



BIODIVERSITY DEVELOPMENT ASSESSMENT REPORT

Proposed Development Lots 3 and 4, DP 584287 97-115 River Road Greenwich

> 14 April 2022 (REF: 18TSA08INT)

www.traversecology.com.au

BIODIVERSITY DEVELOPMENT ASSESSMENT REPORT

Proposed Residential Development

Lots 3 and 4 and 4, DP 584287, 97-115 River Road, Greenwich

Report authors:	George Plunkett B. Sc. (Hons.), PhD – Botanist – Accredited Assessor no. BAAS19010 Lachlan McRae B. Env. Sc. Mgmt (Hons.) – Fauna Ecologist Corrine Edwards B. Env. Sc. Mgmt (Hons.) – Fauna Ecologist Michael Sheather-Reid B. Nat. Res. (Hons.) – Managing Director Accredited Assessor no. BAAS17085
Flora survey:	George Plunkett B. Sc. (Hons.), PhD – Botanist – Accredited Assessor no. BAAS19010
Fauna survey:	Corrine Edwards B. Env. Sc. Mgmt (Hons.) – Fauna Ecologist Lachlan McRae B. Env. Sc. Mgmt (Hons.) – Fauna Ecologist
Plans prepared:	Sandy Cardow B. Sc. Angelene Wright B. Sc.
Approved by:	Michael Sheather-Reid (Accredited Assessor no. BAAS17085)
Date:	14/04/22
File:	18TSA08INT

This document is copyright © Travers bushfire & ecology 2022

Disclaimer:

This report has been prepared to provide advice to the client on matters pertaining to the particular and specific development proposal as advised by the client and / or their authorised representatives. This report can be used by the client only for its intended purpose and for that purpose only. Should any other use of the advice be made by any person, including the client, then this firm advises that the advice should not be relied upon. The report and its attachments should be read as a whole and no individual part of the report or its attachments should be interpreted without reference to the entire report.

The mapping is indicative of available space and location of features which may prove critical in assessing the viability of the proposed works. Mapping has been produced on a map base with an inherent level of inaccuracy, the location of all mapped features are to be confirmed by a registered surveyor.



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Travers bushfire & *ecology* has been engaged to prepare a biodiversity development assessment report (BDAR) for the proposed health care facility (hospital, Pallister House, seniors living, and respite) at Lots 3 and 4, DP 584287, 97-115 River Road, Greenwich. The area bounded by Lots 3 and 4, DP 584287 has been subject to survey effort and will hereafter be referred to as the 'study area'.

The area of direct impact from the development will hereafter be referred to as the 'development footprint'.

Development/Planning proposal

The proposed development is for a health care facility made up of a hospital, Pallister House, seniors living quarters, and a respite with services such as NBN, power, water and sewage.

Recorded biodiversity

Ecological survey and assessment has been undertaken in accordance with the *Biodiversity* Assessment Methodology (BAM) as well as relevant legislation including the *Environmental* Planning and Assessment Act 1979 (EP&A Act), the *Biodiversity* Conservation Act 2016 (BC Act), the *Environment* Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 (EPBC Act) and the Fisheries Management Act 1994 (FM Act). Compliant survey and limitations for candidate species are explained in Section 2.5, Section 4.2.1 (flora) and Section 4.3.2 (fauna).

In respect of matters required to be considered under the *EP&A Act* and relating to the species / provisions of the *BC Act*, one (1) threatened fauna species Grey-headed Flying-fox (*Pteropus poliocephalus*), no threatened flora species, and no threatened ecological communities (TECs) were recorded within the development footprint.

In respect of matters required to be considered under the *EPBC Act*, one (1) threatened fauna species Grey-headed Flying-fox (*Pteropus poliocephalus*), no threatened flora species and no threatened ecological communities listed under this Act were recorded within the development footprint.

In respect of matters relative to the *FM Act*, no suitable habitat for threatened marine or aquatic species was observed within the development footprint.

Impact assessment

Avoidance actions are outlined in Section 5.2. The resultant direct, indirect, and cumulative ecological impacts of the proposal have been carefully considered in Section 5.3. Further recommended mitigation measures, to minimise/offset these impacts to address threatening processes and to create a more positive ecological outcome for threatened biodiversity, have been outlined within Section 6.2.

The Development Proposal will case an impact on 0.93 ha of native vegetation, which includes impacts to two different vegetation units including the following (PCT below refers to Plant Community Type):

- 0.64 ha of remnant / unmanaged PCT 1841 Coastal enriched sandstone forest; including 0.21 ha complete removal and 0.43 ha partial clearing for APZ
- 0.29 ha of planted / managed PCT 1841 Coastal enriched sandstone forest; including 0.13 ha complete removal and 0.0.16 ha partial clearing for APZ

The assessment of serious and irreversible impacts are set out under Section 6.7.2 of the BC Reg 2017 to guide the determining authority on this decision. These principles have been reviewed and assessed in Appendix 1.

There will be no significant impact on matters listed under the FM Act.

Biodiversity Offsets Scheme (BOS) – Threshold Assessment

This project is a State Significant Development, which automatically triggers offsetting under the BOS and therefore threshold criteria does not need consideration.

BAM Calculator results

The BAM Calculator provides a means of objectively determining the loss of biodiversity as a result of a proposed development. The 'credits' generated (Table A & B) are the amount of credits required to be 'transferred' (purchased) to allow the proposal to proceed.

Zone	Veg. zone name	Veg. integrity loss	Area (ha)	Sensitivity to loss	Biodiversity risk weighting	Potential SAII	Ecosystem credits
1	1841_remnant	21.3	0.64	Moderate	1.75	no	6
2	1841_managed	27.1	0.29	Moderate	1.75	no	3
							Total: 9

Table A – Requirement for ecosystem credits

Table B – Requirement for species credits

Species	Area (ha) / count	Credits
Callocephalon fimbriatum / Gang-gang Cockatoo	0.62	7
Calyptorhynchus lathami / Glossy Black-Cockatoo	0.62	7
Cercartetus nanus / Eastern Pygmy-possum	0.93	11
Chalinolobus dwyeri / Large-eared Pied Bat	0.93	16
Deyeuxia appressa / Deyeuxia appressa	5 individuals	15
Hieraaetus morphnoides / Little Eagle	0.93	8
Litoria aurea / Green and Golden Bell Frog	0.93	11
Miniopterus australis / Little Bent-winged Bat	0.1	2
Miniopterus orianae oceanensis / Large Bent-winged Bat	0.1	2
Myotis macropus / Southern Myotis	0.47	6
Ninox connivens / Barking Owl	0.84	9
Ninox strenua / Powerful Owl	0.84	9
Petaurus norfolcensis / Squirrel Glider	0.93	11

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

APZ	asset protection zone
BAM	Biodiversity Assessment Method (2020)
BAR	Biodiversity Assessment Report
BC Act	Biodiversity Conservation Act (2016)
BC Reg	Biodiversity Conservation Regulation (2017)
BCAR	Biodiversity Certification Assessment Report
BDAR	Biodiversity Development Assessment Report
BOS	Biodiversity Offset Scheme
BPA	bushfire protection assessment
BSSAR	Biodiversity Stewardship Site Assessment Report
CEEC	Critically endangered ecological community
CM Act	Coastal Management Act 2016
DAWE	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment.
DCP	development control plan
DEC	NSW Department of Environment and Conservation (superseded by DECC from April 2007)
DECC	NSW Department of Environment and Climate Change (superseded by DECCW from October 2009)
DECCW	NSW Department of Environment, Climate Change and Water (superseded by OEH from April 2011)
DEWHA	Commonwealth Department of Environment, Water, Heritage & the Arts (superseded by SEWPAC)
DOEE	Commonwealth Department of Environment & Energy (superseded by DAWE)
DPIE	NSW Department of Planning, Industry and Environment
EEC	endangered ecological community
EPA	Environment Protection Authority
EP&A Act	Environmental Planning and Assessment Act (1979)
EPBC Act	Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act (1999)
FM Act	Fisheries Management Act
IBRA	Interim Biogeographic Regionalisation for Australia
LEP	local environmental plan
LGA	local government area
LLS Act	Local Land Services Act (2013)
NES	national environmental significance
NPW Act	National Parks and Wildlife Act (1974)
NRAR	Natural Resources Access Regulator (NSW)
	NSW Department of Industry and Investment
	Onice of Environment and Hentage (superseded by DPIE from August 2019)
	praint community type
	rare or threatened Australian plants
	Serious And Irreversible Impacts
	State Environmental Planning Policy
SEWPAC	Commonwealth Dept. of Sustainability Environment Water Population & Communities (superseded by DOEE)
SIS	species impact statement
SULE	safe useful life expectancy
TEC	threatened ecological community
TPZ	tree preservation zone
TSC Act	Threatened Species Conservation Act (1995) – Superseded by the Biodiversity Conservation Act (2016)
VMP	vegetation management plan



TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	INTRODUCT	ΓΙΟΝ	. 1
1	.1	Purpose	2
	1.1.1 1.1.2	Certification of BAM compliance	2 2
1	.2	Site description	3
	1.2.1 1.2.2	Site overview Landscape features	3 4
1	3	Proposed development	5
	.5	Identification of development site footprint	
1	4	Statutory assessment requirements	0
	1.4.1 1.4.2 1.4.3 1.4.4 1.4.5 1.4.6	Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 (EP&A Act) Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016 (BC Act) Fisheries Management Act 1994 (FM Act) Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 (EPBC Act) Coastal Management Act 2016 (CM Act) Licences.	7 7 8 9 9 9
2.	SURVEY ME	THODOLOGY	13
2	.1	Presurvey information collation & resources	13
2	.2	Flora survey methodology	14
2	.3	Fauna survey methodology	14
2	.4	Field survey effort	17
2	.5	Survey limitations	19
3.	SURVEY RE	SULTS	22
3	.1	Flora results	22
	3.1.1 3.1.2 3.1.3 3.1.4 3.1.5	Native vegetation extent Flora species Plant community types (PCTs) Vegetation descriptions of observed communities Vegetation integrity assessment	22 22 24 26 29
3	.2	Fauna results	31
3	.3	Habitat results	32
	3.3.1 3.3.2	Fauna habitat observations Habitat tree data	. 32 . 34
4.	BIODIVERS	ITY ASSESSMENT	37
4	.1	Previous surveys and reports reviewed	37
4	.2	Flora	38
	4.2.1	State legislative flora matters	.38
4	.3	Fauna	42
	4.3.1 4.3.2	Key fauna habitat State legislative fauna matters	.42 .43

4	.4	Watercourses, GDEs & Wetlands	48
	4.4.1	Endangered wetland communities	48
	4.4.2	Groundwater dependent ecosystems (GDEs)	48
	4.4.3	Watercourses	48
	4.4.4	State Environmental Planning Policy (Resilience and Hazards) 2021 – Divis	sion 1
	Coastal wetland	ds and littoral rainforests area	50
5.	IMPACT ASS	SESSMENT	51
5	.1	BOS thresholds	51
5	.2	Avoidance and minimisation actions	51
5	.3	Potential ecological impacts	51
	5.3.1	Prescribed impacts	51
	5.3.2	Direct impacts	53
	5.3.3	Indirect impacts	53
	5.3.4	Cumulative impacts	53
	5.3.5	Serious & Irreversible Impacts (SAIIs)	53
6.	CONCLUSIC	DN	57
6	.1	Legislative compliance	57
6	.2	Mitigation measures	58
6	.3	Biodiversity credit requirements	61
	6.3.1	Impacts requiring offset	61
	6.3.2	Impacts not requiring offset	61
	6.3.3	Areas not requiring assessment	61
7.	BAM CREDI	T RESULTS	62
7	.1	Ecosystem credits and species credits	62
7	.2	Ecosystem credit classes	66
7.	.3	Species credit classes	66
8	Ribliography		89
υ.	Disnography		00

Figures

Figure 1.1 – Study area (red)	1
Figure 1.2 – Zoning	5
Figure 1.3 – Preliminary site plan	6
Figure 1.4 – Site map	11
Figure 1.5 – Location map	12
Figure 3.1 – exotic vegetation in the north of the subject land	28
Figure 3.3 – Flora and fauna survey effort and results	35
Figure 3.4 – Vegetation impacts	36
Figure 4.1 – Nearby mapped watercourses	49
Figure 4.2 – Lane Cove LEP Riparian Land Map (2009)	49
Figure 4.3 – State Environmental Planning Policy (Coastal Management) 2018 map	50
Figure 5.1 – Species credit species polygons	55

Tables

Table 1.1 – Site features	3
Table 1.2 – Landscape features	4
Table 2.1 – Fauna survey effort	17
Table 2.2 – Flora survey effort	
Table 2.3 – Plot and transect survey effort – development footprint	
Table 2.4 – Survey adequacy for species credit species (flora)	
Table 2.5 – Survey adequacy for species credit species (fauna)	21
Table 3.1 – Flora observations within the study area	
Table 3.2 – PCT shortlist	
Table 3.3 – PCTs	
Table 3.4 – Current vegetation integrity score	
Table 3.5 – Future Vegetation Integrity scores	
Table 3.6 – Fauna recorded within the study area	
Table 3.7 – Observed fauna habitat	
Table 3.8 – Habitat tree data	
Table 4.1 – Species credit species (flora)	
Table 4.2 – Ecosystem credit species (fauna)	43
Table 4.3 – Species credit species (fauna)	45
Table 5.1 – Prescribed impacts	51
Table 5.2 – Candidate SAII species	54
Table 6.1 – Measures to mitigate & manage impacts	58
Table 7.1 – Requirement for ecosystem credits	63
Table 7.2 – Requirement for species credits	63
Table 7.3 – Ecosystem credit summary	66
Table 7.4 – Credit classes for PCT 877 and 1395 - Like for like options	
Table 7.5 – Species credit summary	

Appendices

Appendix 1.	SAII impact assessment - species	71
Appendix 2.	Plot Datasheets	74

Appendix 3.	Staff qualifications and experience	83
Appendix 4.	BAM-C outputs	87
Appendix 5.	Microbat Call Analysis	88



1. INTRODUCTION

Travers bushfire & ecology has been engaged to undertake a biodiversity development assessment report for Lots 3 and 4, DP 584287 within the Lane Cove local government area (LGA) (Figure 1.1). This lot is subject to a proposed development application and will hereafter be referred to as the 'study area'.

The area containing the proposed development, APZs, and all associated impact on habitat features is hereafter referred to as the 'development footprint'.

The proposal shall be assessed under the Biodiversity Conservation Act (BC Act), 2016.



Figure 1.1 – Study area (red)

1.1 Purpose

The purposes of this Biodiversity Development Assessment Report (BDAR) are to:

- Carry out a botanical survey to describe the vegetation communities and their conditions
- Carry out a fauna habitat survey for the detection and assessment of fauna and their potential habitats
- Complete targeted surveys for threatened species, populations, and ecological communities
- Prepare a BDAR in accordance with the requirements of the:
 - a) Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 (EPBC Act),
 - b) Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016 (BC Act),
 - c) Biodiversity Conservation Regulation 2017 (BC Reg.),
 - d) Fisheries Management Act 1994 (FM Act), and
- Prepare a BDAR in accordance with the Biodiversity Assessment Methodology (BAM) 2020

1.1.1 Certification of BAM compliance

Section 6.15 of the *BC Act* regarding the currency of a BDAR requires:

- (1) A biodiversity assessment report cannot be submitted in connection with a relevant application unless the accredited person certifies in the report that the report has been prepared on the basis of the requirements of (and information provided under) the biodiversity assessment method as at a specified date and that date is within 14 days of the date the report is so submitted.
- (2) A relevant application is an application for planning approval, for vegetation clearing approval, for biodiversity certification or in respect of a biodiversity stewardship agreement.

George Plunkett (BAAS 19010) is an accredited person under the *BC Act.* I, George Plunkett, certify here that the report has been prepared on the basis of the requirements of (and information provided under) the BAM as 14 April 2022, and that date is within 14 days of the date the report is so submitted.

1.1.2 Terminology

Throughout this report the terms development footprint and study area are used. It is important to have a thorough understanding of these terms as they apply to the assessment.

Development footprint means the area directly affected by the proposal. It has the same meaning as "subject land" defined below.

Study area is the portion of land that encompasses all surveys undertaken and is usually all land contained within the designated property boundary. The study area extends as far as is necessary to assess all important biodiversity values known and likely to occur within the subject land and includes the development footprint and any additional areas which are likely to be affected by the proposal, either directly or indirectly.

Subject land is land to which the BAM is applied in Stage 1 to assess the biodiversity values. It includes land that may be a development site, clearing site, proposed for biodiversity certification or land that is proposed for a biodiversity stewardship agreement. In this case, it refers to the area designated as the development footprint, and has the same meaning for the

purposes of this report. The terms "subject land" and "development footprint" are interchangeable in this regard.

Direct impacts are those that directly affect the habitat and individuals. They include, but are not limited to, death through clearing, predation, trampling, poisoning of the animal/plant itself and the removal of suitable habitat. When applying each factor, consideration must be given to all of the likely direct impacts of the proposed activity or development.

Indirect impacts occur when project-related activities affect species, populations or ecological communities in a manner other than direct loss. Indirect impacts can include loss of individuals through starvation, exposure, predation by domestic and/or feral animals, loss of breeding opportunities, loss of shade/shelter, deleterious hydrological changes, increased soil salinity, erosion, inhibition of nitrogen fixation, weed invasion, fertiliser drift, or increased human activity within or directly adjacent to sensitive habitat areas. As with direct impacts, consideration must be given, when applying each factor, to all of the likely indirect impacts of the proposed activity or development.

1.2 Site description

1.2.1 Site overview

Table 1.1 provides an overview the planning, cadastral, and topographical details of the study area and an overview of the site and surrounds is shown on Figure 1.4 and Figure 1.5 (site and location maps).

