is solely applicable to the specific property and development proposal assessed.

#### Disclaimer

The analysis, assessment and recommendations contained in the following Bushfire Assessment Report, are the sole views of Advanced Bushfire Performance Solutions Pty Ltd. The bushfire protection assessment, recommendations and strategies contained in this report are intended to address the submission requirements for DAs on bush fire prone land as outlined in appendix 4 of *Planning for Bush Fire Protection* 2006.

While the utmost care is taken in the assessment and reporting process, Advanced Bushfire Performance Solutions Pty Ltd does not warrant that the information contained in this report will be free from error or omission. Also there is no implied assurance nor guarantee that compliance with the strategies and recommendations contained in this report will result in a development application consent being granted by a local government body; nor will Advanced Bushfire Performance Solutions Pty Ltd be liable for any financial losses incurred throughout the development planning and application process, should an application not be successful.

Because the nature of bushfires is unpredictable and in many cases immeasurable the information contained in this report, if used, in part or in whole, should reduce the risk of a bushfire hazard occurring. But in no way can the information contained in this report be used as a guarantee against any damages or losses resulting from any bushfire events.

The customer's exclusive remedy against Advanced Bushfire Performance Solutions Pty Ltd for any act or omission, including negligence, or failure in any service delivered (including under strict liability in tort) shall be, at Advanced Bushfire Performance Solutions Pty Ltd option, the return, replacement or reimbursement for credit of such services provided.

In no event shall Advanced Bushfire Performance Solutions Pty Ltd be liable to the customer or to any other person for direct or indirect, consequential, incidental or special damages beyond the limitation contained in the preceding paragraph.

#### **Document Control**

Document Name	Project Ref	Date	Author	Status
20150922WCEA BAR 1.0	20150922WCEA	01-Nov-15	ТО	Version 1
20150922WCEA BAR 1.1	20150922WCEA	02-Nov-15	ТО	Version 2

# 

### **Proposed Development**

Is the proposal on bush fire prone land	The site is within bushfire prone land on the <b>Blue Mountains LGA</b> Bush Fire Prone Land Map.						
Does the proposal require a Bush Fire Safety Authority and referral to the RFS	YES I NO Subdivision proposals are subject to section.100B of the <i>Rural Fires Act 1997</i>						
Does the proposal rely on alternative solutions	YES IN NO Compliance with AS3959-2009 Method 2 and SFR modelling are alternative assessment methodologies						
Description	Subdivision of 1 residential lot into 17 residential lots and infrastructure lot (road and access way)						
Stage 1 Plan	Subdivision of 1 residential lot into 17 residential lots and infrastructure lot (road and access way)						
Plan Reference	Concept Subdivision Plan Dwg: 2014/129/DA1 K June 2015						





#### **Asset Protection Zones**

APZ determined in accordance with Appendix 2

APZ located wholly within the development

APZ managed to RFS standards

APZ are easily manageable and do not compromise soil stability or support crown fires

#### Summary of results

Transect	A	Vegetation	Olama		ies			
	Азресс		Slope	PBP2006 T:A2.4	AS3959 T:2.4.2	Appendix B	Proposed	Comp
T1	West	DS Forest	6.28° US (0°)	20m	25-35m	15.038m	>15m	Yes
T2	West	DS Forest	13.77° US (0°)	20m	25-35m	10.583m	>11m	Yes
Т3	West	DS Forest	12.41° US (0°)	20m	25-35m	11.747m	>12m	Yes
Т4	South	DS Forest	8.13° US (0°)	20m	25-35m	13.781m	>14m	Yes
Т5	South	DS Forest	13.39° US (0°)	20m	25-35m	11.067m	>11m	Yes