Table 1.1 – Site features

Location	97-115 River Road, Greenwich, NSW 2250
Location description	The site is surrounded by predominately existing urban development with scattered vegetation to the east. The northern boundary runs parallel to River Rd. The southern and eastern boundary are connected to Gore Creek Reserve/Lane Cove Bushland Park.
Area	2.22 ha
Local government area	Lane Cove Council
Zoning	SP2 – Special Purpose
Grid reference MGA-56	331905E 6255520N MGA 2020-56
Elevation	Approximately 40-50 m AHD
Topography	Situated on a sloping topography towards the south-west portion of the site where there is a approx 40 m high drop-off/escarpment.
Catchment and drainage	There are no creek lines within the study area. However, there is Gore Creek to the south-west within approx. 100 m of site and it is expected that any drainage filters down to the Creek, which in turn drains into Lane Cove River. Refer to Figure 1.5 for local drainages and steam order.
Existing land use	The site is currently in operation as Hammond Care Greenwich Hospital.

1.2.2 Landscape features

Table 1.2 examines the landscape features of the proposed development site in accordance with the BAM.

Table 1.2 – Landscape features

Patch size	>100 ha
IBRA bioregions and subregions	Sydney Basin bioregion – Pittwater subregion (Figure 1.4 and Figure 1.5)
NSW landscape region and area (ha)	Port Jackson Basin
Native vegetation extent in the buffer area (1500 m)	203.13 ha approx. and 26.79% Cover class: 10–30%
Cleared areas	Approximately 0.9 ha of land within the study area is cleared
Evidence to support differences between mapped vegetation extent and aerial imagery	Mapped vegetation closely matches aerial imagery.
Rivers and streams classified according to stream order	The site map (Figure 1.4) shows the study area with first, second and third order streams
Wetlands within, adjacent to and downstream of the site, including important wetlands	There are several dams across the site, shown on the site map (Figure 1.4)
	There is some connectivity to the development footprint. There is connection to Lane Cove Bushland Park and Gore Creek to the west and also to Gore Creek Reserve to the south. The north of the site runs
Connectivity features	parallel to River Rd and to the east is mainly existing residential properties (i.e., poor connectivity in those directions). The location map (Figure 1.5) shows an overview of the extent of native vegetation and connective features in the locality.
Connectivity features Geology and soils	parallel to River Rd and to the east is mainly existing residential properties (i.e., poor connectivity in those directions). The location map (Figure 1.5) shows an overview of the extent of native vegetation and connective features in the locality. Geology: Hawkesbury Sandstone (Rh) – Sandstone, quartz, with some shale. Soils: The majority of the study area is located on the Gymea soil landscape. gy—shallow to moderately deep (30-100 cm) Yellow Earths and Earthy Sands on crests and inside of benches; shallow (<20 cm) Siliceous Sands on leading edges of benches; localised Gleyed Podzolic Soils and Yellow Podzolic Soils on shale lenses; shallow to moderately deep (<100 cm) Siliceous Sands and Leached Sands along drainage lines. The eastern and western extremities of the site lie on the Hawkesbury soil landscape. ha—shallow (>50 cm), discontinuous Lithosols/Siliceous Sands associated with rock outcrop; Earthy Sands, Yellow Earths and some Yellow Podzolic Soils on inside of benches and along joints and fractures; localised Yellow and Red Podzolic Soils associated with shale lenses; Siliceous Sands and secondary Yellow Earths along drainage lines

1.2.3 Zoning

The site is currently zoned SP2 under the Lane Cove LEP of 2010 (Figure 1.2) which is for Special Purposes (health services facilities).



Figure 1.2 – Zoning (Source: Planning Portal, 2022)

1.3 Proposed development

The subject proposal is for the detailed design and construction of the facility following its concept approval under SSD-8699. Specifically, SSD-13619238 seeks approval for the following:

- Demolition of the existing hospital building and associated facilities at the site;
- Construction of a new hospital facility and integrated healthcare uses and services, including:
 - a new 7 storey main hospital building;
 - two new 5-6 storey serviced self-care housing buildings (serviced seniors living);
 - a new 2-3 storey respite care building;

- Construction of associated site facilities and services, including pedestrian and vehicular access and basement parking;
- Site landscaping and infrastructure works; and
- Preservation of Pallister House which will continue to host dementia care and administrative functions.

The proposed layout is shown on Figure 1.3.

The area of land subject to direct impacts caused by the proposal; inclusive of demolition, new buildings, internal roads, services and asset protect zones (APZs); will hereafter be referred to as the 'development footprint'. The larger area outside of the development area (development footprint) will hereafter be referred to as the 'study area'.

The development footprint is essentially all internal road reserves, building allotments, asset protection zones (APZs), and fence lines.

1.3.1 Identification of development site footprint

A total of 0.93 ha of native vegetation will be impacted by the proposal, of which 0.34 ha will be completely removed, while another 0.59 ha will be partially cleared for APZ management purposes. Impacted vegetation is shown on Figure 3.3.



Figure 1.3 – Preliminary site plan (Source: Bickerton Masters, 11/02/2022)

1.4 Statutory assessment requirements

1.4.1 Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 (EP&A Act)

Prior to any development taking place in New South Wales a formal assessment needs to be made of the proposed work to ensure it complies with relevant planning controls and, according to its nature and scale, confirm that it is environmentally and socially sustainable. State, regional, and local planning legislation indicates the level of assessment required, and outlines who is responsible for assessing the development. The development assessment and consent system is outlined in Part 4 of the *EP&A Act* and the infrastructure and environmental impact assessment system is outlined in Part 5 of the *EP&A Act*.

Section 7.14 State significant development or infrastructure

- (1) This section applies to an application for development consent for State significant development under Part 4, or an application for approval for State significant infrastructure under Part 5.1, that is required under Division 2 to be accompanied by a biodiversity development assessment report.
- (2) The Minister for Planning, when determining in accordance with the EP&A Act any such application, is to take into consideration under that Act the likely impact of the proposed development on biodiversity values as assessed in the biodiversity development assessment report. The Minister for Planning may (but is not required to) further consider under that Act the likely impact of the proposed development on biodiversity values.
- (3) If the Minister for Planning decides to grant consent or approval and the biodiversity offsets scheme applies to the proposed development, the conditions of the consent or approval may require the applicant to retire biodiversity credits to offset the residual impact on biodiversity values (whether of the number and class specified in the report or other number and class). The residual impact is the impact after the measures that are required to be carried out by the terms or conditions of the consent or approval to avoid or minimise the impact on biodiversity values of the proposed development.
- (4) A condition to retire biodiversity credits is required to be complied with before any development is carried out that would impact on biodiversity values. If the retirement of particular biodiversity credits applies to a stage of the development, compliance with the condition for their retirement is postponed until it is proposed to carry out that stage of the development.
- (5) This section does not operate to limit the matters that the Minister for Planning may take into consideration in relation to the impact of proposed development on biodiversity values, the measures that the Minister may require to avoid or minimise those impacts or the power of the Minister to refuse to grant consent or approval because of those impacts.

1.4.2 Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016 (BC Act)

The BC Act repeals the Threatened Species Conservation Act 1995, the Nature Conservation Trust Act 2001 and the animal and plant provisions of the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1974.

The *BC Act* and the *BC Reg* establishes a regulatory framework for assessing and offsetting impacts on biodiversity values due to proposed developments and clearing. It establishes a framework to avoid, minimise, and offset impacts on biodiversity from development through the Biodiversity Offsets Scheme. Where development consent is granted, the authority may

impose as a condition of consent an obligation to retire a number and type of biodiversity credits determined under the new Biodiversity Assessment Method (BAM).

The BOS applies to:

- local development (assessed under Part 4 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979) that triggers a BOS threshold or is likely to significantly affect threatened species based on the test of significance in section 7.3 of the Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016
- state significant development and state significant infrastructure projects, unless the Secretary of the Department of Planning, Industry and Environment and the environment agency head determine that the project is not likely to have a significant impact
- <u>biodiversity certification</u> proposals
- clearing of native vegetation in urban areas and areas zoned for environmental conservation that exceeds a BOS threshold and does not require development consent
- clearing of native vegetation that requires approval by the Native Vegetation Panel under the <u>Local Land Services Act 2013</u>
- activities assessed and determined under Part 5 of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979* (generally, proposals by government entities) if proponents choose to 'opt in' to the Scheme.

Proponents will need to supply evidence relating to the triggers for the BOS thresholds and the test of significance (where relevant) when submitting their application to the consent authority.

Development consent cannot be granted for non-State significant development under Part 4 of the *EP&A Act* if the consent authority is of the opinion it is likely to have serious and irreversible impacts (SAII) on biodiversity values. The determination of SAII is to be made in accordance with principles prescribed section 6.7 of the *BC Regulation 2017*. The principles have been designed to capture those impacts which are likely to contribute significantly to the risk of extinction of a threatened species or ecological community in New South Wales.

The threatened species test of significance is used to determine if a development or activity is likely to significantly affect threatened species or ecological communities, or their habitats. It is applied as part of the Biodiversity Offsets Scheme entry requirements and for Part 5 activities under the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act (EP&A Act)*, 1979.

The test of significance is set out in s.7.3 of the *BC Act.* If the activity is likely to have a significant impact, or will be carried out in a declared area of outstanding biodiversity value, the proponent must either apply the Biodiversity Offsets Scheme or prepare a species impact statement (SIS).

The environmental impact of activities that will not have a significant impact on threatened species will continue to be assessed under s.111 of the *EP&A Act*

1.4.3 Fisheries Management Act 1994 (FM Act)

The *FM Act* provides a list of threatened aquatic species that require consideration when addressing the potential impacts of a proposed development. Where a proposed activity is located in an area identified as critical habitat, or such that it is likely to significantly affect threatened species, populations, ecological communities, or their habitats, an SIS is required to be prepared.

1.4.4 Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 (EPBC Act)

The *EPBC Act* requires that Commonwealth approval be obtained for certain actions. It provides an assessment and approvals system for actions that have a significant impact on matters of *national environmental significance* (NES). These may include:

- World Heritage Properties and National Heritage Places
- Wetlands of International Importance protected by international treaty
- Nationally listed threatened species and ecological communities
- Nationally listed migratory species
- Commonwealth marine environment

Actions are projects, developments, undertakings, activities, and series of activities or alteration of any of these. An action that needs Commonwealth approval is known as a controlled action. A controlled action needs approval where the Commonwealth decides the action would have a significant effect on an NES matter.

Where a proposed activity is located in an area identified to be of NES, or such that it is likely to significantly affect threatened species, ecological communities, migratory species or their habitats, then the matter needs to be referred to the Commonwealth Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment (DAWE) for assessment. In the case where no listed federal species are located on site then no referral is required. The onus is on the proponent to make the application and not the Council to make any referral.

A threshold criterion apply to specific NES matters which may determine whether a referral is or is not required, such as for the *EPBC*-listed ecological communities Cumberland Plain Woodland and Shale-Gravel transition Forest. Consultation with DOEE may be required to determine whether a referral is or is not required. If there is any doubt as to the significance of impact or whether a referral is required, a referral is generally recommended to provide a definite decision under the *EPBC Act* thereby removing any further obligations in the case of 'not controlled' actions.

A significant impact is regarded as being:

important, notable, or of consequence, having regard to its context or intensity and depends upon the sensitivity, value, and quality of the environment which is impacted and upon the duration, magnitude, and geographical extent of the impacts. A significant impact is likely when it is a real or not a remote chance or possibility.

Source: EPBC Policy Statement

Guidelines on the correct interpretation of the actions and assessment of significance are located on the department's web site <u>http://www.environment.gov.au/epbc/publications</u>.

1.4.5 Coastal Management Act 2016 (CM Act)

The Coastal Management Act (CM Act, 2016) establishes the framework and overarching objects for coastal management in New South Wales. The Act commenced on 29 June 2018 and replaces the previous Coastal Protection Act (1979).

The purpose of the *CM Act* is to manage the use and development of the coastal environment in an ecologically sustainable way, for the social, cultural and economic well-being of the people of New South Wales.

The CM Act also supports the aims of the Marine Estate Management Act 2014, as the coastal zone forms part of the marine estate.

The CM Act defines the coastal zone, comprising four (4) coastal management areas:

- coastal wetlands and littoral rainforests area; areas which display the characteristics of coastal wetlands or littoral rainforests that were previously protected by SEPP 14 and SEPP 26
- 2. coastal vulnerability area; areas subject to coastal hazards such as coastal erosion and tidal inundation
- 3. coastal environment area; areas that are characterised by natural coastal features such as beaches, rock platforms, coastal lakes and lagoons and undeveloped headlands. Marine and estuarine waters are also included
- 4. coastal use area; land adjacent to coastal waters, estuaries and coastal lakes and lagoons.

The *CM Act* establishes management objectives specific to each of these management areas, reflecting their different values to coastal communities.

1.4.6 Licences

Individual staff members of *Travers bushfire & ecology* are licensed under Clause 20 of the *National Parks and Wildlife (Land Management) Regulation 1995* and Sections 120 & 131 of the *National Parks and Wildlife Act 1974* to conduct flora and fauna surveys within service and non-service areas. NPWS Scientific Licence Numbers: SL100848.

Travers bushfire & ecology staff are licensed under an Animal Research Authority issued by the NSW Department of Primary Industries. This authority allows *Travers bushfire & ecology* staff to conduct various fauna surveys of native and introduced fauna for the purposes of environmental consulting throughout New South Wales.



Figure 1.4 – Site map



Figure 1.5 – Location map

2. SURVEY METHODOLOGY

2.1 Presurvey information collation & resources

Technical resources utilised:

Legislation

- Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 (EPBC Act)
- Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016 (BC Act)
- Biodiversity Conservation Regulation 2017 (BC Reg.)
- Fisheries Management Act 1994 (FM Act)

Survey Guidelines

- Survey guidelines for Australia's threatened birds (DEWHA 2010)
- Survey guidelines for Australia's threatened fish (DEWHA 2011)
- Survey guidelines for Australia's threatened frogs (DEWHA 2010)
- Survey guidelines for Australia's threatened mammals (DEWHA 2011)
- Survey guidelines for Australia's threatened bats (DEWHA. 2010)
- Survey guidelines for Australia's threatened reptiles (DEWHA 2011)
- Matters of National Environmental Significance (Commonwealth of Australia 2013)
- Threatened Biodiversity Survey and Assessment: Guidelines for Developments and Activities 2004 (working draft), Department of Environment and Conservation (DEC)
- Threatened Species Survey and Assessment Guidelines: Field Survey Methods for Fauna Amphibians (DECC – April 2009a)
- Hygiene Protocol for the Control of Diseases in Frogs (DECC 2008)
- Region based guide to the echolocation calls of Microchiropteran bats (DEC 2004)
- Species credit threatened bats and their habitats (DPIE 2018)
- Field survey methods: Best practice field survey methods for environmental consultants and surveyors when assessing proposed development sites or other activities on sites containing threatened species, populations or ecological communities (OEH 2004)
- Surveying threatened plants and their habitats: NSW survey guide for the Biodiversity Assessment Method (DPIE 2020)

Mapping Resources

- Aerial photographs (Google Earth Pro / Spatial Information Exchange / NearMap)
- Topographical maps (scale 1:25,000)
- LiDAR data for contours (Land and Property Information, est. 2015 estimated)
- ESpade OEH tool for checking soil types

Threatened species records

- BioNet database which holds data from a number of custodians (18/10/2021 to 10 km)
- Atlas of Living Australia (NCRIS/GBIF 2017)
- Birdata (Birdlife Australia 2017)
- NSW Bird Atlas (NSWBA 2017)

Vegetation mapping/resources:

- BioNet Vegetation Classification System
- The Native Vegetation of the Sydney Metropolitan Area (OEH 2016)
- Australian Virtual Herbarium
- Surveying threatened plants and their habitats NSW survey guide for the Biodiversity Assessment Method (DPIE 2020).

Vegetation Mapping:

The Native Vegetation of the Sydney Metropolitan Area (OEH 2016) maps the following communities within the study area:

- PCT 1776 Smooth-barked Apple Red Bloodwood open forest on enriched sandstone slopes around Sydney and the Central Coast
- PCT 1778 Smooth-barked Apple Coast Banksia / Cheese Tree open forest on sandstone slopes on the foreshores of the drowned river valleys of Sydney
- PCT 1828 Coachwood Lilly Pilly Water Gum gallery rainforest in sandstone gullies of the Sydney basin
- Urban exotic / native

2.2 Flora survey methodology

Flora survey was undertaken on 18 October 2021 and 8 Feb 2022 over a combined time of 8 hrs.

Stratified survey using the BAM was undertaken. The following information was collected at each of four (4) BAM plots:

- Native overstorey, mid-storey and ground cover recorded for all observed species and an estimate of stems (20 m x 20 m, 10 m x 40 m).
- Stratum (and layer): stratum and layer in which each species occurs (20 m x 20 m)
- Growth form: growth form for each recorded species (20 m x 20 m
- Species name: scientific name and common name (20 m x 20 m)
- Percent projected foliage cover of the understorey strata and exotic vegetation (20 m x 20 m
- Number of trees with hollows visible from the ground (20 m x 50 m)
- The total length of fallen logs >10 cm in diameter (20 m x 50 m)
- The proportion of regenerating overstorey species (20 m x 50 m)
- Number of large trees (20 m x 50 m)
- Estimates of leaf litter cover, bare ground, cryptograms and rocks in 1 m x 1 m subplots at five (5) locations along the central transect (20 m x 50 m)

Targeted survey for threatened flora was undertaken throughout the subject lots (refer to Figure 3.2).

All plot sheets utilised for the BAM calculator are provided in Appendix 2.

2.3 Fauna survey methodology

Site survey effort accounting for techniques deployed, duration, and weather conditions are outlined in Table 2.1 and are depicted on Figure 3.2.

Diurnal birds

Two (2) diurnal bird census points were undertaken within the development footprint and one (1) was undertaken at the driveway off Vincent's Road to the south-east. A minimum of 15 minutes of survey was undertaken at each census point in an area radiating out to between 30–50 m. Bird census points were selected to give an even spread and representation across the site and its communities (Figure 3.2). Census points were also commenced in locations where bird activity was apparent, as often different small bird species are found foraging together. Opportunistic diurnal bird survey was conducted between census points and whilst undertaking other diurnal surveys. Additional opportunistic surveys were conducted on another two days.

A raptor nest search transect was also conducted throughout the study area over two days (Figure 3.2).