Complies

All o	hers				1					
		Managed	-					Yes		
*denotes setback determined by modeled flame length The APZ for this project were assessed using the methodology in <i>Planning for Bush Fire Protection</i> 2006 Appendix 2 and AS3959-2009 Method 1 (Simplified) and Method 2 (Detailed).										
egetation		<ul> <li>Vegetati</li> <li>The Blue predomining the solution of the structure scleroph</li> <li>It assume than 18 of the solution of the solution</li></ul>	on assessed from onsite e Mountains City Council nantly E. piperita and A. uth. cture of the vegetation is yll forest and in AS3959 ed that all vegetation wit degrees can be manage	e inspection (1 l website desc costata forest e predominanti -2009 as A03. thin the site th d to asset pro	8/10/2015). Tribes mixed very in the west and the tection zone is the tection zo	egetation imp d C. gummif described in cted vegetatio tandards.	eacting the site era and E. si PBP2006 as on or on slop	e that is eberi forest dry es greater		
lope		<ul> <li>Slopes in within the 2m conto</li> <li>The slop upslope</li> <li>Transect</li> </ul>	es influencing bushfire behaviour were calculated from 1m contours provided by sur n the site and to the south. Areas where the survey did not extend were assessed u contours. slopes are represented by 6 transects of up to 100m length (T01-T06). All slopes ar ope to the proposed development. sects T04 and T05 are less than 100m to exclude the influence of the escarpment							
nvironmenta Features	nta • None									
etback		<ul> <li>Asset pro- reserves</li> <li>Setbacks shading</li> <li>The mini Plan (Me</li> <li>Larger m reduce th</li> <li>Setbacks Service of Zones (s</li> </ul>	protection zones are to be wholly contained within the proposed residual lots or road as. ks are measured from the edge of the unmanaged bushfire hazard vegetation (green g on the bushfire Assessment Plan) to the walls of any proposed building. nimum complying setback is shown as a black dashed line in the Bushfire Assessmen <i>l</i> ethod 2) managed asset protection zones will generally support lower construction standards the costs of construction. ks are based on management to APZ standards as described in the NSW Rural Fire e documents <i>Planning for Bush Fire Protection</i> 2006 and <i>Standards for Asset Protect</i> (see Appendix B).							
	e APZ for thi Simplified) a getation ope	e APZ for this project Simplified) and Meth getation ope vironmenta satures	a APZ for this project were assessed u         Simplified) and Method 2 (Detailed).         • Vegetati         • The Blue predomining in the solution of the struscence of the structure of the struct	a APZ for this project were assessed using the methodology in Pla         Simplified) and Method 2 (Detailed).         • Vegetation assessed from onside         • The Blue Mountains City Council predominantly E, piperita and A. in the south.         • The structure of the vegetation is sclerophyll forest and in AS3959         • It assumed that all vegetation with than 18 degrees can be manage         • Slopes influencing bushfire beha within the 3te and to the south.         • The slopes are represented by 6 upslope to the proposed develop         • Transects T04 and T05 are less         vironmenta satures         • None         • Asset protection zones are to be reserves.         • Stopack are measured from the shading on the bushfire Assesson         • The minimum complying setback Plan (Method 2)         • Larger managed asset protection zones are to be reserves.         • Setbacks are based on manage reserves (see Appendix B).         • Setbacks in Planning for Zones (see Appendix B).	AP2 for this project were assessed using the methodology in Planning for Bush.         Simplified) and Method 2 (Detailed).         • Vegetation assessed from onsite inspection (1         • The Blue Mountains City Council website desc predominantly E. piperita and A. costata forest in the south.         • It assumed that all vegetation is predominantly         • It assumed that all vegetation within the site th than 18 degrees can be managed to asset pro         • It assumed that all vegetation within the site th than 18 degrees can be managed to asset pro         • Slopes influencing bushfire behaviour were ca within the site and to the south. Areas where 1 2m contours.         • The slopes are represented by 6 transects of u upslope to the proposed development.         • The slopes are represented by 6 transects of u upslope to the proposed development.         • Transects T04 and T05 are less than 100m to         vironmenta astures       • Asset protection zones are to be wholly contain reserves.         • Setbacks are measured from the edge of the u shading on the bushfire Assessment Plan) to to         • The minimum complying setback is shown as a Plan (Method 2)         • Larger managed asset protection zones will ge reduce the costs of construction.         • Setbacks are based on management to AP2 s Service documents Planning for Bush Fire Protection with the potential to allow a deemed-to-satisfy	a APZ for this project were assessed using the methodology in Planning for Bush Fire Protection 2 Simplified) and Method 2 (Detailed).         • Vegetation assessed from onsite inspection (18/10/2015).         • The Blue Mountains City Council website describes mixed we predominantly E. piperita and A. costata forest in the west at in the south.         • The structure of the vegetation is predominantly open forest sclerophyll forest and in AS3859-2009 as A03.         • It assumed that all vegetation within the site that is not prote than 18 degrees can be managed to asset protection zones than 18 degrees can be managed to asset protection zones than 18 degrees can be managed to asset protection zones within the site and to the south. Areas where the survey did 2m contours.         • The slopes are represented by 6 transects of up to 100m len upslope to the proposed development.         • Transects T04 and T05 are less than 100m to exclude the in reserves.         • Setbacks are measured from the edge of the unmanaged bu shading on the bushlife Assessment Plan) to the walls of an shading on the bushlife Assessment Plan) to the walls of an the reserves.         • Setbacks are based on management to APZ standards as discrime Plan (Method 2)         • Larger managed sets protection zones will generally supported we for Baset protection 2006 are designed to a shading on the public Protection 2006 are designed to a shading on the bushlife Assessment Plan) to the walls of an Store's (see Appendix B).         • Status and the potential to allow a deemed-to-satisfy building constitution and the potential to allow a deemed-to-satisfy building constitution and the potential to allow a deemed-to-satisfy building constitution and the pot	a AP2 for this project were assessed using the methodology in Planning for Bush Fire Protection 2008 Appendix         Simplified) and Method 2 (Detailed).         • Vegetation assessed from onsite inspection (18/10/2015).         • The Blue Mountains City Council website describes mixed vegetation impresention and VE, spectral and A. costata forest in the west and C. gummin in the south.         • The structure of the vegetation is predominantly open forest described in sciencephyll forest and in AS3959-2009 as A03.         • It assumed that all vegetation within the site that is not protected vegetation than 18 degrees can be managed to asset protection zone standards.         • Stopes influencing bushfire behaviour were calculated from 1m contours i within the site and to the south. Areas where the survey did not extend within the site and to the south. Areas where the survey did not extend within the site and to the south. Areas where the survey did not extend within the state and to the south. Areas where the survey did not extend within the state and to the south. Areas where the survey did not extend within the state and to the south. Areas where the survey did not extend with restarters         • The stopes are represented by 6 transacts of up to 100m length (T01-T00 upsigoe to the proposed development.         • Transects TO4 and TO5 are less than 100m to exclude the influence of the statures         • None         • Asset protection zones are to be wholly contained within the proposed free reserves.         • Setbacks are measured from the edge of the unmanaged bushfire bazar standard as an proposed free reserves.         • Setbacks are measured from the edge of the	applied and Method 2 (Dealand).           • Vegetation assessed from onsile inspection (18/10/2015).           • Vegetation assessed from onsile inspection (18/10/2015).           • The Blue Mountains City Council website describes mixed vegetation impacting the sit predominantly E: pipetita and A. costate forest in the west and C. gummler and E. sit in the south.           • The structure of the vegetation is predominantly open forest described in PBP2006 as sclerophyll forest and in AS3959-2009 as A03.           • It assumed that all vegetation within the site that is not protected vegetation or on slop than 18 degrees can be emproved protection zones standards.           • Stopes influencing bushfire behaviour were calculated from 1m contours provided by s within the site and to the south. Areas where the survey did not extend were assessed 2m contours.           • The stopes are represented by 6 transects of up to 100m length (T01-T06). All slopes upslope to the proposed development.           • Asset protection zones are to be wholly contained within the proposed residual lots or reserves.           • Stopes influencing stabilities shown as a black dashed line in the sustation within the site and 10 the south. Areas where the survey did not extend were assessed 2m contours.           • The slopes are represented by 6 transects of up to 100m length (T01-T06). All slopes upslope to the proposed development.           • Transacts T04 and T05 are less than 100m to exclude the influence of the escarpment reserves.           • Schacks are measured from the digs of the ummanged bushfire herzard vegetation ( shading on the bushfire Asseessment Plan) to the walls of any proposed bushfir		

		<ul> <li>(Level 3). This standard has been replaced by AS3959-2009 with BAL levels. Level 3 is deemed to be the equivalent to BAL-29 by the RFS (Red dashed line in Bushfire Assessment Plan).</li> <li>Setbacks in AS3959-2009 (Method 1) are designed to ensure no (new) potential buildings are impacted by greater than 29kWm<sup>2</sup> RHF based on generic bushfire types (Blue dashed line in Bushfire Assessment Plan). These setbacks support compliance with the complying development code (CDC)</li> <li>Setbacks in AS3959-2009 (Method 2) are designed to ensure no (new) potential buildings are impacted by greater than 29kWm<sup>2</sup> RHF and/or flame contact (Black dashed line in Bushfire Assessment Plan). These setbacks are considered an alternative assessment by the RFS and do not support CDC compliance.</li> <li>All proposed APZs must be practical, not compromise soil stability and negate potential crown fires within the APZ. Areas to the southwest at the base of the escarpment have been excluded from the potential APZ due to the steep slope. A detailed survey of this area could support extension of the APZ into this area if it is able to support practical APZ management without compromising soil stability.</li> </ul>
	Management	<ul> <li>All proposed residential lots are to be managed (as a minimum) to outer protection area (OPA) standards and maintained at this standard until building construction stage. This will ensure that adjoining lots are not unnecessarily restricted by unmanaged lots. If lots are not managed to OPA standards adjoining lots would need to consider the impact of a bushfire hazard on the residential lot and may be required to building to higher construction standards adjoining lots would need to consider the impact of a bushfire hazard on the residential lot and may be required to building to higher construction standards than would be required at the completion of the subdivision. Ultimately all residential lots will be managed to inner protection area standards.</li> <li>The site is currently partially cleared but does not extend to the required APZs.</li> <li>All asset protection zones provided within the proposed residential lots and residual lot will be the responsibility of the landowner.</li> <li>Any portion of an asset protection zone that is extended onto adjacent lots (not the subject lot) will need to be secured by covenants on the title. No APZ has been proposed on adjacent land at this time.</li> <li>The Blue Mountains Bush Fire Risk Management Plan does not provide any specific management regimes to the site or adjacent bushland.</li> </ul>
	10/50 code	• This site is located in a designated 10/50 Code vegetation entitlement area. This permits clearing trees within 10m of residential buildings and under-scrubbing up to 50m without further approvals where consistent with the provisions of the Code.
	BFEA Code	<ul> <li>Section 63 of the Rural Fires Act 1997 places a 'duty of care' on landowners to prevent the occurrence of bushfires or minimise the danger of spread of fires on land vested in or under its control or management.</li> <li>The Bush Fire Environmental Assessment Code (BFEA Code) describes the appropriate asset protection zones to adjoining assets (e.g. residential buildings).</li> <li>This site adjoins a number of residential buildings to the north.</li> <li>The land owner is responsible for providing asset protection zones (20m) to the existing buildings on adjoining lots. This responsibility exists now but may be diminished by development of the site.</li> </ul>

	Short Fire Run (SFR) modelling addresses the effect of less developed bushfires impa site due to limited fire runs.	acting
	<ul> <li>The RFS recently released a discussion paper addressing the potential fire behaviour over short fire runs. This paper was based on principles described by Alexander et al discussion paper Short Fire Run – A Risk Perspective for the Bushland Interface v.1.6 described the reduced fire front widths of early developing fires consistent with a ratio modelled ellipse (length/breadth ratio). A model to apply this is currently under develo the RFS.</li> </ul>	of bus (Ref: 3) and of an pment
Short Fire	<ul> <li>Use of short fire run modelling is an alternative solution and is limited to runs of no greater than 20°.</li> </ul>	eater t
Run	<ul> <li>A simplified and conservative application of the model is based on fixed parameters s 30km/h winds. This provides a fixed L/B ratio of 1:2.82 under all fuel and slope combi</li> </ul>	uch as
	The predicted width of the ellipse is conservatively adopted as the max potential Flam	e Wid
	<ul> <li>Fires developing over short runs with moderate winds (30km/h) are assumed to have contact risks and have been excluded from the assessment. AS3959-2009 Method 2 relies upon RHF calculations using 90° flame angles and disregards flame length calculations</li> </ul>	lower mode ulatior
	<ul> <li>Short Fire Run modelling was assessed as per the table in Appendix D and Flame Wi applied to Method 2 modelling (see Appendix C) with 90° Flame Angles.</li> </ul>	dth wa
	No new buildings are proposed at this time.	
Construction	<ul> <li>This report specifically addresses a bushfire assessment for subdivision compliance. I report relating to PBP2006 Appendix 2 may not be applied to future building developm subject to the Complying Development Code or s.79BA of the EP&amp;A Act. These will re reassessment using the methodology described in AS3959-2009 only.</li> </ul>	Parts o nent w equire
Services Compliance wit	h s.4.1.3. for services	omp
	A 100mm reticulated mains water network is currently available to the site.	
	<ul> <li>Where a reticulated supply is provided then hydrants should be located within appropriation distances (max 90m from the most distant part of a proposed building).</li> </ul>	riate
	• Future buildings not wholly within 90m of a hydrant may be required to provide onsite storage tanks (50000L) at the building approval stage.	water
Water	<ul> <li>Future buildings not wholly within 70m of a hydrant may be required to provide specifi property access roads.</li> </ul>	c stan
	• Future buildings not within 60m of a hydrant may not be able to satisfy the provisions Complying Development Code (CDC).	of the
	No hydrants should be located within driveways.	
	Hydrants should be located within the road reserve and not within the paved road.	
	All above ground pipes and fittings are to be metal.	
	Power transmission lines external to the sites are above ground.	
Electricity	All new power lines within the site should be located underground.	
0.00	No information provided. Should gas be provided then it must comply with appropriat	e stan
Gas	All above ground pipes and fittings should be metal	
Access Compliance wit	h s.4.1.3(1)	Com
	Perimeter Roads (interfacing with the bushland)	
	No perimeter public access roads are proposed	
Public access road	A perimeter road would separate the development from the bushfire hazard. This road could provide asset protection zone or control line for bushfire suppression.	
	The road would need to service 4 lots or more to be classified as a public access road.	

• Perimeter roads should be a minimum 8m wide (kerb to kerb)



#### **Non-Perimeter Roads**

- A non-perimeter public access road is proposed
- A non-perimeter road would not provide direct access to the bushfire hazard and would not be directly exposed to the bushfire impacts.
- The road would need to service 4 lots or more to be classified as a public access road.
- Perimeter roads should be a minimum 6.5m wide (kerb to kerb) along a straight section up to 8m wide about the bends
- The proposed road is a non-perimeter public road. This is a loop road with residential development on each side.
- The carriageway (generally kerb invert to kerb invert) should comply with the widths in Table 4.1 of PBP2006. A 7m wide road would comply along the straight sections but the curves would need to be expanded or have restricted parking on one side. Width can be measured from top of roll top kerbing.