Nocturnal birds

Given the suitability of habitat present, Masked Owl (*Tyto novaehollandiae*), Powerful Owl (*Ninox strenua*), Barking Owl (*Ninox connivens*), and Sooty Owl (*Tyto tenebricosa*) were targeted by call-playback techniques.

Given that the hollow-bearing tree SHT 2 provided owl roosting potential, stag-watching of that tree was undertaken on the night of the 18/10/2021.

Arboreal and terrestrial mammals

There is limited habitat onsite considered suitable for threatened arboreal and terrestrial mammal species. Preliminary nocturnal habitat searches and spotlighting were undertaken over one (1) day and night.

Bats

Mega-chiropteran bat species, such as Grey-headed Flying-fox, were surveyed by targeting flowering / fruiting trees during spotlighting activities and by listening to distinctive vocalisations. Suitable roosting habitat is searched for presence of small or large established camps during diurnal survey periods.

Micro-chiropteran bats were passively surveyed for using two ultrasonic recording detectors deployed for nine (9) nights: one (1) preliminary night in October 2020 and then eight (8) consecutive nights in Feb 2020. This provided a total effort of 18 detector nights.

The escarpment to the west of the site was searched for potential bat habitat such as caves and crevices for one hour on 28/02/2022.

Amphibians

No amphibian surveys were conducted.

Reptiles

There is no habitat onsite considered suitable for threatened reptile species. However, opportunistic diurnal habitat searches were undertaken in October 2021.

Habitat trees

Only significant habitat trees were recorded (see below).

Significant habitat trees

Significant habitat trees are defined as trees containing large hollows suitable for use by owls and/or containing a number of good quality hollows typically consisting of more than one medium (10–30

cm) sized hollows. A tree may also be considered significant where evidence of use by select fauna is found such as a glider sap feed tree, raptor nest, or owl roost.

Significant Hollow-bearing trees were identified and recorded within the development footprint on a *Trimble* handheld GPS unit during surveys. All data such as hollow types, hollow size, tree species, diameter at breast height, canopy spread and overall height were collected and a metal tag with the tree number placed on the trunk for field relocation purposes. Other habitat features such as nests and significant sized mistletoes for foraging were also searched for. A summary of significant habitat tree results is provided in Table 3.8.

2.4 Field survey effort

Table 2.1 and Table 2.2 below detail the flora and fauna survey effort undertaken for the development footprint.

Table 2.1 – Fauna survey effort

Fauna group	Date	Weather conditions	Survey technique(s)	Time effort (24hr)
	18/10/2021	6/8 cloud, no wind, no rain, temp 21.9–16oC	Diurnal census x3	1hr
Diurnal birds			Diurnal opportunistic	3hr 10min 1630–1940
	15/02/2022	2/8 cloud, no wind, no rain, temp 24oC	Raptor nest search	0.5hrs 1430–1500
	15/02/2022	2/8 cloud, no wind, no rain, temp 24oC	Diurnal opportunistic	0.5hrs 1430–1500
	28/02/2022	8/8 cloud, no wind, patchy rain, temp 22oC	Diurnal opportunistic	1.5hrs 1645–1815
Nocturnal	18/10/2021	6/8 cloud, no wind, no rain, temp 16oC	Spotlighting	1hrs 2000–2100
birds			Call playback (Section 2.5 species)	Commenced @ 2130
Arboreal	18/10/2021	6/8 cloud, no wind, no rain, temp 16oC	Spotlighting	1hrs 2000–2100
mammals			Call playback (Section 2.5 species)	Commenced @ 2130
Terrestrial	18/10/2021	6/8 cloud, no wind, no rain, temp 16oC	Spotlighting	1hrs 2000–2100
mammals			Call playback (Section 2.5 species)	Commenced @ 2130
	18/10/2021	6/8 cloud, no wind, no rain, temp 16oC	Ultrasonic microbat recording (Passive monitoring) x2	2hrs 2000–2200 (x2)
Bats	07/02/2022- 15/3/2022	70 mm rain, average wind speed approx. 20 km/h, average maximum temp 27.1°C.	Ultrasonic microbat recording (Passive monitoring) x2	14 recorder nights
	28/02/2022	8/8 cloud, no wind, patchy rain, temp 22oC	Cave/crevice searches	1.5hrs 1645–1815
	07/02/2022	2/8 cloud, no wind, no rain, temp 24oC	Rocky habitat roots searches	0.5hrs 1400–1430
Reptiles	18/10/2021	6/8 cloud, no wind, no rain, temp 21.9–16oC	Diurnal opportunistic / habitat searches	1hr 1500–1600
Amphihians	18/10/2021	6/8 cloud, no wind, no rain, temp 21.9–16oC	Spotlighting / call identification	1hr 1500–1600
Amphibians	28/02/2022	8/8 cloud, no wind, patchy rain, temp 22oC	Breeding habitat search	1.5hrs 1645–1815

Table 2.2 – Flora survey effort

Flora survey	Survey technique(s)	Dates
Vegetation communities	Survey of the boundaries of all communities – field verification, plotting vegetation boundaries on aerial photographs	8 Feb 2022
Stratified sampling	Four (4) 20 m x 20 m / 50 m x 20 m floristic transect plots within native vegetation using BAM	18 Oct 2021, 8 Feb 2022
Targeted searches	Parallel field traverse across the entire subject land	18 Oct 2021, 8 Feb 2022

Table 2.3 – Plot and transect survey effort – development footprint

Veg zone no.	РСТ	Condition	Area (Ha)	Minimum plots required	Plot sampled	Plot identifier	Plot size	Easting at 0 m	Northing at 0 m	Bearing
1	1841	Remnant / unmanaged	0.64	1	3	1 2 3	20 m x 50 m	332043 E 331811 E 331996 E	6255457 N 6255471 N 6255428 N	14 143 104
2	1841	Planted / managed	0.29	1	1	4	20 m x 50 m	332056 E	6255523 N	250

2.5 Survey limitations

It is important to note that field survey data collected during the survey period is representative of species occurring within the development footprint for potentially that occasion only. Due to effects of fire, breeding cycles, migratory patterns, camouflage, weather conditions, time of day, visibility, predatory and / or feeding patterns, increased species frequency or richness may be observed within the development footprint outside the nominated survey period. Habitat assessments based on the identification of micro-habitat features for various species of interest, including regionally significant and threatened species, have been used to minimise the implications of this survey limitation.

Flora survey limitations

The species list does not include all household or exotic garden / landscaping species and those species which could not be identified at the time of the survey past genus level. Cryptic species not flowering at the time of the survey may not be observed during survey outside of peak flowering periods. Likewise cryptic orchid species are generally only recognisable when flowering.

Targeted flora survey is compliant for all candidate species with potential to occur, except for *Deyeuxia appressa*, which requires survey in December to assess presence (current survey was conducted in October and February). For the purposes of this BDAR and credit assessment, it is assumed that *D. appressa* is present in accordance with the BAM. This species is a very rare grass only known from a few records, and is listed as a potential SAII entity. Appendix 1 provides assessment of SAII entities, but targeted survey is required to allow for accurate determination of SAII on this species.

			Potential to	Sı	irvey adequad	;y
Common name	BC Act	Potential SAII entity	occur (presence status) / Habitat	Defined survey period (TBDC)	Conducted survey	Survey sufficient to exclude
Deyeuxia appressa	E1	yes	unlikely	Dec	Oct, Feb	no
Epacris purpurascens var. purpurascens	V	no	unlikely	Sept-Oct	Oct, Feb	yes
Grammitis stenophylla	E1	no	low	All months	Oct, Feb	yes
Leptospermum deanei	V	no	low	Oct–Nov	Oct, Feb	yes
Persoonia mollis subsp. maxima	V	no	unlikely	All months	Oct, Feb	yes
Rhodamnia rubescens	CE	no	unlikely	All months	Oct, Feb	yes
Rhodomyrtus psidioides	CE	no	unlikely	All months	Oct, Feb	yes
Syzygium paniculatum	E	no	low	April–June	Oct, Feb	no - but see comments below

Table 2.4 – Survey adequacy for species credit species (flora)

Fauna survey limitations

Diurnal birds

General bird surveys were conducted during three one-hour sessions on different days but all surveys were in the middle of the day, which is not an optimum time for bird surveys. There were no targeted diurnal bird surveys conducted for threatened cockatoos such as the Gang-Gang Cockatoo or Glossyblack Cockatoo, therefore, these species cannot be ruled out.

Bats

Further bat recorder deployment is needed along the escarpment to rule out the presence of cave breeding bats.

Nocturnal birds

All nocturnal bird survey was conducted in a single night, which does not take into consideration the huge number of environmental variables that could have led to certain species being present and/or detected on that night.

Arboreal and terrestrial mammals

All mammal survey was conducted in a single afternoon and night, which does not take into consideration the huge number of environmental variables that could have led to certain species being present and/or detected on that day/night.

Habitat trees

Hollow-dependent threatened species were not recorded during survey. However, not all hollows suitable for roosting/denning/breeding by threatened fauna within the development footprint have been recorded and stag-watched.

Candidate species

The BAM-C has identified a list of threatened fauna species credit species that have potential habitat associated with the recorded PCTs in the development footprint (refer to Table 4.3 for this full list). Species credit species require survey to rule out presence on site otherwise these species must be assumed to be present and will generate subsequent credits for offsetting.

Following a habitat assessment of the site and surrounding study area, as well as the elimination of select species where breeding habitat is absent, the following species require seasonal survey.

Table 2.5 – Survey adequacy for species credit species (fauna)

			Potential to	Survey adequacy			
Common name	BC Act	Potential SAII entity	occur (presence status) / Habitat	Defined survey period (TBDC)	Conducted survey	Survey sufficient to exclude	
Glossy Black-Cockatoo (breeding)	V	no	yes	Jan-Sept	Oct	No	
Eastern Pygmy Possum	V	no	yes	Oct-March	N/A	No	
Southern Myotis	V	no	yes	Oct-March	Oct and Feb	No	
Green and Golden Bell Frog	Е	no	yes	Nov-March	N/A	No	
Powerful Owl (breeding)	V	no	yes	May-August	Oct	No	
Barking Owl (breeding)	V	no	yes	May-Dec	Oct	No	
Masked Owl (breeding)	V	no	yes	May-Aug	Oct	No	
Gang-gang Cockatoo (breeding)	V	no	yes	Oct-Jan	Oct and Feb	No	
Squirrel Glider	V	no	yes	All year	Oct	No	
Red-crowned Toadlet	V	no	yes	All year	N/A	No	
Large-eared Pied Bat	V	yes	yes	Nov-Jan	Oct and Feb	No	
Little Bentwing-bat (breeding)	V	yes	yes	Dec-Feb	Oct and Feb	No	
Large Bent-winged Bat (breeding)	V	yes	yes	Dec-Feb	Oct and Feb	No	
Little Eagle (breeding)	V	no	yes	Aug-Oct	Oct and Feb	Yes	
Koala (breeding) – species	E1	no	yes	All year	Oct and Feb	yes	



3. SURVEY RESULTS

3.1 Flora results

3.1.1 Native vegetation extent

The native vegetation to be impacted measures 1.32 ha. This is a combination of impacts from building footprints, internal driveways, and APZs.

3.1.2 Flora species

The plants observed within the vegetation communities of the study area are listed in the Table 3.1 below.

Family	Scientific name	Plot 1	Plot 2	Plot 3	Plot 4	
Trees		% foliage cover				
Myrtaceae	Angophora costata			30		
Sterculiaceae	Brachychiton acerifolius		1	0.1		
Cunoniaceae	Ceratopetalum apetalum		0.5			
Myrtaceae	Eucalyptus pilularis	2	3			
Myrtaceae	Eucalyptus resinifera	21				
Myrtaceae	Eucalyptus saligna	3				
Moraceae	Ficus rubiginosa		5	8	50	
Phyllanthaceae	Glochidion ferdinandi	0.5	0.5	5	3	
Proteaceae	Grevillea robusta			4		
Myrtaceae	Lophostemon confertus				8	
Oleaceae	Notelaea longifolia		0.5			
Shrubs						
Rutaceae	Acronychia oblongifolia	5				
Proteaceae	Banksia spinulosa				1	
Elaeocarpaceae	Elaeocarpus reticulatus		0.5			
Malvaceae	Hibiscus heterophyllus		0.5			
Pittosporaceae	Pittosporum undulatum	2	1	20	4	
Podocarpaceae	Podocarpus spinulosus		0.5			
Palms						
Arecaceae	Archontophoenix cunninghamiana			0.1		
Doryanthaceae	Doryanthes excelsa			3	4	
Arecaceae	Livistona australis		0.5			
Vines						
Lauraceae	Cassytha pubescens			2		
Luzuriagaceae	Eustrephus latifolius		0.5			
Dilleniaceae	Hibbertia dentata			0.1		
Rubiaceae	Morinda jasminoides		0.5			
Smilacaceae	Smilax glyciphylla		0.5			

Table 3.1 – Flora observations within the study area

Family	Scientific name	Plot 1	Plot 2	Plot 3	Plot 4
Grass & grass-lik	e				
Poaceae	Cynodon dactylon			4	
Cyperaceae	Cyperus gracilis				40
Poaceae	Entolasia stricta			2	
Cyperaceae	Lepidosperma laterale			0.1	
Lomandraceae	Lomandra longifolia		0.5	3	1
Poaceae	Microlaena stipoides			2	5
Poaceae	Oplismenus aemulus	0.5	0.5	3	15
Poaceae	Poa affinis			0.1	
Forbs					
Commelinaceae	Commelina cyanea	0.5		1	
Phormiaceae	Dianella caerulea			1	
Convolvulaceae	Dichondra repens	0.5			1
Oxalidaceae	Oxalis perennans				0.1
Solanaceae	Solanum americanum				0.5
Ferns					
Adiantaceae	Adiantum aethiopicum			4	
Adiantaceae	Adiantum hispidulum		0.5		
Aspleniaceae	Asplenium aethiopicum		0.5	0.1	
Dicksoniaceae	Calochlaena dubia			8	
Cyatheaceae	Cyathea leichhardtiana		0.5		
Davalliaceae	Nephrolepis cordifolia		0.5		
Dennstaedtiaceae	Pteridium esculentum			0.1	
High-threat exotion	s				
Basellaceae	Anredera cordifolia	0.5	0.5		
Apocynaceae	Araujia sericifera			2	
Asparagaceae	Asparagus aethiopicus	0.5	1	1	0.1
Poaceae	Axonopus fissifolius				3
Asteraceae	Bidens pilosa		0.5	0.1	0.1
Asparagaceae	Chlorophytum comosum			4	
Lauraceae	Cinnamomum camphora	2	0.5	8	
Rosaceae	Cotoneaster spp.	0.5			
Poaceae	Ehrharta erecta	0.5		3	2
Fabaceae	Erythrina crista-galli	3			
Araliaceae	Hedera helix	0.5			0.1
Convolvulaceae	Ipomoea cairica	0.5	0.5	0.1	
Verbenaceae	Lantana camara			0.1	
Oleaceae	Ligustrum lucidum	2	2	1	3
Oleaceae	Ligustrum sinense	0.5	0.5		
Ochnaceae	Ochna serrulata	0.5	2	2	1
Oleaceae	Olea europaea	0.5		1	
Arecaceae	Phoenix canariensis			2	
Commelinaceae	Tradescantia fluminensis		1	5	

3.1.3 Plant community types (PCTs)

Evidence used to identify a PCT: Zones 1 & 2

Recorded native species within plots 1–3 were entered into the BioNet Vegetation Classification Tool, along with Interim Biogeographic Regionalisation for Australia (IBRA) subregion (Pittwater). This produced a shortlist of PCTs for each plot, the top 5 of which are reproduced in Table 3.2. For each of these plots, the top ranked PCT is PCT 1841. This PCT is a close match for the remnant vegetation on site, with canopy diagnostic such as *Angophora costata, Eucalyptus pilularis* and *Eucalyptus saligna* present. The landscape position and underlying geology is also correct: sandstone gullies and sheltered slopes enriched by clay material. PCT 1841 is the best-fit PCT and has been assigned to Zone 1.

Zone 2 appears to be mostly comprised of planted native vegetation, although there are several plants representative of the indigenous vegetation. Plot 4 within Zone 2 was located within mostly planted vegetation, so was not used to determine PCT. It is reasonable to assume that the original vegetation within Zone 2 would have been similar to that within Zone 1. As such, we have also assigned this zone to PCT 1841.

It is noted that the PCTs mapped by OEH, *Keystone Ecological* and *Eco Logical Australia*, 1776 and 1778, have not been selected for Zones 1 and 2. PCT 1776 (Coastal Enriched Sandstone Dry Forest) does not rank highly among the shortlisted PCTs, ranking equal 22nd (Plot 1), equal 11th (Plot 2) and equal 9th (Plot 3). It is classed as a Sydney Coastal Dry Sclerophyll Forest, whereas the vegetation observed is aligned to a Wet Sclerophyll vegetation class. PCT 1778 (Coastal Sandstone Foreshores Forest) is a better match, ranking 2nd in each shortlist for Plots 2 and 3, and equal 6th for plot 1. It too is classed as Sydney Coastal Dry Sclerophyll Forest, although it is described as containing many mesic species. Although a potential match, it is considered that PCT 1841 is the correct PCT for Zones 1 and 2 as it consistently ranks highest based on floristic analysis of all plot data through the BVCT. As noted in Section 4.1, our determination of PCT 1841 is based on detailed assessment of plot data using the BioNet Vegetation Classification tool, which is the industry-accepted method and required under the BAM. The determination by *Keystone* and *Eco Logical* does not provide detailed justification, nor a shortlist of potential PCTs for each vegetation zone, and appears to generally follow the mapping by OEH (2016).