Curve radius (m)		Swept path (m)	Single lane (m)	Dual lane (m)		Yes	
	<40	3.5	4.5	8.0	-		
	40-69	3.0	3.9	7.5	-		
	70-100	2.7	3.6	6.9			
	>100	2.5	3.5	6.5	-		
•	Minimum inner curv The intersection of internal curves are	ve radius is greater t the proposed road c greater than 6m rad	han 6m an support a >6m r ius	adius inner curve	. All		
•	Minimum distance I The intersection ca	between inner and o n support a >6m wid	outer curves is 6m				
One Wa •	ay Access Roads No one way public	access roads are pro	oposed			Yes	
Dead E	nds						
•	No dead-end roads	are proposed					
•	Dead ends are not	recommended (but a	are permitted)				
•	These should not be more than 200m in length.						
•	It should incorporate a 12m outer radius turning circle						
<ul> <li>The RFS guidelines do not define a turning circle to mean either the road reserve or the paved road. No industry definition is available to clarify this issue. As a CAT 1 Tanker requires 17.5m to turn full lock, them the paved carriageway should be a minimum 19m as required by Council unless otherwise stipulated by the RFS.</li> </ul>							
•	Parking should not	be permitted within	the cul-de-sac.				
•	Should be clearly s	ign posted as a dead	d end				

	All Roads	
	<ul> <li>Road surfaces should support 2 wheeled drive vehicles and provide all weather access</li> </ul>	
	Road surfaces and bridges should support 15 tonnes	
	Traffic management devices should not inhibit access to emergency services vehicles	Yes
	Cross fall should not exceed 3 degrees	
	<ul> <li>Sealed roads should have a maximum grade of 15° with max avg grade of 10°</li> </ul>	
	Minimum vertical clearance should be no less than 4m	
	Access should be speed limited to <70kph.	
	Hydrants and Parking	
	Hydrants should be located in the road reserve beyond the paved road surface	
	Hydrants should be located outside parking reserves	
	<ul> <li>Public roads (between 6.5m and 8m wide) should prohibit parking on the side of the road supporting hydrants</li> </ul>	Yes
	<ul> <li>Public roads up to 6.5m wide should provide parking in parking bays</li> </ul>	
	Parking bays should be a minimum 2.6m wide from kerb invert to road pavement	
	<ul> <li>No property access design specifications apply where a hydrant is within 70m of the most distant part of the building and the public access road is limited to 70kph</li> </ul>	
Property access	<ul> <li>Tankers should be able to comply with AS2419 distances (20m hydrant+ 60m hose + 10m jet = 90m) without entering the lot.</li> </ul>	Yes
	<ul> <li>Where the road services less than 4 lots the recommended paved width is 4m but exceptions may apply for narrower access over short lengths to address obstructions.</li> </ul>	
Fire Trails	No fire trails are proposed or required	Yes
Landscapin	g (	Compli
	No landscape plans have been reviewed for this report.	
	<ul> <li>Any new landscaping within the developments should adopt (where practical) the foll principles:</li> </ul>	lowing
	<ul> <li>Moisture content of leaves should be high (250-400% of dry oven weight)</li> </ul>	
	<ul> <li>Volatile oil content of leaves should be low</li> </ul>	
	<ul> <li>Mineral content of leaves should be high</li> </ul>	
	<ul> <li>Leaves should be thick (broad) with low area to volume ratio</li> </ul>	
	<ul> <li>Density of foliage should be high and less permeable to air flow</li> </ul>	
Landscaping	<ul> <li>Density of foliage should be high and less permeable to air flow</li> <li>Continuity of plant form should be broken or separated</li> </ul>	
Landscaping	<ul> <li>Density of foliage should be high and less permeable to air flow</li> <li>Continuity of plant form should be broken or separated</li> <li>Height of lowest foliage above ground should be maximised</li> </ul>	
Landscaping	<ul> <li>Density of foliage should be high and less permeable to air flow</li> <li>Continuity of plant form should be broken or separated</li> <li>Height of lowest foliage above ground should be maximised</li> <li>Size of plant should be wide spread rather than tall and narrow</li> </ul>	
Landscaping	<ul> <li>Density of foliage should be high and less permeable to air flow</li> <li>Continuity of plant form should be broken or separated</li> <li>Height of lowest foliage above ground should be maximised</li> <li>Size of plant should be wide spread rather than tall and narrow</li> <li>Dead foliage on the plant should be minimal</li> </ul>	
Landscaping	<ul> <li>Density of foliage should be high and less permeable to air flow</li> <li>Continuity of plant form should be broken or separated</li> <li>Height of lowest foliage above ground should be maximised</li> <li>Size of plant should be wide spread rather than tall and narrow</li> <li>Dead foliage on the plant should be minimal</li> <li>Bark texture should be tight and smooth</li> </ul>	
Landscaping	<ul> <li>Density of foliage should be high and less permeable to air flow</li> <li>Continuity of plant form should be broken or separated</li> <li>Height of lowest foliage above ground should be maximised</li> <li>Size of plant should be wide spread rather than tall and narrow</li> <li>Dead foliage on the plant should be minimal</li> <li>Bark texture should be tight and smooth</li> <li>Quantity of ground fuels should be minimised</li> </ul>	
Landscaping	<ul> <li>Density of foliage should be high and less permeable to air flow</li> <li>Continuity of plant form should be broken or separated</li> <li>Height of lowest foliage above ground should be maximised</li> <li>Size of plant should be wide spread rather than tall and narrow</li> <li>Dead foliage on the plant should be minimal</li> <li>Bark texture should be tight and smooth</li> <li>Quantity of ground fuels should be minimised</li> <li>Fineness of ground fuels should be minimised</li> </ul>	
Landscaping	<ul> <li>Density of foliage should be high and less permeable to air flow</li> <li>Continuity of plant form should be broken or separated</li> <li>Height of lowest foliage above ground should be maximised</li> <li>Size of plant should be wide spread rather than tall and narrow</li> <li>Dead foliage on the plant should be minimal</li> <li>Bark texture should be tight and smooth</li> <li>Quantity of ground fuels should be minimised</li> <li>Fineness of ground fuels should be minimised</li> <li>Compaction ability of ground fuels should be maximised</li> </ul>	
Landscaping	<ul> <li>Density of foliage should be high and less permeable to air flow</li> <li>Continuity of plant form should be broken or separated</li> <li>Height of lowest foliage above ground should be maximised</li> <li>Size of plant should be wide spread rather than tall and narrow</li> <li>Dead foliage on the plant should be minimal</li> <li>Bark texture should be tight and smooth</li> <li>Quantity of ground fuels should be minimised</li> <li>Fineness of ground fuels should be minimised</li> <li>Compaction ability of ground fuels should be maximised</li> <li>Mineral content of ground fuel should be maximised</li> </ul>	
Landscaping	<ul> <li>Density of foliage should be high and less permeable to air flow</li> <li>Continuity of plant form should be broken or separated</li> <li>Height of lowest foliage above ground should be maximised</li> <li>Size of plant should be wide spread rather than tall and narrow</li> <li>Dead foliage on the plant should be minimal</li> <li>Bark texture should be tight and smooth</li> <li>Quantity of ground fuels should be minimised</li> <li>Fineness of ground fuels should be minimised</li> <li>Compaction ability of ground fuels should be maximised</li> <li>Mineral content of ground fuel should be maximised</li> </ul>	

C	Other BPMs	No additional measures
	Deviations	• The assessment does not deviate from the standards, specific objectives and performance criteria of <i>Planning for Bush Fire Protection</i> 2006

### 3 Comments

Each proposed lot presents a complying subdivision opportunity to varying degrees. Lots 3 and 4 are the most constrained whilst all others provide more than adequate siting opportunities.

The subdivision is only required to comply with setbacks described in Table A2.4 of Appendix 2 Planning for Bush Fire Protection 2006. All lots are able to support these setbacks and provide suitable siting opportunities for reasonable building footprints (approx. 10m x 15m).

An assessment of the setbacks to comply with Table 2.2.2 of AS3959-2009 Method 1 (simple) is designed to provide minimum conservative setbacks to support a complying BAL-29 building. Complying with these setbacks will permit compliance with the CDC and resolve any conflicts with PBP2006 subdivision setbacks.

The last is a detailed methodology designed to provide the absolute minimum setbacks that the NSW Rural Fire Service should endorse by granting a Bush Fire Safety Authority. This minimum setback will require a complementary BAL-29 construction standard (AS3959-2009). This methodology models the site specific bushfire behaviour to determine the actual setback to achieve the performance outcome.

All setbacks exceed the modelled flame length. These should be not potential flame contact with residential buildings sited beyond the minimum setback.

Although Short Fire Run modelling was considered for the site no short fire run modelling applies to these transects. Transects T01-T06 have either a greater than 150m fire run or have the potential to develop a greater fire run in unmanaged vegetation with regeneration of currently cleared areas.

### **4** Bushfire Protection Measures - recommendations

Performance Criteria	Recommendation	Compliance
APZ	1. The entire area of proposed lots 1-17 shall be managed to inner protection area standards as described in the RFS documents <i>Planning for Bush Fire Protection</i> 2006 and <i>Standards for Asset Protection Zones</i> .	Yes
Construction	2. NA	Yes
Access	3. Access should comply with Section.4.1.3 (2) of <i>Planning for Bush</i> <i>Fire Protection</i> 2006	Yes
Services	4. All services shall comply with Section 4.1.3 of <i>Planning for Bush</i> <i>Fire Protection</i> 2006	Yes
Landscaping	<ul> <li>5. Landscaping within the development should adopt (where practical) the principles detailed in Appendix 5 of PBP2006.</li> <li>a. Moisture content of leaves should be high (250-400% of dry oven weight)</li> <li>b. Volatile oil content of leaves should be low</li> <li>c. Mineral content of leaves should be high</li> <li>d. Leaves should be thick (broad) with low area to volume ratio</li> <li>e. Density of foliage should be high and less permeable to air flow</li> <li>f. Continuity of plant form should be broken or separated</li> <li>g. Height of lowest foliage above ground should be maximised</li> </ul>	Yes

		narrow	
	i.	Dead foliage on the plant should be minimal	
	j.	Bark texture should be tight and smooth	
	k.	Quantity of ground fuels should be minimised	
	l	Fineness of ground fuels should be minimised	
	m.	Compaction ability of ground fuels should be maximised	
	n.	Mineral content of ground fuel should be maximised	
Emergency	6. The dev of the N	veloper is encouraged to provide each lot owner with a copy SW RFS Home Fire Escape Plan (Appendix A)	NA





http://www.rfs.nsw.gov.au/resources/bush-fire-survival-plan

## C Appendix B – Asset Protection Zone Standards

Planning for Bush Fire Protection 2006

requirements of Standards for Asset Protection Zones (RFS,2005)	
Location of APZs on slopes >18	
is not supported for new	
development on wooded	
vegetation due to	
environmental constraints and	
difficulties in management. In	
addition vegetation could carry	
a canopy fire without the	
support of understorey fuel	
(p.71) Retention of taller trees	
will assist in filtering out	
embers	
Tree canopy is not contiguous	

#### Standards for Asset Protection Zones

Asset Protection Zone	Inner Protection Area	Outer Protection Area
APZ is a fuel reduced area		
surrounding a built asset or		
structure		
APZ should be wholly located		
with your land		
Fallen ground fuels <6mm dia		
and bark should be removed		
on a regular basis		
Grasses need to be kept short		
and where possible green		
Separate tree crowns by 2-5m		
Canopy should not overhang		
within 2-5m of a dwelling		
Native trees and shrubs should		
be retained as clumps or		
islands and should maintain a		
covering of <20% of the area.		
Ensure there is no contiguous		
fuel path to the dwelling		
Fire trails, gravel paths, rows of		
trees, dams, creeks, swimming		
pools, tennis courts, and		
vegetable gardens are		
permitted in an APZ		