Zone	PCT ranking	PCT no.	PCT name d					
			Plot 1					
	1	1841	Coastal enriched sandstone moist forest	5				
	2	1237	Blue Gum high forest	4				
4 9 9	=3	1281	Sydney Turpentine - Ironbark forest	4				
1&2	=3	1795	Coastal flats Swamp Mahogany forest	4				
	=3	1915	Coastal flats tall moist forest	4				
	Plot 2							
	1	1841	Coastal enriched sandstone moist forest	8				

Table 3.2 – PCT shortlist

Zone	PCT ranking	PCT no.	PCT name				
	2	1778	Coastal sandstone foreshores forest	7			
	=3	1237	Blue Gum high forest	6			
	=3	1621	Smooth-barked Apple open forest on coastal lowlands of the Central Coast	6			
	=3	1625	Red Bloodwood - Sydney Peppermint - Podocarpus spinulosus shrubby open forest of the southern Central Coast	6			
	=3	1780	Coastal sandstone riparian forest	6			
	=3	1793	Coastal Sand Bangalay Forest	6			
	=3	1795	Coastal flats Swamp Mahogany forest	6			
	=3	1833 Coastal escarpment littoral rainforest		6			
	=3	1915	Coastal flats tall moist forest	6			
			Plot 3				
	1	1841	Coastal enriched sandstone moist forest	12			
	=2	1183	Smooth-barked Apple - Sydney Peppermint - Turpentine heathy open forest on plateaux areas of the Sydney Basin Bioregion	11			
	=2	1778	Coastal sandstone foreshores forest	11			
	=4	1793	Coastal Sand Bangalay Forest	9			
	=4	1845	845 Coastal shale-sandstone forest				

Rainforest vegetation outside of subject land:

A small area of rainforest vegetation occurs in the far south west of Lot 3. As this vegetation is outside of the subject land and will not be impacted, no vegetation zone has been applied to this vegetation in accordance with the BAM. As no detailed flora survey was undertaken in that portion of the site, this vegetation has been assigned to PCT 1828 following the designation by previous mapping by OEH (2016), Keystone Ecological (2019) and EcoLogical Australia (2019). PCT 1828 is associated with the *Hygrocybeae Community of Lane Cove Bushland Park in the Sydney Basin Bioregion* which is listed as Critically Endangered under the *BC Act*, but is geographically constrained to Lane Cove Bushland Park and Osborne Park, which are close by but outside the subject lots. The proposal will not impact on this TEC.

PCT code	PCT name	Vegetation formation	Vegetation class	% Cleared	Area within development site (ha)	TEC status
1841	Coastal enriched sandstone moist forest	Wet Sclerophyll Forests (Shrubby sub- formation);	North Coast Wet Sclerophyll Forests	67	1.21 on site, 0.93 to be impacted	no associated TEC
1828	Coastal sandstone gallery rainforest	Rainforests;	Littoral Rainforests;	6	0.03 on site, none to be impacted	Hygrocybeae Community

3.1.4 Vegetation descriptions of observed communities

The following vegetation communities were identified within the subject land through onground vegetation survey.

Zone 1 – PCT 1841 - Coastal enriched sandstone moist forest – remnant / unmanaged

This is the primary vegetation community on the site, occurring in the south eastern and south western portions of the site. It represents the majority of the remnant vegetation present and is in a moderate condition, with good diversity of native understorey species and a moderate abundance of exotics.



Photo 3.1 – Zone 1: PCT 1841 (remnant / unmanaged) in the location pf BAM plot 3

Canopy – Angophora costata, Eucalyptus pilularis, Eucalyptus resinifera and Eucalyptus saligna providing 20–30% Projected Foliage Cover (PFC).

Mid-storey – Pittosporum undulatum, Glochidion ferdinandi, Brachychiton acerifolius, Archontophoenix cunninghamiana, Doryanthes excelsa, Calochlaena dubia, Cassytha pubescens and Hibbertia dentata providing 20–40% PFC. Exotic species are abundant in places, and include Hedera helix, Ipomoea cairica, Lantana camara, Ligustrum lucidum, Ligustrum sinense, Ochna serrulata, Olea europaea and Phoenix canariensis.

Groundcovers – Adiantum aethiopicum, Asplenium aethiopicum, Pteridium esculentum, Commelina cyanea, Dianella caerulea, Cynodon dactylon, Oplismenus aemulus, Lomandra Iongifolia, Lepidosperma laterale, Poa affinis, Entolasia stricta and Microlaena stipoides providing 1–20% PFC. Exotic ground covers include species such as Tradescantia fluminensis.

Zone 2 – PCT 1841 - Coastal enriched sandstone moist forest – planted/managed

This vegetation is comprised mostly of planted native trees and shrubs. It is likely that some of these are remnant or self-established plants from the indigenous, remnant vegetation, but it is not possible to distinguish which are planted or not with great level of certainty. The understorey is highly managed and contains a lot of mown lawn.



Photo 3.2 – Zone 2: PCT 1841 (managed / planted) in the north east of the site within Plot 4

Canopy – species include Ficus rubiginosa, Eucalyptus pilularis, E. microcorys, E. sideroxylon and Stenocarpus sinuatus providing up to 50% PFC.

Mid-storey – Syzygium smithii, Callistemon spp., Melia azedarach, Leptospermum sp., Banksia spp. and Cupaniopsis anacardioides providing up to 5% PFC.

Groundcovers – *Cyperus gracilis, Oplismenus aemulus, Lomandra longifolia* and *Microlaena stipoides* providing up to 60% PFC.

Exotic vegetation
Exotic and non-native trees and shrubs are scattered through out the managed portions of the subject land. Species include *Cinnamomum camphora, Corymbia citriodora, Cupressus* spp., *Phoenix canariensis, Pinus radiata, Jacaranda mimosifolia, Camelia japonica, Liquidambar styraciflua* and *Jacaranda mimosifolia*. As this vegetation lacks native species, it does not need to be assigned to a vegetation zone or PCT.



Figure 3.1 – exotic vegetation in the north of the subject land.

PCT 1828 Coastal sandstone gallery rainforest (outside subject land)

This vegetation occurs outside the subject land in the far south west of the subject lot 3. This vegetation is typically dominated by *Ceratopetalum apetalum*, with a scattered cover of small trees in the sub-canopy layer, usually comprising *Callicoma serratifolia, Acmena smithii, Tristaniopsis laurina* and tree ferns (*Cyathea* spp.).



Photo 3.3 – vegetation close to PCT 1828 - Coastal sandstone gallery rainforest in the south west of lot 3

3.1.5 Vegetation integrity assessment

A vegetation integrity assessment is an assessment on the site's condition. Vegetation patches are broken into zones of roughly equal quality and then surveyed by transect plots. The number of required transect plots is dependent upon the size of the zone.

Vegetation zone area (ha)	Minimum number of plots/transects
<2	1 plot/transect
>2-5	2 plots/transects
>5-20	3 plots /transects
>20-50	4 plots/transects
>50-100	5 plots/transects
>100-250	6 plots/transects
>250-1000	7 plots/transects; more plots may be needed if the condition of the vegetation is variable across the zone
>1000	8 plots/transects; more plots may be needed if the condition of the vegetation is variable across the zone

Once data from the transect plot has been collected, the composition of native plant species per growth form is assessed, along with numbers of stems, percentages of exotic or high threat exotic species present, number and sizes of Eucalypt and non-Eucalypt tree stems, litter cover, rock cover, cryptogram cover, hollows and fallen logs. Therefore the vegetation integrity assessment is a measure of composition, structure and function.

The breakdown of PCTs and zones is shown on Figure 3.2. Impacted areas (the development footprint) are shown cross-hatched. Figure 3.2 shows the location of the plots in relation to the impacted areas.

The vegetation integrity score is obtained using equations and weightings based upon a number of entities to calculate scores for composition, structure and function, for an overall current vegetation integrity score.

Table 3.4 – Current vegetation integrity score

Vegetation zone name	Area (ha)	Composition condition score	Structure condition score	Function condition score	Current vegetation integrity score
1841_remnant	0.64	17.4	23.4	74.3	31.2
1841_managed	0.29	19.6	48	52.8	36.7

The future vegetation integrity score is measured assuming there will be no vegetation retained within, and to 2 m from, the building footprint and driveway. These areas will have a future vegetation integrity score of zero.

In the areas within the APZ it is assumed that there will be limited vegetation retained in compliance with Inner Protection Area (IPA) APZ standards. The *Standards for Asset Protection Zones* (RFS, 2005) provides the following vegetation maintenance guidelines for IPAs:

Fuel loads within the IPA are to be maintained so they do not exceed 4t/ha.

Trees are to be maintained to ensure;

- Canopy cover does not exceed 15%
- Trees (at maturity) do not touch or overhang the building
- Tree canopies (at maturity) should be well spread out and not form a continuous canopy
- Lower limbs should be removed up to a height of 2 m above ground
- Preference should be given to smooth barked and evergreen trees.

Shrubs are to be maintained to ensure;

- Large discontinuities or gaps in vegetation
- Shrubs should not be located under trees
- Shrubs should not form more than 10% of ground cover
- Clumps of shrubs should be separated from exposed windows and doors by a distance of at least twice the height of vegetation.

Grass is to be maintained to ensure:

- A height of 10 cm or less
- Leaves and debris are removed.

Based on these guidelines, we have assumed the following is estimating future VI scores for the APZ management zones:

- Trees: richness decrease to 3, cover decrease to 15
- Shrubs: richness decrease to 2, cover decrease to 5 (Zone 1
- Grasses: richness maintained at 2.3 (Zone 1) or 4 (Zone 2), cover maintained to 5.2 (Zone 1) and 61 (Zone 2)
- Forbs: richness maintained at 1.7 (Zone 1) or 3 (Zone 2), cover maintained at 1 (Zone 1) and 1.6 (Zone 2)

- Ferns: richness maintained at 1 (Zone 1) or 0 (Zone 2), cover decrease to 1 (Zone 1) and 0 (Zone 2)
- Other: richness decreased/maintained at 1, cover decrease to 1.
- Large trees: decrease to 1
- Litter cover: decrease to 40%
- Corse woody debris: decrease to 0 m
- Hollows: decrease to 1 per plot
- Tree stem classes: decrease to 3 (Zone 1) or maintained at 2 (Zone 2)
- High threat weed cover: decrease to 5%

It is important to note that the BAM-C only allows future integrity scores within a certain range which are dependent on benchmark values and plot data. This is the cause of discrepancies in future richness and cover values between the vegetation zones presented above. Given the above estimates, the future vegetation integrity score will be above zero within the APZ as indicated in Table 3.5.

Vegetation zone name	Management zone	Area (ha)	Compos. condition score	Struct. condition score	Funct. condition score	Future VI score	Change in VI score	Total change in VI score
1841_remnant	Total impact	0.21	0	0	0	0	-31.2	21.2
	APZ	0.43	11	8.6	32.5	14.8	-16.4	-21.5
1841_managed	Total impact	0.13	0	0	0	0	-36.7	27.1
	APZ	0.16	19.6	9.9	27.2	17.4	-19.3	-27.1

Table 3.5 – Future Vegetation Integrity scores

3.2 Fauna results

Fauna species observed throughout the duration of fauna surveys are listed below.

Table 3.6 – Fauna recorded within the study area

Common name	Scientific name	Method observed
Birds		Oct 2021
Australian Magpie	Cracticus tibicen	0
Australian Raven	Corvus coronoides	WO
Australian White Ibis	Threskiornis molucca	0
Brown Gerygone	Gerygone mouki	W
Brush Turkey	Alectura lathami	0
Laughing Kookaburra	Dacelo novaeguineae	WO
Magpie-lark	Grallina cyanoleuca	WO
Masked Lapwing	Vanellus miles	WO
Noisy Miner	Manorina melanocephala	WO
Pied Currawong	Strepera graculina	WO
Rainbow Lorikeet	Trichoglossus haematodus	OW
Red Wattlebird	Anthochaera carunculata	WO
Rock Dove *	Columba livia	WO
Sulphur Crested Cockatoo	Cacatua galerita	OW
Welcome Swallow	Hirundo neoxena	OW
Mammals		
Black Rat *	Rattus rattus	0

Common name		Scientif	Scientific name				
Brown Rat *		Rattus n	Rattus norvegicus				
Common Brushtail Possu	Im	Trichosu	ırus vulpecula		0		
Common Ringtail Possun	n	Pseudoo	cheirus peregrinus		0		
Domesticated Dog *		Canis lu	pus familiaris		0		
Gould's Long-eared Bat		Nyctoph	ilus gouldii		U		
Grey-headed Flying Fox ^T	S	Pteropus	s poliocephalus		0		
Reptiles							
Delicate Skink		Lamprop	Lampropholis delicata				
Eastern Water Skink		Eulampr	us quoyii		0		
Amphibians							
Striped March Frog		Limnody	0				
Note: * indicates introduced species TS indicates threatened species MS indicates Migratory species All species listed are identified to a high level of certainty unless otherwise noted as: PR indicates species identified to a 'probable' level of certainty – more likely than not PO indicates species identified to a 'prosable' level of certainty – low-moderate level of confidence							
E - Nest/roost F- Tracks/scratchings FB - Burrow G - Crushed cones	H - Hair/feathers/ski K- Dead O - Observed OW- Obs & heard c	in all	P - Scat Q- Camera T - Trapped/netted U- Anabat/ultrasound	W - Heard ca X- In scat Y - Bone/teet Z- In raptor/o	all th/shell wl pellet		

3.3 Habitat results

3.3.1 Fauna habitat observations

The fauna habitats present within the site are identified within the following table.

Table 3.7 – Observed fauna habitat

			Торо	graphy					
Flat ✓	Gentle 🗸		Moderate	\checkmark	Steep	\checkmark		Drop-offs	\checkmark
		Ve	egetatio	on structu	ıre				
Closed Forest	Open Forest	\checkmark	Woodland	√ b	Heath			Grassland •	1
		D	isturba	nce histo	ory				
Fire		Under-s	crubbing	\checkmark		Cut and	fill work:	S	
Tree clearing ✓		Grazing							
			Soil la	ndscape					
DEPTH:	Deep	\checkmark	Moderate	e √	Sha	llow		Skeletal	
TYPE:	Clay	\checkmark	Loam		Sar	d √		Organic 🗸	
VALUE:	Surface for	aging ,	\checkmark	Sub-surface	e foraging	g √	Denn	ing/burrowing	
WATER RETENTION:	Well Draine	ed √	Damp / M	Moist ✓	Wat	er logged	\checkmark	Swamp / Soal	(
Rock habitat									
CAVES:	Large		Small	\checkmark	De	ер		Shallow 🗸	
CREVICES:	Large		Small	\checkmark	De	ep √		Shallow	
ESCARPMENTS:	Winter / lat	e sunny a	ispects	\checkmark	Sha	ded winter	/ late as	spects 🗸	
OUTCROPS:	High Surfa	ce Area H	lides	Med. Surfa	ce Area	Hides	Low S	urface Area Hide	es √
SCATTERED / ISOLATED:	High Surfa	ce Area H	lides	Med. Surfa	ce Area	Hides ✓	Low S	urface Area Hide	es √
Feed resources									
	Eucalypts	\checkmark		Corymbias			Melale	eucas √	
FLOWERING TREES.	Banksias			Acacias		\checkmark			
SEEDING TREES:	Allocasuari	inas		Conifers					
WINTER FLOWERING	C. maculat	а	E. crebra	a	E. g	loboidea		E. sideroxylon	

Topography							
EUCALYPTS:	A. costata 🗸	E. grandi	s	E. multicaulis		E. scias	
	E. robusta	E. teretic	ornis 🗸	E. agglomerata	a	E. siderophloia	
FLOWERING PERIODS:	Autumn	Winter	\checkmark	Spring 🗸		Summer 🗸	
OTHER:	Mistletoe	Figs / Fru	uit ✓	Sap / Manna		Termites	
Foliage protection							
UPPER STRATA:	Dense		Moderate	\checkmark	Sparse	• ✓	
MID STRATA:	Dense		Moderate		Sparse	, √	
PLANT / SHRUB LAYER:	Dense		Moderate	\checkmark	Sparse	• ✓	
GROUNDCOVERS:	Dense		Moderate	\checkmark	Sparse)	
Hollows / logs							
TREE HOLLOWS:	Large ✓		Medium	\checkmark	Small	\checkmark	
TREE HOLLOW TYPES	Spouts / branch 🗸	Trunk ✓	Broken Trunk	K Basal C	avities	Stags 🗸	
GROUND HOLLOWS:	Large		Medium	\checkmark	Small		
	l l	/egetati	on debris				
FALLEN TREES:	Large		Medium v	(Small	\checkmark	
FALLEN BRANCHES:	Large		Medium	\checkmark	Small	\checkmark	
LITTER:	Deep		Moderate	\checkmark	Shallov	N 🗸	
HUMUS:	Deep		Moderate		Shallow	N 🗸	
	Dr	rainage	catchment				
WATER BODIES	Wetland(s) Soa	ak(s)	Dam(s) Dr	rainage line(s) ✓	Cree	k(s) ✓ River(s)	
RATE OF FLOW:	Still		Slow 🗸		Rapid		
CONSISTENCY:	Permanent <pre></pre>		Perennial	-	Epherr	neral 🗸	
RUNOFF SOURCE:	Urban / Industrial	Parkland	\checkmark	Grazing		Natural 🗸	
RIPARIAN HABITAT:	High quality 🗸	Moderate	e quality 🗸	Low quality		Poor quality	
		Artificia	al habitat				
STRUCTURES:	Sheds		Infrastructure	\checkmark	Equipn	nent	
SUB-SURFACE	Pipe / culvert(s)		Tunnel(s)		Shaft(s	5)	
FOREIGN MATERIALS:	Sheet		Pile / refuse				

3.3.2 Habitat tree data

Significant habitat trees observed within the development footprint / study area are tabled below. Significant habitat trees are defined as trees containing large hollows suitable for use by owls and/or containing a number of good quality hollows typically consisting of more than one medium (10–30 cm) sized hollows. A tree may also be considered significant where evidence of use by select fauna is found such as glider sap feed tree, raptor nest, or owl roost.

We note that SHT2 is the only significant habitat tree within the subject land. The other three are outside of the subject land (Figure 3.2), but buffers from these tree contribute to species polygons used to assess credit requirements for assumed candidate species (see Section 4.3.2).