NBC Bus A\$3959 (2009)	Appendix B - D	ack Asse	essment R	eport V2.1	BPAD		
Printed:	02/11/20	ID Assessn	nent Date:	01/11/2015	Bushfire Planning & Desi		
Assessor:	C Teren	ce O'Toole	BPAD Level	3 BPD-PA-13734	Accredited Practition Level 3		
Site Street A	ddress:	54 Luchetti Ave, Hazelbrook					
Local Govern	nment Area:	Blue Moun	tains	Alpine Area:	No		
Equations Us	sed						
Rate of Fire S Radiant Heat: Peak Elevatio Peak Flame A	pread: Noble Drysdale, 19 on of Receiver Angle: Tan et	et al., 1980 985; Sullivan r: Tan et al., 2 al., 2005	et al., 2003; Ta 2005	an et al., 2005			
Run Descrip	otion: T	01					
Vegetation I	Information						
Vegetation Ty	ype:	Forest		Vegetation Group:	Forest and Wood		
Vegetation SI	lope:	6.28 Degree	S	Vegetation Slope Typ	e: Upslope		
Surface Fuel	Load(t/ha):	20		Overall Fuel Load(t/h	a): 25		
Site Information							
Site Informa	ation						
Site Informa Site Slope:	ation	3.8 Degrees	i.	Site Slope Type:	Upslope		
Site Informa Site Slope: Elevation of I	a <u>tion</u> Receiver(m):	3.8 Degrees 6	i	Site Slope Type: APZ/Separation(m):	Upslope 15.038		
Site Informa Site Slope: Elevation of I Fire Inputs	<u>ation</u> Receiver(m):	3.8 Degrees 6	i	Site Slope Type: APZ/Separation(m):	Upslope 15.038		
Site Informa Site Slope: Elevation of I Fire Inputs Veg./Flame W	a <u>tion</u> Receiver(m): /idth(m):	3.8 Degrees 6 100	i	Site Slope Type: APZ/Separation(m): Flame Temp(K)	Upslope 15.038 1090		
Site Informa Site Slope: Elevation of I Fire Inputs Veg./Flame W Calculation	a <u>tion</u> Receiver(m): /idth(m): Parameters	3.8 Degrees 6 100		Site Slope Type: APZ/Separation(m): Flame Temp(K)	Upslope 15.038 1090		
Site Informa Site Slope: Elevation of I Fire Inputs Veg./Flame W Calculation Flame Emissi	a <u>tion</u> Receiver(m): Vidth(m): Parameters	3.8 Degrees 6 100 2 95	•	Site Slope Type: APZ/Separation(m): Flame Temp(K) Relative Humidity(%)	Upslope 15.038 1090 : 25		
Site Informa Site Slope: Elevation of I Fire Inputs Veg./Flame W Calculation Flame Emissi Heat of Comb	a <u>tion</u> Receiver(m): Vidth(m): Parameters ivity: pustion(kJ/kg	3.8 Degrees 6 100 <u>5</u> 95 95 91 18600	5	Site Slope Type: APZ/Separation(m): Flame Temp(K) Relative Humidity(%) Ambient Temp(K):	Upslope 15.038 1090 : 25 308		
Site Informa Site Slope: Elevation of P Fire Inputs Veg./Flame W Calculation Flame Emissi Heat of Comb Moisture Fact	ation Receiver(m): Vidth(m): Parameters ivity: bustion(kJ/kg	3.8 Degrees 6 100 2 95 3) 18600 5	•	Site Slope Type: APZ/Separation(m): Flame Temp(K) Relative Humidity(%) Ambient Temp(K): FDI:	Upslope 15.038 1090 : 25 308 100		
Site Informa Site Slope: Elevation of I Fire Inputs Veg./Flame W Calculation Flame Emissi Heat of Comb Moisture Fact Program Ou	ation Receiver(m): Vidth(m): Parameters ivity: pustion(kJ/kg cor: tputs	3.8 Degrees 6 100 95 9) 18600 5	\$	Site Slope Type: APZ/Separation(m): Flame Temp(K) Relative Humidity(%) Ambient Temp(K): FDI:	Upslope 15.038 1090 : 25 308 100		
Site Informa Site Slope: Elevation of I Fire Inputs Veg./Flame W Calculation Flame Emissi Heat of Comb Moisture Fact Program Ou Category of A	ation Receiver(m): Vidth(m): Parameters ivity: bustion(kJ/kg tor: tputs Attack: H	3.8 Degrees 6 100 2 95 3) 18600 5 IGH	•	Site Slope Type: APZ/Separation(m): Flame Temp(K) Relative Humidity(%) Ambient Temp(K): FDI: Peak Elevation of Red	Upslope 15.038 1090 : 25 308 100 ceiver(m): 6.69		
Site Informa Site Slope: Elevation of I Fire Inputs Veg./Flame W Calculation Flame Emissi Heat of Comb Moisture Fact Program Ou Category of A Level of Coms Padiant Heat	ation Receiver(m): Vidth(m): Parameters ivity: pustion(kJ/kg cor: tputs Attack: H struction: B (kW/m2): 20	3.8 Degrees 6 100 95 9) 18600 5 IGH AL 29	5	Site Slope Type: APZ/Separation(m): Flame Temp(K) Relative Humidity(%) Ambient Temp(K): FDI: Peak Elevation of Ree Fire Intensity(kW/m): Elame Angle (degree	Upslope 15.038 1090 : 25 308 100 ceiver(m): 6.69 20099 c): 59		
Site Informa Site Slope: Elevation of I Fire Inputs Veg./Flame W Calculation Flame Emissi Heat of Comb Moisture Fact Program Ou Category of A Level of Coms Radiant Heat	ation Receiver(m): Vidth(m): Parameters ivity: bustion(kJ/kg tor: tputs Attack: H struction: B (kW/m2): 23 o(m): 1	3.8 Degrees 6 100 2 95 3) 18600 5 IGH AL 29 9 3 11	•	Site Slope Type: APZ/Separation(m): Flame Temp(K) Relative Humidity(%) Ambient Temp(K): FDI: Peak Elevation of Rea Fire Intensity(kW/m): Flame Angle (degrees Maximum View Eactor	Upslope 15.038 1090 : 25 308 100 ceiver(m): 6.69 20099 s): 58 r: 0.444		
Site Informa Site Slope: Elevation of I Fire Inputs Veg./Flame W Calculation Flame Emissi Heat of Comb Moisture Fact Program Ou Category of A Level of Cons Radiant Heat Flame Length Rate Of Spres	Ation Receiver(m): Vidth(m): Parameters ivity: pustion(kJ/kg tor: tputs Attack: H struction: B (kW/m2): 29 h(m): 1: ad (km/h): 1	3.8 Degrees 6 100 95 9) 18600 5 IGH AL 29 9 3.11 56	5	Site Slope Type: APZ/Separation(m): Flame Temp(K) Relative Humidity(%) Ambient Temp(K): FDI: Peak Elevation of Rea Fire Intensity(kW/m): Flame Angle (degrees Maximum View Factor Inner Protection Area	Upslope 15.038 1090 : 25 308 100 ceiver(m): 6.69 20099 s): 58 or: 0.444 (m): 15		