Tree no.	Scientific name	Common name	DBH (cm)	Height (m)	Spread (m)	Hollows & other habitat features recorded
SHT1	-	Stag	70	5	2.5	1x 20cm trunk hollow (2 m from ground)
SHT2	Eucalyptus pilularis	Black butt	60	8	6	2x 10-15cm spout hollow 2x 15-20cm branch spout 1x 20-30cm trunk hollow 1x 30-40cm trunk hollow (all are 3-4m above the ground)
SHT3	Eucalyptus pilularis	Black butt	100	12	8	1x 10cm branch spout 1x 10cm branch spout (3-4m above ground)
SHT4	Eucalyptus pilularis	Black butt	100	20	10	1x 25 cm trunk spout (approx. 12 m from ground)

Table 3.8 – Habitat tree data



Figure 3.2 – Flora and fauna survey effort and results



Figure 3.3 – Vegetation impacts

4. **BIODIVERSITY ASSESSMENT**

4.1 **Previous surveys and reports reviewed**

The following reports were examined and reviewed as part of this assessment to identify the potential vegetation communities and other threatened biodiversity with potential to occur for assessment.

Biodiversity Development Assessment Report for the proposed Greenwich Hospital Redevelopment, Keystone Ecological (January 2019)

Keystone Ecological conducted a Biodiversity Development Assessment Report for the proposed Greenwich Hospital Redevelopment in 2019. Flora surveys were undertaken by random meander and full floristic transects and quadrats in accordance with the Biodiversity Assessment Method 2017 (BAM 2017). Fauna survey employed call identification, habitat assessment, diurnal and nocturnal searches and searches for signs of animal activity. The fauna survey did not however conduct target searches for terrestrial mammals due to the perceived lack of suitable habitat and survey equipment vulnerability.

The flora survey was undertaken between July and December 2017.

Fauna survey was undertaken between November and December 2017.

PCTs identified:

- DSF04 = PCT 1776 Smooth-barked Apple Red Bloodwood Open Forest on enriched
- sandstone slopes around Sydney and the Central Coast;
- DSF06 = PCT 1778 Smooth-barked Apple Coast Banksia / Cheese Tree Open Forest on sandstone slopes on the foreshores of the drowned river valleys of Sydney; and
- RF02 = PCT 1828 Coachwood Lilly Pilly Water Gum Gallery Rainforest in sandstone gullies of the Sydney Basin

Recorded threatened fauna species:

- Pteropus poliocephalus Grey-headed Flying-fox
- Saccolaimus flaviventris Yellow-bellied Sheathtail-bat
- Chalinolobus dwyeri Large-eared Pied Bat (probable)

Recorded threatened flora species:

None recorded.

Greenwich Hospital Redevelopment Biodiversity Development Assessment Report, Eco Logical Australia (September 2019)

Eco Logical Australia conducted a Biodiversity Development Assessment Report for the proposed Greenwich Hospital Redevelopment in 2019. Target surveys were not undertaken during this assessment however, habitat assessment, vegetation mapping and assessment was undertaken following the methods described in the Biodiversity Assessment Method 2017.

PCTs identified

• PCT 1776 Smooth-barked Apple - Red Bloodwood open forest on enriched sandstone slopes around Sydney and the Central Coast moderate condition

- Vegetation Zone 2: PCT 1776 Smooth-barked Apple Red Bloodwood open forest on enriched sandstone slopes around Sydney and the Central Coast managed understorey
- Vegetation Zone 3: PCT 1778 Smooth-barked Apple Coast Banksia / Cheese Tree open forest on sandstone slopes on the foreshores of the drowned river valleys of Sydney
- Vegetation Zone 4: PCT 1828

No threatened flora or fauna species were recorded.

Comparison with current BDAR and assessment

It is noted differences between the current BDAR and the previous reports by *Keystone Ecological* and *Eco Logical Australia* are due to differences in the approach of identifying vegetation, assessing threatened species, and application of the BAM 2017 vs BAM 2020. The current BDAR has been prepared in accordance with the BAM 2020, utilising the BioNet Vegetation Classification Tool, and with consideration of the threatened species survey guidelines.

4.2 Flora

No threatened flora species were observed.

Species recorded within BAM plots are listed in Table 3.1.

4.2.1 State legislative flora matters

(a) Threatened flora species (NSW)

BC Act – no threatened flora species were recorded within the subject land.

(b) Endangered flora populations (NSW)

No endangered populations occur within the Lane Cove LGA.

(c) Threatened ecological communities (NSW)

No threatened ecological communities (TECs) were observed within the subject land.

(d) Ecosystem credit species

The BAM calculator did not predict any threatened flora species as ecosystem credit species.

(e) Species credit species

Based upon the BAM calculator and field surveys to date, the following predicted threatened species were considered as confirmed candidate species:

 Table 4.1 – Species credit species (flora)

				Potential to		Survey Adequacy			
Scientific name	BC Act	Potential SAII entity	Associated PCTs	occur (presence status)	Confirmed candidate species	Defined survey period (TBDC)	Actual Survey period	Survey Compliant (Yes/ No)	Presence
<i>Acacia prominens -</i> endangered population	E2	no	1841	no - outside defined LGAs	no	n/a	n/a	n/a	Absent (outside defined LGAs)
Camarophyllopsis kearneyi	E1	no	1841	no - geographically restricted; microhabitats absent	no	n/a	n/a	n/a	Absent (microhabit ats absent)
Deyeuxia appressa	E1	no	1841	unlikely	yes	Dec	Oct, Feb	no	Present (Assumed)
Epacris purpurascens var. purpurascens	V	no	1841	low	yes	Sept-Oct	Oct, Feb	yes	Absent (Survey)
Grammitis stenophylla	E1	no	1841	unlikely	yes	All months	Oct, Feb	yes	Absent (survey)
Grevillea shiressii	V	no	1841	no	no	n/a	n/a	n/a	Absent (outside defined LGA)
Hygrocybe anomala var. ianthinomarginata	V	no	1841	no - microhabitats absent	no	n/a	n/a	n/a	Absent (microhabit ats absent)
Leptospermum deanei	V	no	1841	low	yes	Oct–Nov	Oct, Feb	yes	Absent (survey)
Melaleuca biconvexa	V	no	1841	no - microhabitats absent	no	n/a	n/a	n/a	Absent (microhabit ats absent)
Persoonia mollis subsp. maxima	V	no	1841	unlikely	yes	All months	Oct, Feb	yes	Absent (survey)
Rhodamnia rubescens	CE	no	1841	unlikely	yes	All months	Oct, Feb	yes	Absent (survey)
Rhodomyrtus psidioides	CE	no	1841	unlikely	yes	All months	Oct, Feb	yes	Absent (survey)

				Potential to			Survey Adequacy	1	
Scientific name	BC Act	Potential SAII entity	Associated PCTs	occur (presence status)	Confirmed candidate species	Defined survey period (TBDC)	Actual Survey period	Survey Compliant (Yes/ No)	Presence
Syzygium paniculatum	Е	no	1841	low	yes	April–June	Oct, Feb	no - but see comments below	Absent (survey)
<i>Wahlenbergia multicaulis -</i> endangered population	E2	no	1841	no - outside defined LGAs	no	n/a	n/a	n/a	Absent (outside defined LGAs)

Exclusions based on distribution, geographic limitations and habitat features

Exclusion of species from consideration as candidate species follows Section 5.1 of the BAM. Candidate species can be excluded from further consideration if:

- The distribution of the species does not include the IBRA subregion within which the subject land is located
- the subject land is outside any geographic limitations of the species distribution based on information from the threatened biodiversity profile search webpage. If no geographic limitations are listed for the species, then this step is not applicable
- none of the habitat constraints for the species as provided in the TBDC are present in a vegetation zone or subject land.
- the species is a vagrant in the IBRA subregion.

After carrying out a field assessment, a candidate species can also be excluded if:

- the microhabitats required by a species are absent from the subject land (or specific vegetation zone).
- the habitat constraints or microhabitats are degraded to the point that the species is unlikely to use the subject land (or specific vegetation zones).

If a candidate species cannot be excluded based on the above criteria, targeted survey must be undertaken, the species assumed present or an expert report obtained that states that the species is unlikely to be present on the subject land or specific vegetation zones.

Excluded species are mentioned below:

Acacia prominens - endangered population

This endangered population is restricted to the LGAs of Hurstville and Kogarah (inclusive of Georges River LGA). The subject land is within the Lane Cove LGA and therefore is outside the distribution of this population.

Camarophyllopsis kearneyi

The TBDC and species final determination states that *Camarophyllopsis kearneyi* is known only from its type locality in Lane Cove Bushland Park. While the subject land is close to this park, it is outside of the park. Young (1999) states that this species grows along the banks of Gore Creek within gallery warm-temperate rainforest. The subject land contains neither creeks nor rainforest. This species can therefore be excluded as a candidate species due to being geographically restricted and a lack of features providing microhabitats for this species.

Melaleuca biconvexa

The TBDC and species profile webpage states that this species grows in damp places, often near streams or low-lying areas on alluvial soils of low slopes or sheltered aspects. The subject land is above an escarpment and does not contain damp or low-lying places providing suitable microhabitats for this species.

Hygrocybe anomala var. ianthinomarginata

The TBDC states that this species occurs in gallery warm temperate forests dominated by Lilly Pilly (*Acmena smithii*), Grey Myrtle (*Backhousia myrtifolia*), Cheese Tree (*Glochidion ferdinandi*) and Sweet Pittosporum (*Pittosporum undulatum*). Similar forest occurs in the far south west of the site outside of the subject land and will not be impacted. Vegetation within

Zones 1 and 2 does not match this specific vegetation and as such this species can be excluded as the subject land does not provide suitable microhabitats for this species..

Wahlenbergia multicaulis - endangered population

This endangered population is restricted to the LGAs of Auburn, Bankstown, Baulkham Hills, Canterbury, Hornsby, Parramatta and Strathfield. The subject land is within the Lane Cove LGA and therefore is outside the distribution of this population.

Syzygium paniculatum

The TBDC-defined survey period for this species is April-June. Targeted survey was undertaken in October and February, which is outside this period. Cultivated Svzvgium plants were recorded within the subject land, but these could all be determined as S. australe, or cultivars thereof, due to the leafy twigs possessing 4-wings, with the wings joining above each produce small pocket (as per Harden 1993 node to а and PlantNet: https://plantnet.rbgsyd.nsw.gov.au/cgi-bin/NSWfl.pl?page=nswfl&lvl=gn&name=Syzygium). It is therefore considered that sufficient survey has been conducted to demonstrate the absence of S. paniculatum within the subject land.

Species assumed present due to survey constraints

Deyeuxia appressa

This species is very rare grass and has only been recorded in two localities: first in 1930 at Herne Bay, Saltpan Creek, off the Georges River, south of Bankstown, then in 1941 from Killara, near Hornsby. There is very low probability that this species would be present on the subject land, but as virtually nothing is known about the ecology and habitat constraints required for this species, we cannot exclude as a candidate species. As survey has not been undertaken in December, in accordance with the BAM, we must assume presence. This species is assessed by count of individuals, rather than area, although the data deficient status of this species makes an estimate of count difficult. As there are only four specimens ever recorded and the subject site is moderately to highly disturbed we consider that, if present, there would only be a few individuals within the site. Subsequently, we have assumed a conservative five individuals in Zone 1. As Zone 2 is largely derived and highly modified, it is very unlikely to support indigenous, threatened flora and as such we have not assumed any *D. appressa* within Zone 2.

Deyeuxia appressa is a potential SAII species – Appendix 1 provides assessment of SAII entities, but targeted survey in December is required to allow for accurate determination of SAII on this species.

4.3 Fauna

All fauna species recorded during surveys, key fauna habitat observations, and habitat tree data are provided in Section 3.

4.3.1 Key fauna habitat

Most notable habitat features for threatened fauna species considered with most potential to occur (see Sections 4.4.4 & 4.4.5) include:

- Large hollows (30+cm)
- Medium hollows (10-30cm)
- Small hollows (<10cm)
- Rock on rock habitat

- Shallow caves and overhangs
- Diverse seasonal flowering opportunities for nectivorous species.
- Winter flowering trees

A complete assessment of the location of habitat trees and the size of hollows was not conducted as part of surveys undertaken. Only the approximate size range and quality of hollows were noted during site visits.

4.3.2 State legislative fauna matters

(a) Threatened fauna species (NSW)

One (1) state listed threatened fauna species – Grey-headed Flying-fox (*Pteropus poliocephalus*) – was recorded within the development footprint during surveys.

(b) Endangered fauna populations (NSW)

There are no endangered fauna populations within the Lane Cove LGA.

(c) State Environmental Planning Policy (Biodiversity and Conservation) 2021 – Koala Habitat Protection

Chapter 4 of State Environmental Planning Policy (Biodiversity and Conservation) 2021 (Koala Habitat Protection) applies to land within LGAs listed under Schedule 2 of the Policy. As the study area falls under the Lane Cove LGA, which is not listed under Schedule 2, it is considered that this SEPP does not apply to this development proposal. Therefore, the overarching legislative document relating to Koalas will be the *BC Act*.

(d) Ecosystem credit species

Based upon the BAM calculator and field surveys to date, the following predicted threatened fauna species were considered as candidate species:

Common name	BC Act	Excluded	Confirmed predicted species	Associated PCT
Barking Owl (foraging)	V		Yes	1841
Dusky Woodswallow	V		Yes	1841
Eastern Coastal Free-tailed Bat	V		Yes	1841
Eastern False Pipistrelle	V		Yes	1841
Gang-gang Cockatoo (foraging)	V		Yes	1841
Greater Broad- nosed Bat	V		Yes	1841
Grey-headed Flying- fox (foraging)	V		Yes	1841
Large Bent-winged Bat (foraging)	V		Yes	1841
Little Bent-winged Bat (foraging)	V		Yes	1841
Little Eagle (foraging)	V		Yes	1841
Little Lorikeet	V		Yes	1841

Table 4.2 – Ecosystem credit species (fauna)

Common name	BC Act	Excluded	Confirmed predicted species	Associated PCT
Masked Owl (foraging)	V		Yes	1841
Osprey (foraging)	V		Yes	1841
Powerful Owl (foraging)	V		Yes	1841
Spotted-tailed Quoll	V		Yes	1841
Varied Sittella	V		Yes	1841
Yellow-bellied Sheathtail-bat	V		Yes	1841
Rosenberg's Goanna	V		Yes	1841
Superb Fruit-dove	V		Yes	1841
Rose-crowned Fruit- dove	V		Yes	1841
Koala (foraging)	Е		Yes	1841
Glossy Black- Cockatoo (foraging)	V	Yes		1841
Swift Parrot (foraging)	Е		Yes	1841
Regent Honeyeater (foraging)	E4A		Yes	1841

Excluded species justification (ecosystem credit species):

Glossy Black-Cockatoo

The site does not support foraging habitat provided by *Allocasuarina* or *Casuarina* trees, which is the single habitat constraint for this species when assessed for ecosystem credits (TBDC).

(e) Species credit species

Based upon the BAM calculator and field surveys to date, the following predicted threatened fauna species were considered as confirmed candidate species:

Table 4.3 – Species credit species (fauna)

				S			
Common name	BC Act	Associated PCTs	Confirmed candidate species	Defined survey period (TBDC)	Actual survey period	Survey sufficient to exclude	Presence
Red-crowned Toadlet	V	1841	Yes	All months	N/A	No (no frog survey undertaken)	Present (Assumed)
Green and Golden Bell Frog	E1	1841	Yes	Nov-March	N/A	No (no frog survey undertaken)	Present (Assumed)
Powerful Owl (breeding)	V	1841	Yes	May-August	Oct	No (outside survey period)	Present (Assumed)
Barking Owl (breeding)	V	1841	Yes	May-Dec	Oct	No (survey effort not sufficient)	Present (Assumed)
Masked Owl (breeding)	V	1841	Yes	May-Aug	Oct	No	Present (Assumed)
Gang-gang Cockatoo (breeding)	V	1841	Yes	Oct-Jan	Oct and Feb	No (survey effort not sufficient)	Present (Assumed)
Glossy Black-Cockatoo (breeding)	V	1841	Yes	Jan-Sept	Oct and Feb	No (survey effort not sufficient)	Present (Assumed)
Eastern Pygmy Possum	V	1841	Yes	Oct-March	nil	No (no trapping undertaken)	Present (Assumed)
Squirrel Glider – species	V	1841	Yes	All year	nil	No (no trapping undertaken)	Present (Assumed)
Squirrel Glider – endangered population	E2	1841	No (outside geographic limits)	N/A	N/A	N/A	Absent (site outside geographic limits)
Large-eared Pied Bat	V	1841	Yes	Nov-Jan	Oct and Feb	No	Present (Assumed)
Southern Myotis	V	1841	Yes	Oct-Mar	Oct and Feb	No (survey effort not sufficient)	Present (Assumed)
Little Bent-winged Bat (breeding)	V	1841	Yes	Dec-Feb	Oct and Feb	No (survey effort not sufficient)	Present (Assumed)
Large Bent-winged Bat (breeding)	V	1841	Yes	Dec-Feb	Oct and Feb	No (survey effort not sufficient)	Present (Assumed)
Grey-headed Flying-fox (breeding)	V	1841	No	N/A	N/A	N/A	Absent (habitat constraints)
Osprey (breeding)	V	1841	No	N/A	N/A	N/A	Absent (habitat constraints)
Little Eagle (breeding)	V	1841	Yes	Aug-Oct	Oct and Feb	Yes	Absent (survey)
Regent Honeyeater (breeding)	E4A	1841	No	N/A	N/A	N/A	Absent (habitat constraints)

				S			
Common name	BC Act	Associated PCTs	Confirmed candidate species	Defined survey period (TBDC)	Actual survey period	Survey sufficient to exclude	Presence
Swift Parrot (breeding)	E1	1841	No	N/A	N/A	N/A	Absent (habitat constraints)
Koala (breeding) – species	E1	1841	Yes	All year	Oct and Feb	yes	Absent (Survey)
Koala – endangered population	E2	1841	No (outside geographic limits)	N/A	N/A	N/A	Absent (site outside geographic limits)

Excluded species justification (species credit species):

• Grey-headed Flying Fox

TBDC habitat constraint is presence of breeding camp. No breeding camps were detected on site or nearby.

• Swift Parrot

The site is not mapped as containing important habitat for this species on the BAM - Important Areas (DPIE) mapping.

• Regent Honeyeater

The site is not mapped as containing important habitat for this species on the BAM - Important Areas (DPIE) mapping.

• Squirrel Glider on Barrenjoey Peninsula, north of Bushrangers Hill – endangered population

The site is placed outside of the geographic limits of the population, which are Barrenjoey Peninsula, north of Bushrangers Hill (TBDC).

• Koala in the Pittwater LGA – endangered population

The site is not within the Pittwater LGA and is therefore outside the geographic limits of this population (TBDC).

Species assumed present due to survey constraints

• Red-crowned Toadlet; Green and Golden Bell Frog

Insufficient survey has been undertaken for these frogs so they must be assumed present. Keystone Ecological conducted acoustic recording of frog calls over 6 days in November and December 2017, but the use of acoustic recorders is not recommended for the red-crowned toadlet as the calls of this species are relatively soft and difficult to distinguish from species of the same genus (DPIE 2020b). Additionally, while acoustic recording can be used for Green and Golden Bell Frog, recorders must be placed on site for a minimum of 14 days (DPIE 2020b).

• Powerful Owl (breeding), Barking Owl (breeding), Masked Owl (breeding), Gang-gang Cockatoo (breeding), Glossy Black-Cockatoo (breeding)

Sufficient survey has not been undertaken to establish presence of breeding within recorded tree hollows for these species. Significant Habitat Tree (SHT) 4 provides suitable breeding hollows for all these species, while SHT 1 and 2 provide suitable breeding hollows for the three owl species only. Stag-watching of these trees is required in the appropriate period over multiple nights (Tables 2.5 and 4.3 provide survey period).

• Eastern Pygmy Possum, Squirrel Glider – species

Trapping is needed to assess presence of these species.

4.4 Watercourses, GDEs & Wetlands

4.4.1 Endangered wetland communities

A number of wetland communities have been listed as TECs under the *BC Act*. We note that 'wetlands' are included in the definition of 'waterfront lands' in accordance with the *Water Management Act 2000 (WM Act*) due to their inclusion in the definition of a 'lake' under the same Act.

No endangered wetland communities were present within the development footprint and therefore a referral to NRAR is not required for impacts on waterfront land.

4.4.2 Groundwater dependent ecosystems (GDEs)

Groundwater dependent ecosystems (GDEs) are communities of plants, animals and other organisms whose extent and life processes are dependent on groundwater. Some examples of ecosystems which depend on groundwater are:

- wetlands;
- red gum forests, vegetation on coastal sand dunes and other terrestrial vegetation;
- ecosystems in streams fed by groundwater;
- limestone cave systems;
- springs; and
- hanging valleys and swamps.

GDEs were not observed within the development footprint and therefore the policy does not require any further consideration. A referral to NRAR is not required for impacts on waterfront land.

4.4.3 Watercourses

Water Management (General) Regulation 2018 hydroline spatial data maps Gore Creek to the south west of the site, which is a second-order stream at that point (Figure 4.1). The site is outside the required 20 m riparian buffer for second order streams under the *Natural Resources Access Regulator (NRAR) Act 2017* and therefore the proposal does not require controlled activity approval by NRAR (Figure 1.5).

Although not a stream, Lane Cove LEP recognises a riparian zone along the western boundary of the development site (Figure 4.2). This riparian zone surrounds a drainage line containing a stormwater outlet and gully that connects to Gore Creek off site.

Watercourse assessment has not been undertaken as part of this BDAR, but *Keystone Ecological* (2017) report that this feature comprises two main parts, above and below a low escarpment. Above the escarpment, the upper portion is a shallow and narrow depression at the base of the west facing slope, situated between the development site and neighbouring properties, and was not observed to carry water. The lower portion, is fed by a stormwater pipe that was observed to carry water. Below the escarpment is in a seemingly more natural condition, with a steep and rocky fall into Gore Creek. However, this area has also been highly disturbed and modified by the installation of the stormwater outlet, and disturbances associated with the filling of the estuary and channelizing of Gore Creek.

The Land Cove LEP (2009) states that development consent must not be granted for development on land to which this clause applies unless the consent authority has considered the impact of the proposed development on the land and any opportunities for rehabilitation of aquatic and riparian vegetation and habitat on that land.



Figure 4.1 – Nearby mapped watercourses



Figure 4.2 – Lane Cove LEP Riparian Land Map (2009)

While the proposal will encroach on this mapped 'riparian zone' it will not directly impact on the actual riparian features associated with Gore Creek. Within the area of the drainage line, weed and sediment control and restoration works are to be completed as part of the VMP, which will mitigate any indirect impacts associated with the construction and development phases of the proposal. Appropriate stormwater control is to be implemented to avoid any increases in sediment, nutrient, pollution and runoff into Gore Creek.

4.4.4 State Environmental Planning Policy (Resilience and Hazards) 2021 – Division 1 Coastal wetlands and littoral rainforests area

The State Environmental Planning Policy (Resilience and Hazards) 2021 maps areas of coastal wetland and littoral rainforest that need consideration under Division 1 of this SEPP. As there are no coastal wetlands, littoral rainforest, or proximity areas to these features within the site, no further consideration of this SEPP is required.



Figure 4.3 – Coastal wetlands and littoral rainforests area map

5. IMPACT ASSESSMENT

5.1 BOS thresholds

This project is a State Significant Development, which automatically triggers offsetting under the BOS, and therefore the BOS threshold criteria do not need consideration.

5.2 Avoidance and minimisation actions

The following strategies and <u>actions</u> have been undertaken to either avoid or minimise impacts on biodiversity values:

- Impacts from clearing native vegetation and threatened species habitat has been minimised by locating the proposal in areas:
 - within existing building footprints
 - o cleared areas
 - o areas of low-condition vegetation
- Minimise clearing particularly on steeply-sloped areas in the far south west of the site
- Avoidance of significant habitat tree SHT2, which provides potential habitat for threatened owls
- Avoidance of direct impacts on PCT 1828 Coastal sandstone gallery rainforest
- Avoidance of rock features providing potential roosting and breeding habitat for threatened microbat species

5.3 Potential ecological impacts

The direct, indirect and cumulative ecological impacts have been considered in respect to recorded biodiversity, threatening processes and extent of impact as a result of the proposed works:

5.3.1 Prescribed impacts

Table 5.1 – Prescribed impacts

Feature	Present (yes / no)	Description of feature characteristics and location	Potential impact	Threatened species or community using or dependent on feature	Section of the BAR where prescribed impact is addressed
Karst, caves, crevices, cliffs, rocks or other geological features of significance	yes	Rock overhangs in far SW of site; rock outcropping in S and SE of site	None likely – rock overhangs are outside the subject land; rock outcrops are within the APZ but outside the development footprint so will not be impacted.	Cave-breeding microbats have potential to use the rock overhangs. No direct impact is proposed on these features, but breeding habitat has been assumed for credit	Credit assessment of candidate threatened microbats for is addressed in Section 4.3.2(e). AS there will be no impacts on these features, no further assessment

Feature	Present (yes / no)	Description of feature characteristics and location	Potential impact	Threatened species or community using or dependent on feature	Section of the BAR where prescribed impact is addressed
				calculations based on inadequate survey.	as a prescribed impact is needed.
Human-made structures	no	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Non-native vegetation	yes	Planted non-native trees	Removal of minor flowering, fruiting and seeding resources e.g. Corymbia citriodora, Syagrus romanzoffiana (Cocos Palm), Mangifera indica (Mango)	Grey-headed Flying Fox	5.3.1
Habitat connectivity	no	n/a	n/a	n/a	5.4
Waterbodies, water quality and hydrological processes	no	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Wind farm development	no	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Vehicle strikes	no	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

The following potential impacts on biodiversity values as a result of the proposal are prescribed (as per clause 6.1 of the BC Reg) as biodiversity impacts to be assessed under the biodiversity offsets scheme:

Non-native vegetation -

(a) describe the nature, extent and duration of short-term and long-term impacts

Response: Flowering and fruiting resources e.g. *Corymbia citriodora, Syagrus romanzoffiana (Cocos Palm), Mangifera indica (Mango)* are present within the development footprint, as described in Section 3.1.4. Parts of this vegetation will be removed for the development. However, this vegetation only provides minor foraging utility and is well represented within the locality. Its removal is not expected to have any short-term or long-term impacts on any entity being assessed under the BAM.

(b) predict the consequences of impacts on threatened entities identified in Subsection 6.1.2

Response: Threatened species recorded or with potential to occur that are known to utilise non-native vegetation include Grey-headed Flying Fox, which is known to forage on flowering a fruiting trees. As this habitat is well represented within the

surrounding locality it is considered that the proposal will not hinder the foraging behaviour and therefore there will be no consequences of these impacts.

(c) justify predictions of impacts with relevant literature and other published sources of information, or advice from experts.

Response: Foraging behaviour for each species are stated in species profiles (*OEH*) and the TBDC (*BioNet*). Based on these profiles, the removal of non-native vegetation from the site is not expected to have a significant impact on any entity being assessed under the BAM.

5.3.2 Direct impacts

The other direct impacts of the proposal within the development footprint are considered as:

- Impacts on 0.64 ha of remnant / unmanaged PCT 1841 Coastal enriched sandstone forest; including 0.21 ha complete removal and 0.43 ha partial clearing for APZ
- Impacts on 0.29 ha of planted / managed PCT 1841 Coastal enriched sandstone forest; including 0.13 ha complete removal and 0.0.16 ha partial clearing for APZ
- Impacts on 0.39 ha of exotic and non-native vegetation
- Subsequent removal of threatened fauna species foraging habitat including:
 - (a) Very minor seasonal flowering resources for Grey-headed Flying-fox
 - (b) Air space and prey species habitat for threatened microbats

5.3.3 Indirect impacts

The potential indirect impacts of the proposal are considered as:

- Very slight reduced cross-site movements by small bird species such as passerines
- Edge effects such as weed incursions caused from soil disturbance, repeated clearing and landscaping species becoming a nuisance in the adjacent remnant bushland
- Increased spill-over from noise, activity, scent and lighting effects into the adjacent quality natural habitat areas
- Increased soil nutrients from changes to runoff that may provide further opportunities for weed plumes
- Concentrated stormwater runoff from solid surfaces and subsequent increased flows

5.3.4 Cumulative impacts

The potential cumulative impacts (combined results of past, current and future activities) of the proposal are considered as:

- Increased risk of weed invasion and fungal mobilisation or infections
- Cumulative loss of native vegetation
- Cumulative loss of fauna habitat

5.3.5 Serious & Irreversible Impacts (SAIIs)

An impact is to be regarded as serious and irreversible if it is likely to contribute significantly to the risk of a threatened species or ecological community most at risk of extinction. Threatened species and communities that are potential for serious and irreversible impacts are identified in the BioNet TBDC, and a list is provided on the DPIE webpage: <a href="https://www.environment.nsw.gov.au/topics/animals-and-plants/biodiversity-offsets-scheme/local-government-and-other-decision-makers/serious-and-irreversible-impacts-of-scheme/local-government-and-other-decision-makers/serious-and-irreversible-impacts-of-scheme/local-government-and-other-decision-makers/serious-and-irreversible-impacts-of-scheme/local-government-and-other-decision-makers/serious-and-irreversible-impacts-of-scheme/local-government-and-other-decision-makers/serious-and-irreversible-impacts-of-scheme/local-government-and-other-decision-makers/serious-and-irreversible-impacts-of-scheme/local-government-and-other-decision-makers/serious-and-irreversible-impacts-of-scheme/local-government-and-other-decision-makers/serious-and-irreversible-impacts-of-scheme/local-government-and-other-decision-makers/serious-and-irreversible-impacts-of-scheme/local-government-and-other-decision-makers/serious-and-irreversible-impacts-of-scheme/local-government-and-other-decision-makers/serious-and-irreversible-impacts-of-scheme/local-government-and-other-decision-makers/serious-and-irreversible-impacts-of-scheme/local-government-and-other-decision-makers/serious-and-irreversible-impacts-of-scheme/local-government-and-scheme/local-government-and-scheme/local-government-and-scheme/local-government-and-scheme/local-government-and-scheme/local-government-and-scheme/local-government-and-scheme/local-government-and-scheme/local-government-and-scheme/local-government-and-scheme/local-government-and-scheme/local-government-and-scheme/local-government-and-scheme/local-government-and-scheme/local-government-and-scheme/local-government-and-scheme/local-government-and-sch

<u>development</u>. The principles for determining serious and irreversible impacts are set out under Section 9.1 of the BAM.

Candidate SAII entities recorded or with potential to occur within the study area include:

Species / TEC (Scientific Name)	Species (Common Name)	BC Act	Potential to occur
Miniopterus schreibersii subsp. oceanensis	Large Bent-winged Bat	V	Possible – assumed present
Miniopterus australis	Little Bent-winged Bat	V	Possible – assumed present
Chalinolobus dwyeri	Large-eared pied-bat	V	Possible – assumed present
Deyeuxia appressa	-	E1	Unlikely – assumed present

Table 5.2 – Candidate SAII species

Species:

The SAII assessment provisions for threatened species are outlined under Section 9.1.2 of the BAM (2021) and have been considered for Large Bent-winged Bat, Little Bent-winged Bat and Large-eared Pied-bat within Appendix 3 of this report as prompted by the BAM calculator. As a result of this assessment it is considered that the proposal does not trigger SAII consideration for Large Bent-winged Bat and Little Bent-winged Bat. Further survey is necessary to assess presence of breeding habitat and breeding individuals of Large-eared Pied-bat, and presence of *Deyeuxia appressa*. These species have been assumed present for the purposes of credit calculation, pending this further survey.



Figure 5.1 – Species credit species polygons



Figure 5.1 cont. – Species credit species polygons



6. CONCLUSION

Travers bushfire & ecology has been engaged to undertake a biodiversity development assessment report for Lots 3 and 4, DP 584287 within the Lane Cove local government area (LGA).

Ecological survey and assessment have been undertaken in accordance with relevant legislation including the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979*, the *Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016*, the commonwealth *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999* and the *Fisheries Management Act 1994*.

6.1 Legislative compliance

In respect of matters required to be considered under the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979* and relating to the species / provisions of the *Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016*, one threatened fauna species, Grey-headed Flying-fox, no threatened flora species, and no TECs, were recorded within the study area.

Offsetting under the Biodiversity Offsets Scheme (BOS) is required for the proposal as the proposal is classed as a State Significant Development.

6.2 Mitigation measures

The following <u>mitigation measures</u> are recommended to avoid, minimise or ameliorate the above potential ecological impacts, address threatening processes and to guide a more positive ecological outcome for threatened species and their associated habitats.

Table 6.1 – Measures to mitigate & manage impacts

Action / Technique	Outcome	Timing / Frequency	Responsibility
A Vegetation Management Plan (VMP) has been prepared to identify mitigation ac	tions for retained biodiversity v	alues within the site:	
(a) Protection and conservation of retained vegetation (PCTs 1841 and 1828) to the south west of the development footprint.	Prevent indirect impacts on retained habitats	Prior to any clearing works. Ongoing	Project Ecologist as guided by the VMP
 Installation of permanent protection fencing and erosion control fencing; 			
 Engagement of a Project Ecologist to undertake ongoing monitoring, compliance inspections and certifications 			
Engagement of a suitably qualified bushland regeneration team.			
 Weed control and maintenance of replanted and managed areas for a period of not less than 5 years in accordance with the Weed Eradication Management Plan (WEMP) produced by Travers bushfire and ecology, Nov 2020); 			
 Restoration of PCT 1841 vegetation within the fully structured revegetation zones to create 0.06ha (600m²) of fully structured and diverse vegetation; 			
 Restoration of PCT 1841 disturbed vegetation within the APZ zones to create 0.02 ha (200m²) of vegetation to comply with OPA standards; and 			
• Management of the restored vegetation, protective fencing and 14x installed nest boxes for a period of 5 years, with regular inspections by the Project Ecologist and compliance certificates sent to Council.			

Action / Technique	Outcome	Timing / Frequency	Responsibility
(b) Sediment and erosion control measures in accordance with Managing Urban Stormwater: Soils and Construction (Landcom 2004) to minimise impact of possible sedimentation to local drainage lines.	Maintain integrity of habitat and natural topsoil soil by preventing deposition	Prior to any clearing works. Ongoing during all exposed soil stages until landscaping is completed	Project Ecologist / Contractors
(c) Management of hollows and hollow-dependent fauna:			
• The felling of hollow-bearing trees is to be conducted under the supervision of a fauna ecologist to ensure appropriate animal welfare procedures are taken, particularly for threatened species. Hollows of high quality or with fauna recorded residing within should be dismantled for relocation and all hollows should be inspected for occupation, signs of previous activity and potential for reuse.	Protection of hollow- dependent wildlife	At time of removal	Project Ecologist
• Subsequent hollows of retention value are to be relocated to nearby conservation areas. If these are placed as on ground habitat and are not reattached to a new recipient tree then they are to be replaced with appropriately sized nest boxes affixed to a retained tree. All hollow sections considered suitable for Squirrel Glider should where possible be recovered and prepared for placement into an appropriate retained tree.	Maintain quality denning / hollow shelter opportunities	At time of removal	Project Ecologist
• Constructed nest boxes should as priority target recorded hollow- dependent threatened species (and their prey species). Boxes should be constructed all of weatherproof timber (marine ply), fasteners and external paint and appropriately affixed to a recipient tree under the guidance of a fauna ecologist.	Protection of hollow- dependent wildlife	Prior to hollow removal	Project Ecologist
• If a threatened species is found to be occupying the hollow at the time of removal then this hollow section is to be reattached to a recipient tree within the nearby conservation areas as selected and directed by the fauna ecologist. The welfare and temporary holding of the residing animal(s) is at the discretion of the fauna ecologist.	Priority protection of hollow- dependent threatened species	At time of removal	Project Ecologist

Action / Technique	Outcome	Timing / Frequency	Responsibility
• The relocated hollow section and nest boxes should be well secured in the recipient tree in a manner that will not compromise the current or future health of that tree.	Ensure hollow integrity is maintained	Time of installation	Project Ecologist
Monitoring of nest boxes and relocated hollows	Ensure hollow integrity is maintained	Each year for 5 years	Project Ecologist
(d) Management of any other displaced fauna	Prevent direct impacts on nesting and terrestrial native fauna species	Prior to and during habitat removal / Adaptive management required	Project Ecologist
(e) If any fauna species, a nest or roost is located during development works, then works should cease until safe relocation can be advised by a contact fauna ecologist	Prevent direct impacts on nesting and terrestrial native fauna species	At time of removal / Adaptive management required	Project Ecologist / Contractors

6.3 Biodiversity credit requirements

6.3.1 Impacts requiring offset

The following impacts will require offsetting:

- Impacts on 0.64 ha PCT 1841 (remnant / unmanaged)
- Impacts on 0.29 ha PCT 1841 (managed / planted)

• loss of habitat for threatened species assumed present, including species credits for Gang-gang Cockatoo, Glossy Black-Cockatoo, Callocephalon fimbriatum / Gang-gang Cockatoo, Eastern Pygmy-possum, Large-eared Pied Bat, *Deyeuxia appressa*, Little Eagle, Green and Golden Bell Frog, Little Bent-winged Bat, Large Bent-winged Bat, Southern Myotis, Barking Owl, Powerful Owl and Squirrel Glider.