Run Description:	T02				
Vegetation Informatio	n				
Vegetation Type:	Forest	Vegetation Group:	Forest and Woodland		
Vegetation Slope:	13.77 Degrees	Vegetation Slope Type:	Upslope		
Surface Fuel Load(t/ha):	: 20	Overall Fuel Load(t/ha):	25		
Site Information					
Site Slope:	4.05 Degrees	Site Slope Type:	Upslope		
Elevation of Receiver(m	): default	APZ/Separation(m):	10.583		
Fire Inputs					
Veg./Flame Width(m):	100	Flame Temp(K)	1090		
<b>Calculation Paramete</b>	rs				
Flame Emissivity:	95	Relative Humidity(%):	25		
Heat of Combustion(kJ/	kg) 18600	Ambient Temp(K):	308		
Moisture Factor:	5	FDI:	100		
Program Outputs					
Category of Attack:	HIGH	Peak Elevation of Receiv	ver(m): 4.7		
Level of Construction:	BAL 29	Fire Intensity(kW/m):	11987		
Radiant Heat(kW/m2):	29	Flame Angle (degrees):	61		
Flame Length(m):	9.03	Maximum View Factor:	0.438		
Rate Of Spread (km/h):	0.93	Inner Protection Area(m	): 11		
Transmissivity:	0.87	Outer Protection Area(m	ı): O		
Run Description:	T03				
Vegetation Informatio	n				
Vegetation Type:	Forest	Vegetation Group:	Forest and Woodland		
Vegetation Slope:	12.41 Degrees	Vegetation Slope Type:	Upslope		
Surface Fuel Load(t/ha):	: 20	Overall Fuel Load(t/ha):	25		
Site Information					
Site Slope:	9.66 Degrees	Site Slope Type:	Upslope		
Elevation of Receiver(m	): 6	APZ/Separation(m):	11.747		
Fire Inputs					
Veg./Flame Width(m):	100	Flame Temp(K)	1090		
Calculation Paramete	rs				
Flame Emissivity:	95	Relative Humidity(%):	25		
Heat of Combustion(kJ/l	kg) 18600	Ambient Temp(K):	308		
Moisture Factor:	5	FDI:	100		
Program Outputs					
Category of Attack:	HIGH	Peak Elevation of Receiv	ver(m): 6.01		
Level of Construction:	BAL 29	Fire Intensity(kW/m):	13167		
Radiant Heat(kW/m2):	29	Flame Angle (degrees):	56		
Flame Length(m):	9.63	Maximum View Factor:	0.44		
Rate Of Spread (km/h):	1.02	Inner Protection Area(m	): 12		
Transmissivity:	0.867	Outer Protection Area(m	i): 0		

Page 2 of 6

Run Description: T04					
Vegetation Information					
Vegetation Type: Forest	Vegetation Group: Forest and Woodland				
Vegetation Slope: 8.13 De	grees Vegetation Slope Type: Upslope				
Surface Fuel Load(t/ha): 20	Overall Fuel Load(t/ha): 25				
Site Information					
Site Slope: 4.15 De	egrees Site Slope Type: Upslope				
Elevation of Receiver(m): 6	APZ/Separation(m): 13.781				
Fire Inputs					
Veg./Flame Width(m): 100	Flame Temp(K) 1090				
Calculation Parameters					
Flame Emissivity: 95	Relative Humidity(%): 25				
Heat of Combustion(kJ/kg) 18600	Ambient Temp(K): 308				
Moisture Factor: 5	FDI: 100				
Program Outputs					
Category of Attack: HIGH	Peak Elevation of Receiver(m): 6.15				
Level of Construction: BAL 29	Fire Intensity(kW/m): 17690				
Radiant Heat(kW/m2): 29	Flame Angle (degrees): 60				
Flame Length(m): 11.9	Maximum View Factor: 0.443				
Rate Of Spread (km/h): 1.37	Inner Protection Area(m): 14				
Transmissivity: 0.861	Outer Protection Area(m): 0				
Run Description: T05					
Vegetation Information					
Vegetation Type: Forest	Vegetation Group: Forest and Woodland				
Vegetation Slope: 13 39 D	egrees Vegetation Slope Type: Upslope				
regetation blope. 10.00 D					
Surface Fuel Load(t/ha): 20	Overall Fuel Load(t/ha): 25				
Surface Fuel Load(t/ha): 20 Site Information	Overall Fuel Load(t/ha): 25				
Surface Fuel Load(t/ha): 20 Site Information Site Slope: 7.72 De	Overall Fuel Load(t/ha): 25				
Surface Fuel Load(t/ha): 20 Site Information Site Slope: 7.72 De Elevation of Receiver(m): default	egrees Site Slope Type: Upslope 4PZ/Separation(m): 11.067				
Surface Fuel Load(t/ha): 20 Site Information Site Slope: 7.72 De Elevation of Receiver(m): default Fire Inputs	egrees Site Slope Type: Upslope APZ/Separation(m): 11.067				
Surface Fuel Load(t/ha): 20 Site Information Site Slope: 7.72 De Elevation of Receiver(m): default Fire Inputs Veg /Elame Width(m): 100	egrees Site Slope Type: Upslope APZ/Separation(m): 11.067				
Surface Fuel Load(t/ha): 20 Site Information Site Slope: 7.72 De Elevation of Receiver(m): default Fire Inputs Veg./Flame Width(m): 100 Calculation Parameters	Overall Fuel Load(t/ha):     25       egrees     Site Slope Type:     Upslope       APZ/Separation(m):     11.067       Flame Temp(K)     1090				
Surface Fuel Load(t/ha): 20         Site Information         Site Slope:       7.72 De         Elevation of Receiver(m): default         Fire Inputs         Veg./Flame Width(m):       100         Calculation Parameters         Flame Emissivity:       05	egrees Site Slope Type: Upslope APZ/Separation(m): 11.067 Flame Temp(K) 1090				
Surface Fuel Load(t/ha): 20         Site Information         Site Slope:       7.72 De         Elevation of Receiver(m): default         Fire Inputs         Veg./Flame Width(m):       100         Calculation Parameters         Flame Emissivity:       95         Heat of Combustion (k Ukm) 100000	Overall Fuel Load(t/ha):       25         egrees       Site Slope Type:       Upslope         APZ/Separation(m):       11.067         Flame Temp(K)       1090         Relative Humidity(%):       25         Ambient Temp(K):       209				
Surface Fuel Load(t/ha): 20         Site Information         Site Slope:       7.72 De         Elevation of Receiver(m): default         Fire Inputs         Veg./Flame Width(m):       100         Calculation Parameters         Flame Emissivity:       95         Heat of Combustion(kJ/kg) 18600	Overall Fuel Load(t/ha):       25         egrees       Site Slope Type:       Upslope         APZ/Separation(m):       11.067         Flame Temp(K)       1090         Relative Humidity(%):       25         Ambient Temp(K):       308         EDI:       100				
Surface Fuel Load(t/ha):       20         Site Information       20         Site Slope:       7.72 De         Elevation of Receiver(m):       default         Fire Inputs       Veg./Flame Width(m):       100         Calculation Parameters       95         Heat of Combustion(kJ/kg)       18600         Moisture Factor:       5	Overall Fuel Load(t/ha):       25         egrees       Site Slope Type:       Upslope         APZ/Separation(m):       11.067         Flame Temp(K)       1090         Relative Humidity(%):       25         Ambient Temp(K):       308         FDI:       100				
Surface Fuel Load(t/ha): 20         Site Information         Site Slope:       7.72 De         Elevation of Receiver(m): default         Fire Inputs         Veg./Flame Width(m):       100         Calculation Parameters         Flame Emissivity:       95         Heat of Combustion(kJ/kg) 18600         Moisture Factor:       5         Program Outputs         Category of Attack:	Overall Fuel Load(t/ha):       25         egrees       Site Slope Type:       Upslope         APZ/Separation(m):       11.067         Flame Temp(K)       1090         Relative Humidity(%):       25         Ambient Temp(K):       308         FDI:       100				
Surface Fuel Load(t/ha): 20         Site Information         Site Slope:       7.72 De         Elevation of Receiver(m): default         Fire Inputs         Veg./Flame Width(m):       100         Calculation Parameters         Flame Emissivity:       95         Heat of Combustion(kJ/kg) 18600         Moisture Factor:       5         Program Outputs         Category of Attack:       HIGH         Level of Construction:       PAL 20	Overall Fuel Load(t/ha):       25         egrees       Site Slope Type:       Upslope         APZ/Separation(m):       11.067         Flame Temp(K)       1090         Relative Humidity(%):       25         Ambient Temp(K):       308         FDI:       100         Peak Elevation of Receiver(m):       5.41         Eire Intensity//W/m):       12306				
Surface Fuel Load(t/ha): 20         Site Information         Site Slope:       7.72 De         Elevation of Receiver(m): default         Fire Inputs         Veg./Flame Width(m):       100         Calculation Parameters         Flame Emissivity:       95         Heat of Combustion(kJ/kg) 18600         Moisture Factor:       5         Program Outputs         Category of Attack:       HIGH         Level of Construction:       BAL 29         Padiant Heat(kW/m2):       29	Overall Fuel Load(t/ha):       25         egrees       Site Slope Type:       Upslope         APZ/Separation(m):       11.067         Flame Temp(K)       1090         Relative Humidity(%):       25         Ambient Temp(K):       308         FDI:       100         Peak Elevation of Receiver(m):       5.41         Fire Intensity(kW/m):       12306         Elame Angle (degrees):       50				
Surface Fuel Load(t/ha): 20         Site Information         Site Slope:       7.72 De         Elevation of Receiver(m): default         Fire Inputs         Veg./Flame Width(m):       100         Calculation Parameters         Flame Emissivity:       95         Heat of Combustion(kJ/kg) 18600         Moisture Factor:       5         Program Outputs         Category of Attack:       HIGH         Level of Construction:       BAL 29         Radiant Heat(kW/m2):       29         Flame Longth(m):       9.10	Overall Fuel Load(t/ha):       25         egrees       Site Slope Type:       Upslope         APZ/Separation(m):       11.067         Flame Temp(K)       1090         Relative Humidity(%):       25         Ambient Temp(K):       308         FDI:       100         Peak Elevation of Receiver(m):       5.41         Fire Intensity(kW/m):       12306         Flame Angle (degrees):       58         Maximum View Easter:       0.420				
Surface Fuel Load(t/ha): 20         Site Information         Site Slope:       7.72 De         Elevation of Receiver(m): default         Fire Inputs         Veg./Flame Width(m):       100         Calculation Parameters         Flame Emissivity:       95         Heat of Combustion(kJ/kg) 18600         Moisture Factor:       5         Program Outputs         Category of Attack:       HIGH         Level of Construction:       BAL 29         Radiant Heat(kW/m2):       29         Flame Length(m):       9.19	Overall Fuel Load(t/ha):       25         egrees       Site Slope Type:       Upslope         APZ/Separation(m):       11.067         Flame Temp(K)       1090         Relative Humidity(%):       25         Ambient Temp(K):       308         FDI:       100         Peak Elevation of Receiver(m):       5.41         Fire Intensity(kW/m):       12306         Flame Angle (degrees):       58         Maximum View Factor:       0.439         Inner Protection Area(m):       14				

Page 3 of 6

Run Description:	T06			
Vegetation Information	on			
Vegetation Type:	Forest	Vegetation Group:	Forest	and Woodland
Vegetation Slope:	11.86 Degrees	Vegetation Slope Type:	Upslop	e
Surface Fuel Load(t/ha	: 20	Overall Fuel Load(t/ha):	25	
Site Information				
Site Slope:	15.47 Degrees	Site Slope Type:	Upslop	be
Elevation of Receiver(r	n): default	APZ/Separation(m):	12.648	3
Fire Inputs				
Veg./Flame Width(m):	100	Flame Temp(K)	1090	
Calculation Parameter	ers			
Flame Emissivity:	95	Relative Humidity(%):	25	
Heat of Combustion(kJ	<b>/kg)</b> 18600	Ambient Temp(K):	308	
Moisture Factor:	5	FDI:	100	
Program Outputs				
Category of Attack:	HIGH	Peak Elevation of Receiv	ver(m):	7.42
Level of Construction:	BAL 29	Fire Intensity(kW/m):		13676
Radiant Heat(kW/m2):	29	Flame Angle (degrees):		53
Flame Length(m):	9.88	Maximum View Factor:		0.441
Rate Of Spread (km/h):	1.06	Inner Protection Area(m	):	13
Transmissivity:	0.865	Outer Protection Area(m	ı):	0



Bushfire Attack Level	29	29	29	29	29	29	
Flame angle	58	61	56	60	58	53	
Flame Length	13.11	9.03	9.63	11.9	9.19	9.88	
Radiant Heat Flux	29	29	29	29	29	29	
Elevation of Reciever	9	۵	9	9	9	9	
Flame width	52	55	58	100	100	100	
Total Ellipse Breadth	51.61	54.91	57.47	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Total Ellipse Length	145.72	155.02	162.26	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Short Fire Run Length	141	150	157	0	0	0	
Site Slope	-3.80	-4.05	-9.66	4.15	-7.72	-15.47	
Site Slope Length	15.038	10.583	11.747	13.781	11.067	12.648	
Site Slope Lower Elevation	666	668	670	665	660	659.5	
Site Slope Upper Elevation	665	667.25	668	666	658.5	656	
Up/Down	US	US	US	US	US	US	
Slope	-6.28	-13.77	-12.41	-8.13	-13.39	-11.86	
Run	100	100	100	49	63	100	
Fall	-11	-24.5	-22	-7	-15	-21	
Lower Elevation	677	692.5	692	672	675	681	
Upper Elevation	666	668	670	665	660	660	
Setback	15.038	10.583	11.747	13.781	11.067	12.648	
Vegetation Type	DS Forest						
ßü	Transect T01	Transect T02	Transect T03	Transect T04	Transect T05	Transect T06	