6.3.2 Impacts not requiring offset

The following impacts do not require offset:

- Impacts on non-native vegetation
- Indirect impacts on remaining native vegetation areas as outlined in Section 5.3.3.

All areas of native vegetation impact will require offsetting and have been accounted for in the BAM calculator.

6.3.3 Areas not requiring assessment

Native vegetation that has not been directly impacted by this proposal, both within the study area and beyond, do not require credit assessment.

7. BAM CREDIT RESULTS

7.1 Ecosystem credits and species credits

Ecosystem credits and species credits that measure the impact of the development on biodiversity values have been calculated, assuming full removal of vegetation for roads, removal of trees and shrubs for fence lines with retention of some ground layer species, and thinning of vegetation in APZs reducing both cover and abundance. The result of this means that all impacted areas will still have some future biodiversity value, and as such, the future vegetation integrity score will be above 0. There will be a significant drop in the scores, but as they still retain some value, the number of credits required is less. Future vegetation integrity score at the development site is shown in Section 3.1.5.

Habitat suitability for threatened species has been considered in Section 4. Some species are considered for species credits, particularly if potential breeding habitat is compromised or impacted.

Ecosystem credits for plant community types (PCTs), ecological communities and threatened species habitat is shown below in Table 7.1. Species credits for threatened species are shown in Table 7.2.

Table 7.1 – Requirement for ecosystem credits

Zone	Veg. zone name	Veg. integrity loss	Area (ha)	Sensitivity to loss	Sensitivity to loss justification	Sensitivity to gain	Biodiversity risk weighting	Potential SAII	Ecosystem credits
1	1841_remnant	21.3	0.64	Moderate	PCT Cleared - 67%	High	1.75	no	6
2	1841_managed	27.1	0.29	Moderate	PCT Cleared - 67%	High	1.75	no	3
									Total: 9

Table 7.2 – Requirement for species credits

Vegetation zone name	Habitat condition (vegetation integrity) loss	Area / Count	Sensitivity to loss	Sensitivity to loss(Justification)	Sensitivity to gain	Sensitivity to gain(Justification)	Biodiversity risk weighting	Potenti al SAII	Species credits
Callocephalon f	fimbriatum / Gang-gang	g Cockatoo ((Fauna)						
1841_managed	27.1	0.12 ha	Moderate		High		2	FALSE	2
1841_remnant	21.3	0.5 ha	Moderate		High		2	FALSE	5
									Subtotal: 7
Calyptorhynchu	ıs lathami / Glossy Bla	ck-Cockatoo	o (Fauna)						
1841_managed	27.1	0.12 ha	Moderate		High		2	FALSE	2
1841_remnant	21.3	0.5 ha	Moderate		High		2	FALSE	5
									Subtotal: 7
Cercartetus nar	nus / Eastern Pygmy-po	ossum (Fau	na)						
1841_managed	27.1	0.29 ha	Moderate		High		2	FALSE	4
1841_remnant	21.3	0.64 ha	Moderate		High		2	FALSE	7
								S	Subtotal: 11
Chalinolobus d	wyeri / Large-eared Pie	d Bat (Faur	na)						
Vegetation zone name	Habitat condition (vegetation integrity) loss	Area / Count	Sensitivity to loss	Sensitivity to loss(Justification)	Sensitivity to gain	Sensitivity to gain(Justification)	Biodiversity risk weighting	Potenti al SAII	Species credits
-------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------	------------------	------------------------	---------------------------------------	------------------------	---------------------------------------	--------------------------------	--------------------	--------------------
1841_managed	27.1	0.29 ha	Moderate		Very High		3	TRUE	6
1841_remnant	21.3	0.64 ha	Moderate		Very High		3	TRUE	10
								5	Subtotal: 16
Deyeuxia appre	essa / Deyeuxia appres	sa (Flora)							
1841_remnant	N/A	5 individuals	Very High		High		3	TRUE	15
								S	Subtotal: 15
Hieraaetus mor	phnoides / Little Eagle	(Fauna)							
1841_managed	27.1	0.29 ha	Moderate		Moderate		1.5	FALSE	3
1841_remnant	21.3	0.64 ha	Moderate		Moderate		1.5	FALSE	5
									Subtotal: 8
Litoria aurea / G	Freen and Golden Bell	Frog (Fauna	a)						
1841_managed	27.1	0.29 ha	High		High		2	FALSE	4
1841_remnant	21.3	0.64 ha	High		High		2	FALSE	7
								S	Subtotal: 11
Miniopterus aus	s <i>tralis /</i> Little Bent-wing	ged Bat (Fa	una)						
1841_managed	27.1	0.06 ha	Moderate		Very High		3	TRUE	1
1841_remnant	21.3	0.04 ha	Moderate		Very High		3	TRUE	1
									Subtotal: 2
Miniopterus oria	anae oceanensis / Larg	je Bent-wing	ged Bat (Fau	na)					
1841_managed	27.1	0.06 ha	Moderate		Very High		3	TRUE	1
1841_remnant	21.3	0.04 ha	Moderate		Very High		3	TRUE	1
									Subtotal: 2
Myotis macropu	us / Southern Myotis (I	Fauna)							

Vegetation zone name	Habitat condition (vegetation integrity) loss	Area / Count	Sensitivity to loss	Sensitivity to loss(Justification)	Sensitivity to gain	Sensitivity to gain(Justification)	Biodiversity risk weighting	Potenti al SAII	Species credits
1841_managed	27.1	0.14 ha	Moderate		High		2	FALSE	2
1841_remnant	21.3	0.33 ha	Moderate		High		2	FALSE	4
									Subtotal: 6
Ninox conniven	es / Barking Owl (Faun	a)							
1841_managed	27.1	0.23 ha	Moderate		High		2	FALSE	3
1841_remnant	21.3	0.6 ha	Moderate		High		2	FALSE	6
									Subtotal: 9
Ninox strenua /	Powerful Owl (Fauna))							
1841_managed	27.1	0.23 ha	Moderate		High		2	FALSE	3
1841_remnant	21.3	0.6 ha	Moderate		High		2	FALSE	6
									Subtotal: 9
Petaurus norfol	censis / Squirrel Glide	r (Fauna)							
1841_managed	27.1	0.29 ha	Moderate		High		2	FALSE	4
1841_remnant	21.3	0.64 ha	Moderate		High		2	FALSE	7
								5	Subtotal: 11
Pseudophryne	australis / Red-crowne	d Toadlet (F	Fauna)			-			
1841_managed	27.1	0.29 ha	Moderate		Moderate		1.5	FALSE	3
1841_remnant	21.3	0.64 ha	Moderate		Moderate		1.5	FALSE	5
									Subtotal: 8
Tyto novaeholla	andiae / Masked Owl(F	Fauna)							
1841_managed	27.1	0.23 ha	Moderate		High		2	FALSE	3
1841_remnant	21.3	0.6 ha	Moderate		High		2	FALSE	6
									Subtotal: 9

7.2 Ecosystem credit classes

Table 7.3 – Ecosystem credit summary

РСТ	TEC	Area	HBT Cr	No HBT Cr	Credits
1841-Coastal enriched sandstone moist forest	Not a TEC	0.93	6	3	9

Table 7.4 – Credit classes for PCT 877 and 1395 - Like for like options

РСТ	Class	Trading group	HBT	Credits	IBRA region
1841	North Coast Wet Sclerophyll Forests This includes PCT's: 661, 686, 694, 827, 1217, 1237, 1244, 1285, 1504, 1841, 1843, 1915	North Coast Wet Sclerophyll Forests - ≥ 50% - < 70% cleared group (including Tier 3 or higher threat status).	Yes	6	Pittwater , Cumberland, Sydney Cataract, Wyong and Yengo. or Any IBRA subregion that is within 100 kilometers of the outer edge of the impacted site.
1841	North Coast Wet Sclerophyll Forests This includes PCT's: 661, 686, 694, 827, 1217, 1237, 1244, 1285, 1504, 1841, 1843, 1915	North Coast Wet Sclerophyll Forests - ≥ 50% - < 70% cleared group (including Tier 3 or higher threat status).	No	3	Pittwater , Cumberland, Sydney Cataract, Wyong and Yengo. or Any IBRA subregion that is within 100 kilometers of the outer edge of the impacted site.

7.3 Species credit classes

Table 7.5 – Species credit summary

Species	Veg. zones	Area (ha) / count	Credits
<i>Callocephalon fimbriatum /</i> Gang-gang Cockatoo	1841_remnant, 1841_managed	0.62	7
Calyptorhynchus lathami / Glossy Black- Cockatoo	1841_remnant, 1841_managed	0.62	7
Cercartetus nanus / Eastern Pygmy- possum	1841_remnant, 1841_managed	0.93	11
Chalinolobus dwyeri / Large-eared Pied Bat	1841_remnant, 1841_managed	0.93	16
Deyeuxia appressa / Deyeuxia appressa	1841_remnant	5 individuals	15
Hieraaetus morphnoides / Little Eagle	1841_remnant, 1841_managed	0.93	8

Species	Veg. zones	Area (ha) / count	Credits
Litoria aurea / Green and Golden Bell Frog	1841_remnant, 1841_managed	0.93	11
<i>Miniopterus australis /</i> Little Bent-winged Bat	1841_remnant, 1841_managed	0.1	2
<i>Miniopterus orianae oceanensis /</i> Large Bent-winged Bat	1841_remnant, 1841_managed	0.1	2
Myotis macropus / Southern Myotis	1841_remnant, 1841_managed	0.47	6
Ninox connivens / Barking Owl	1841_remnant, 1841_managed	0.84	9
Ninox strenua / Powerful Owl	1841_remnant, 1841_managed	0.84	9
Petaurus norfolcensis / Squirrel Glider	1841_remnant, 1841_managed	0.93	11

All above-listed species need to be offset with the same species but anywhere in NSW.

The pricing of credits can vary greatly over time and it is advised that the proponent use the online Biodiversity Offset Payment Calculator tool to determine the current pricing of credits (<u>https://www.lmbc.nsw.gov.au/offsetpaycalc</u>).

8. **BIBLIOGRAPHY**

Auld, B. A. & Medd, R. W. (1996) Weeds. Inkata Press.

- Barker, J., Grigg, G. C. & Tyler, M. J. (1995) *A Field Guide to Australian Frogs.* Surrey Beatty & Sons.
- Bennett, A. F. (1990a) *Habitat Corridors: Their Role in Wildlife Management and Conservation*. Department of Conservation and Environment, Victoria).
- Bennett, A. F. (1990b) Habitat corridors and the conservation of small mammals in a fragmented forest environment. *Landscape Ecology.* 4: 109-122.
- Churchill, S. (2008) Australian Bats, 2nd Ed., Jacana Books, Crows Nest, Sydney.
- Cogger, H. G. (1996) Reptiles and Amphibians of Australia. Reed Books, Australia.
- Cropper, S. (1993) Management of endangered plants. CSIRO Publications, Melbourne.
- DEC (2004) Threatened Species Survey and Assessment: Guidelines for developments and activities (working draft), New South Wales Department of Environment and Conservation, Hurstville, NSW.
- DECC (2008) *Hygiene protocol for the control of disease in frogs*. Information Circular Number 6. DECC (NSW), Sydney South.
- DECC (2008) Rapid Fauna Habitat Assessment of the Sydney Metropolitan Catchment Management Authority Area Department of Environment and Climate Change, Hurstville.
- DECCW & Water NSW (2010). *NSW Wetlands Policy* NSW Department of Environment, Climate Change.
- DEWHA. 2010. *Survey guidelines for Australia's threatened bats*. Department of Environment Water Heritage and Arts.
- DPIE (2019) *Biodiversity Assessment Method Operational Manual: Stage 2.* State of NSW and Department of Planning, Industry and Environment.
- DPIE (2020a) *Biodiversity Assessment Method.* State of NSW and Department of Planning, Industry and Environment.
- DPIE (2020b) NSW Survey Guide for Threatened Frogs A guide for the survey of threatened frogs and their habitats for the Biodiversity Assessment Method. State of NSW and Department of Planning, Industry and Environment.
- DPIE (2022) Atlas of NSW Wildlife (BioNet).
- Eco Logical Australia (2019) Greenwich Hospital Redevelopment Biodiversity Development Assessment Report Biodiversity Development Assessment Report. Prepared for Hammond Care.
- Ehmann, H. (1997) Threatened Frogs of New South Wales. FATS Group.
- EPBC Listing Advice (2009) Advice to the Minister for the Environment, Heritage and the Arts from the Threatened Species Scientific Committee on an amendment to the List of Threatened Ecological Communities and the EPBC Act 1999 Cumberland Plain Woodlands and Shale-Gravel Transition Forest.
- Griffiths, K. (1997) Frogs and Reptiles of the Sydney Region. University NSW Press.

Harden, G. (1993) Flora of New South Wales. University NSW Press.

Hoser, R. (1989) Australian Reptiles and Frogs. Pierson & Co.

- Keystone Ecological (2019) Biodiversity Development Assessment Report, Greenwich Hospital Redevelopment, Lane Cove LGA.
- Klaphake, V. (2002) Key to the grasses of Sydney. Van Klaphake, Byabarra.
- Klaphake, V. (2010) *Eucalypts of the Sydney Region. 2nd Ed.* Van Klaphake, Byabarra.
- Lamp, C. & Collett, F. (1996) A Field Guide to Weeds in Australia. Inkata Press.
- Lunney, D., Urquart, C .A. & Reed, P. (1988) Koala Summit, NPWS.
- Marchant, S., & P. J. Higgins (Eds) (1990) *Handbook of Australian, New Zealand and Antarctic Birds.* Volumes 1-7 Oxford University Press, Melbourne.
- Morrison, R. G. B. (1981) A Field Guide to the Tracks & Traces of Australian Animals. Rigby.
- Murphy, C. L. & Tille, P. J. (1993) Soil Landscapes of the Sydney 1:100,000 Sheet. Department of Conservation & Land Management.
- OEH (2016) NSW Guide to Surveying Threatened Plants.
- OEH (2016) The Native Vegetation of the Sydney Metropolitan Area. Version 3.0. NSW Office of Environment and Heritage, Sydney.
- OEH (2017) *Biodiversity Assessment Method.* Office of Environment and Heritage for the NSW Government.
- OEH (2018) 'Species credit' threatened bats and their habitats, NSW survey guide for the Biodiversity Assessment Method
- Parnaby, H. (1992) An interim guide to identification of insectivorous bats of south-eastern Australia. The Australian Museum, Sydney, Technical Report, No. 8.
- Pennay, M., Law, B., Reinhold, L. (2004). Bat calls of New South Wales: Region based guide to the echolocation calls of Microchiropteran bats. NSW Department of Environment and Conservation, Hurstville.
- Phillips, S. & Callaghan, J. (2008) The Spot Assessment Technique: a tool for determining levels of localised habitat use by Koalas Phascolarctos cinereus. Aust. Koala Foundation. Manuscript submitted to: Ecological management and Restoration
- Phillott, A. D, Skerratt, L. F., McDonald, K. R., Speare, R., Hines, H. B., Meyer, E., Cashins, S. D, Mendez, D. & Berger, L. (2010) Minimising exposure of amphibians to pathogens during field studies. Inter-research. Diseases of Aquatic Organisms, *Contribution to* DAO Special 4: 'Chytridiomycosis: an emerging disease'
- Pizzey, G. & Knight, F. (1997) A Field Guide to the Birds of Australia. Angus & Robertson.
- Reader's Digest (1976) Complete Book of Australian Birds.
- Richardson, F. J., Richardson, R. G. & Shepherd, R. C. H (2011) Weeds of the South-East: an Identification Guide for Australia. Everbest Printing Co. Pty. Ltd. China.

Robinson, L. (2003) Field Guide to the Native Plants of Sydney. 3rd ed. Simon & Shuster.

Robinson, M. (1996) A Field Guide to Frogs of Australia. Reed.

Schodde, R. and Tidemann, S. (Eds) (1986) *Readers Digest complete book of Australian Birds.* Second Edition. Reader's Digest Services Pty Ltd, Sydney. Simpson & Day (1996) Field Guide to the Birds of Australia. Viking.

- Smith (2002) Squirrel Glider (*Petaurus norfolcensis*) Conservation Management Plan: Wyong Shire. Wyong Shire Council, Wyong
- Specht, R. L., Specht, A., Whelan, M. B. & Hegarty, E. E. (1995) *Conservation Atlas of Plant Communities in Australia.* Southern Cross University Press, Lismore.
- Triggs, B. (1996) Tracks, Scats & Other Traces: A Field Guide to Australian Mammals. Oxford University Press, Melbourne.
- Trounson, Donald & Molly (1998) Australian Birds Simply Classified. Murray David Publishing Pty Ltd, NSW.
- Van Dyke, S. and Strahan, R. (Eds) (2008) *The Mammals of Australia* (3rd Edn). Reed New Holland. Sydney.
- Wilson, K. W. and Knowles, D. G. (1988) Australia's Reptiles A Photographic Reference to the Terrestrial Reptiles of Australia. Cornstalk Publishing.
- Young, A. M. (1999) The Hygrocybeae (Fungi, Basidiomycota, Agaricales, Hygrophoraceae) of the Lane Cove Bushland Park, New South Wales. *Austrobaelia* Vol. 5, No. 3, pp. 535-564.

Appendix 1. SAll impact assessment - species

The additional impact assessment provisions for threatened species to determine a Serious and Irreversible Impact (SAII) are outlined under Section 9.2 of the BAM (2020) and have been applied to the Large Bent-winged Bat, Little Bent-winged Bat, Large-eared Pied Bat and *Deyeuxia appressa* as follows below. These species have been assumed present for credit calculation as required by the BAM.

Measures taken to avoid the direct and indirect impact on species at risk of SAII are outlined in Section 5.2. We have consulted the Threatened Biodiversity Data Collection (TBDC) and other sources to enable the application of the four principles set out in clause 6.7 of the *BC Reg.* For the species considered this is summarized as follows:

		Prin	ciple	e		Deference		
	1	2	3	4	Justification	Reference		
Large Bent- winged Bat				\checkmark	The species is dependent on non-responding attribute (breeding habitat only)	TBDC		
Little Bent-winged Bat				\checkmark	The species is dependent on non-responding attribute (breeding habitat only)	TBDC		
Large-eared Pied Bat				\checkmark	The species is dependent on non-responding attribute (breeding habitat only)	TBDC		
Deyeuxia appressa		\checkmark	\checkmark		Very small population size; restricted distribution	TBDC		

The criteria as specified in Section 9.1.2.4 of the BAM required to be considered for candidate SAII species nominated is with respect to Principles 1–3 only. As these do not apply to the microbat species considered, a summary is provided below:

Large Bent-winged Bat & Little Bent-winged Bat – These species are allocated to species credit class for breeding habitat only. Species sensitivity to loss is indicated by the TBDC as 'moderate'. Species sensitivity to potential gain for breeding is 'very high'. Species sensitivity to potential gain for foraging is 'high'.

The Large Bent-winged Bat and Little Bent-winged Bat have not been recorded onsite but have been assumed present for credit calculation purposes (see Section 4.3.2(e)).

Any impacts on breeding habitat could be considered potentially serious and irreversible. 'Potential breeding habitat' as defined by *The BAM Bat Guide* for these species includes "caves, tunnels, mines or other structures known or suspected to be used". No such habitat exists within the subject land, although there are rock features outside the subject land to the south-west that may provide potential breeding habitat (Figure 3.2). As these habitat features will not be impacted by the proposal, and are outside the subject land, there will be no likely SAII on Large Bent-winged Bat or Little Bent-winged Bat. Further targeted survey of these features for presence of bat breeding habitat is recommended for the Large-eared Pied Bat (see below), and this will advise on these other two species.

Large-eared Pied Bat – Insufficient information is available on the species' distribution and ecology to guide effective management (DPIE – Saving Our Species Strategies). This is a species credit species. Species sensitivity to loss is indicated by the TDBC as 'moderate'. Species sensitivity to potential gain is 'very high'.

The Large-eared Pied Bat has been recorded by Keystone Ecological in 2017 with probable level of certainty. No surveys have been undertaken to determine presence of potential breeding habitat and breeding individuals in accordance with the BAM. Subsequently, the species is assumed present for the purposes of this BDAR and species credit assessment.

The 'Species credit' threatened bats and their habitats – NSW survey guide for the Biodiversity Assessment Method (The BAM Bat Guide) outline how to define presence of important 'breeding habitat'. Species polygons for offsetting calculations have also been generated in accordance with Table 1 of this guide.

The SAII threshold for this species is potential breeding habitat and presence of breeding individuals. Potential breeding habitat for this species is defined by The BAM Bat Guide as "The PCTs associated with the species (as per the TBDC) within 100m of rocky areas containing caves, or overhangs or crevices, cliffs or escarpments, or old mines, tunnels, culverts, derelict concrete buildings."

Sandstone overhangs and small open caves have been recorded within the study area along escarpment within 100 m of the habitat subject land. These are consistent with 'potential breeding habitat' as defined by Section 3.3 of *The BAM Bat Guide*. All recorded overhangs are located within 100 m of the subject land, and a 50 m buffer radius has been applied to generate the species polygon (as defined by the *The BAM Bat Guide* and TBDC). The proposal potentially impacts on breeding habitat, but surveys must be undertaken as per the Threatened Bat Survey Guide to confirm presence of the species and any breeding individuals.

In order to accurately assess potential SAII on Large-eared Pied Bat, further survey is required to finalise the SAII assessment for this species. This would involve harp trapping in areas of the potential breeding habitat features between mid-November and end of January. Age, sex and reproductive status of captured bats must be assessed and recorded.

Deyeuxia appressa

This species is very rare grass and has only been recorded in two localities: first in 1930 at Herne Bay, Saltpan Creek, off the Georges River, south of Bankstown, then in 1941 from Killara, near Hornsby. It is very likely that this species is extinct as no more recent records have been made in the last 80 years. There is very low probability that this species would be present on the subject land, but as virtually nothing is known about the ecology and habitat constraints required for this species, we cannot exclude as a candidate species. As survey has not been undertaken in December, in accordance with the BAM, we have assumed presence for the purposes of credit calculation.

As per Section 9.1.2.4 of the BAM 2020 the following information, where available, is provided to determine SAII:

The impact on the species' population (Principles 1 and 2) presented by:

(a) an estimate of the number of individuals (mature and immature) present in the subpopulation on the subject land (the site may intersect or encompass the subpopulation) and as a percentage of the total NSW population, and

Response: The species has not been recorded on the subject land, yet target survey has not been undertaken in the correct month of December. This species is assessed by count of individuals, rather than area, although the data deficient status of this species makes an estimate of count difficult. As there are only two individuals ever recorded and the site is moderately to highly disturbed we consider that, if present, there would only be a few individuals within the site. Subsequently, we have assumed a very conservative five individuals per vegetation zone (Zone 1, Zone 2), which totals to 10 individuals for the subject land. The total size of the population within NSW is unknown, but as there have only

ever been four collections made, it can be assumed that the population, if extant, would be very small.

(b) an estimate of the number of individuals (mature and immature) to be impacted by the proposal and as a percentage of the total NSW population, or

Response: No individuals have been recorded, but for the purposes of credit calculation we have assumed an impact on 10 plants. This is likely to be an over estimate, as only four collections have ever been made of this species. The total population in NSW is unknown.

(c) if the species' unit of measure is area, provide data on the number of individuals on the site, and the estimated number that will be impacted, along with the area of habitat to be impacted by the proposal

Response: n/a

impact on geographic range (Principles 1 and 3) presented by:

(d) the area of the species' geographic range to be impacted by the proposal in hectares, and a percentage of the total AOO, or EOO within NSW

Response: The TDBC does not specify the total AOO, or EOO within NSW.

(e) the impact on the subpopulation as either: all individuals will be impacted (subpopulation eliminated); OR impact will affect some individuals and habitat; OR impact will affect some habitat, but no individuals of the species will be directly impacted

Response: No individuals have been recorded, but for the purposes of credit calculation we have assumed an impact on 10 plants. This is likely to be an over estimate, as only four collections have ever been made of this species. The existence and total size of any sub population in is unknown. Targeted survey in December is recommended to assist in this assessment.

(f) to determine if the persisting subpopulation that is fragmented will remain viable, estimate (based on published and unpublished sources such as scientific publications, technical reports, databases or documented field observations) the habitat area required to support the remaining population, and habitat available within dispersal distance, and distance over which genetic exchange can occur (e.g. seed dispersal) and pollination distance for the species

Response: The proposal will not fragment any areas of native vegetation or habitat. No published information is available on the ecology or habitat requirements of this species, including dispersal and pollination distance.

(g) to determine changes in threats affecting remaining subpopulations and habitat if the proposed impact proceeds, estimate changes in environmental factors including changes to fire regimes (frequency, severity); hydrology, pollutants; species interactions (increased competition and effects on pollinators or dispersal); fragmentation, increased edge effects, likelihood of disturbance; and disease, pathogens and parasites. Where these factors have been considered elsewhere in relation to the target species, the assessor may refer to the relevant sections of the BDAR or BCAR.

Response: As the area of impact is minimal, there will be no notable changes in threats affecting remaining subpopulations (if extant) or habitat.

Appendix 2. PLOT DATASHEETS



Appendix 3. STAFF QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE

Team member (role)	Accreditations and qualifications	Experience	Employment history	Skills and expertise
George Plunkett (Botanist)	 Biodiversity Assessment Method (BAM) Assessor (Accredited Assessor no. BAAS19010) PhD – Plant systematics, ecology and evolution Bachelor of Science (Honours) – Ecology / Botany, University of New England (UNE), NSW Four-wheel drive vehicle operation Senior First Aid Certificate 	George has 12 years of experience as a plant taxonomist, flora ecologist and botanist, including a PhD in plant systematics, ecology and evolution, and has a very well-developed understanding of the Australian flora.	 2017-Current: Botanist, Travers bushfire & ecology 2016-2017: Research Botanist, UNE 2010-2011: Research Botanist, UNE 2008-2009: Plant Ecologist, Ecotone Flora Fauna Consultants 	 High-quality report writing Application of the BAM and BOS Highly experienced in botanical survey and ecological analysis Plant identification and taxonomy Flora and fauna assessment Threatened species, ecological communities and endangered population surveys and analysis Habitat tree analysis and assessment Noxious weed identification Tree assessment
Michael Sheather-Reid (Managing Director)	 Bachelor of Natural Resources (Hons), University of New England BioBanking Assessor Engineering Assistant – CAD Drafting MUSIC Modelling – Stormwater quality and quantity modelling (RMIT) Bush Regeneration II Certificate, Ryde TAFE NSW WorkCover OHS Construction Induction Chemical Handling Certificate, Ryde TAFE 	Michael has a wealth of experience in environmental consulting and on ground management of bushland, wetland and riparian habitats having undertaken environmental assessment, ecological consultancy and restoration in both the private and public sectors for over 22 years.	 2007- Current: Senior Ecologist, Travers bushfire & ecology 2004 -2007: Senior Ecologist, Conacher Travers Pty Ltd 2002-2004: Project Manager, Urban Bushland Management Projects Pty Ltd 1999-2002: Project Manager Sustainable Vegetation Management Pty Ltd 1995-1999: Managing Director Sheather-Reid & Associates Pty Ltd 1996-1997: NSW Landcare Liaison Officer, Australian Conservation Foundation 1992-1995: Environmental Officer, Dept. Land & Water Conservation 1990-1992: Scientific Officer Dept. of Water Resources 	 Ecological assessment Rezoning studies Biodiversity offset planning Restoration management and coordination Biotic and soil translocation Watercourse assessment Project ecologist services EPBC Act referrals Controlled Activity Approvals Vegetation management plans

Team member (role)	Accreditations and qualifications	Experience	Employment history	Skills and expertise
Sandy Cardow (GIS officer)	Bachelor of Science (Biological Sciences) (Macquarie University)	Sandy has over twenty years of experience in Spatial Information (Geographic Information Systems (GIS)), which includes preparation of mapping in local government roles and has completed a Bachelor of Science (Biological Sciences).	 2017 - Current: GIS Officer, Travers bushfire & ecology 2014 - 2017: GIS Consultant, Forestry Corp. NSW 2005 - 2011: GIS Analyst, Forests NSW 2002 - 2005: GIS Data Librarian, Forests NSW 2000 - 2002: GIS Operator, Forests NSW 2000 - 2002: GIS Data Import / Export Officer, Forests NSW 1999 2000: GIS Project Officer DECC 1998 - 1999: GIS Support Officer DECC 1998 - 1999: Wildlife Atlas Data Entry Officer DECC 	 Geographic Information Systems Data management and analysis Spatial databases and database administration GPS Cartography Natural resource management Client liaison
Lachlan McRae (Fauna ecologist)	 Bachelor of Environmental Science and Management (majoring in Biodiversity and Ecosystems) Bachelor of Environmental Science and Management HONOURS – 1st Class Anabat Insight Advanced Workshop – Titley Scientific Kaleidoscope Pro Advanced Training – Wildlife Acoustics Drive and Recover a 4WD – Out of Town 4WD Provide First Aid – St John Ambulance Trim and Cut Felled Trees and Maintain Chainsaws – Chainsaw Accreditation and Safety Mammal & Amphibian Handling & Microchipping Training – University of Newcastle/Australian Wildlife Conservancy Advanced Reptile Keepers Licence 	Lachlan has several years' experience in fauna survey techniques, threatened species target surveys, acoustic data analysis, and active call identification of vertebrate fauna within coastal habitats of NSW. He has specialist bat identification skills and experience leading threatened species field surveys in NSW, SA, & NT.	 2019 – 2021: Amphibian Research Assistant - University of Newcastle Jan-Feb 2020: Botanical Intern - Canberra National Herbarium July-Dec 2021: Ecology and Conservation Intern - Australian Wildlife Conservancy 2020 – Current: Fauna Ecologist - Travers bushfire & ecology 	 Threatened fauna target surveys & assessment Flora and fauna species identification Report writing to a high scientific standard Bioacoustic analysis for all fauna groups Microbat identification, harp trapping, and reference call collection Pitfall and radiotracking surveys targeting threatened mammal species Thorough knowledge of experimental design and statistical analysis

Team member (role)	Accreditations and qualifications	Experience	Employment history	Skills and expertise
Corrine Edwards (Fauna Ecologist)	 Bachelor of Environmental Science and Management. (Hons) (University of New South Wales) (2016-2020) 	Corrine has over 10 years' experience in fauna survey techniques, researching ecological interactions and identification of vertebrate fauna within a magnitude of Australian habitats. She is experienced in leading research projects, experimental design, data collection, data analysis and report writing.	 2021 - Current: Fauna Ecologist, Travers Bushfire and Ecology 2020 - Recipient of the Marilyn Fox Environmental Science Prize 2019 - 2020: Research scholarship fellow at the Fowlers Gap Research Station 2019 - Research assistant at University of NSW 2015-2016 - Reptile Research Assistant, Adelaide Museum 2014 - 2015 Amphibian Research Assistant, University of Western Australia 2012-14 - Reptile Zookeeper - Australian Reptile Park 	 Survey techniques for all major vertebrate fauna groups (including threatened species target searches) Fauna identification, morphology and behaviour Fauna field assessment Microhabitat identification Project ecology Experimental design and statistical analysis Scientific report writing •

Appendix 4. BAM-C OUTPUTS

-This document has not been endorsed or approved by Office of Environment and Heritage or Muddy Boots Environmental Training-

BAM Site -	Field Survey Fo	orm			Site Shee	t no: 1	of /
		Survey Name	Zone ID		Record	lers	
Date	18/10/2021	Greenwich BA	mo1 /875408x	DiW	avman		
Zone 56	Datum GDA94	Plot ID	BANDI	Plot dimensions	10+50	Photo	#
Easting 332045	Northing 6255-458	IBRA region	ln m	Midline bearing from 0 m	10° N		Magnetic °
Vegetation Clas	S	Open Fo	rest.				Confidence: H M L
Plant Communi	ty Туре	PCT 17	76		EEC	tick .	H M L

Record easting and northing at 0 m on midline. Dimensions (Shape) of 0.04 ha base plot.

BAM (400	Sum values	
	Trees	
	Shrubs	
Count of	Grasses etc.	
Richness	Forbs	
	Ferns	
	Other	
	Trees	
Sum of	Shrubs	
of native	Grasses etc.	
plants by	Forbs	
form group	Ferns	
	Other	

	BAM Attribute (1000 m	² plot)
DBH	# Tree Stems Count	# Stems with Hollows
80 + cm	11 1	3
50 – 79 cm	41	
30 – 49 cm	1	
20 – 29 cm	1	
10 – 19 cm		
5 – 9 cm	-	
< 5 cm		n/a
Length of logs (m (≥10 cm diameter, >50 cm in length)) 10m T	ally space

Counts apply when the number of tree stems within a size class is ≤ 10. Estimates can be used when > 10 (eg. 10, 20, 30..., 100, 200, 300...). For a multi-stemmed tree, only the largest living stem is included in the count/estimate. Tree stems must be living.

For hollows, count only the presence of a stem containing hollows. For a multi-stemmed tree, only the largest stem is included in the count/estimate. Stems may be dead and may be shrubs.

BAM Attribute (1 x 1 m plots)	Litter cover (%)	Bare ground cover (%)	Cryptogam cover (%)	Rock cover (%)				
Subplot score (% in each)	95 95 98 90 90	al 62 d 57 a	a <u>b</u> cd c	a b c d 10				
Average of the 5 subplots								

Litter cover is assessed as the average percentage ground cover of litter recorded from five 1 m x 1 m plots centred at 5, 15, 25, 35, 45 m along the plot midline. Litter cover includes leaves, seeds, twigs, branchlets and branches (less than 10 cm in diameter). Assessors may also record the cover of rock, bare ground and cryptogams.

Physiography + site features that may help in determining PCT and Management Zone (optional)

Morphological	SIStere putero,s.	Landform Element		Landform Pattern	stope.	Microrelief	S/Shanep
Lithology	sandstone.	Soil Surface Texture	sandy laam	Soil Colour	dankned brown.	Soil Depth	?
Slope		Aspect	E	Site Drainage	?	Distance to nearest water and type	?

Plot Disturbance	code	code	Observational evidence:
Clearing (inc. logging)	2	R	Underscrubbing. timited Shrub a ground cover
Cultivation (inc. pasture)		_	
Soil erosion	-	-	
Firewood / CWD removal	-	-	
Grazing (identify native/stock)	-	-	
Fire damage	-	-	
Storm damage	-	1	
Weediness	2	-	
Other			

Severity: 0=no evidence, 1=light, 2=moderate, 3=severe

Age: R=recent (<3yrs), NR=not recent (3-10yrs), O=old (>10yrs)

-This document has not been endorsed or approved by Office of Environment and Heritage or Muddy Boots Environmental Training-

400 m ² r	plot: Sheet _/ of _/ Survey Name Plot Identifier		Re	corders	and a second s	
Date	161 1012021 1875A08× Granwich BAMOI	D	IWAN	emai	J	
GF Code	Top 3 native species in each growth form group: Full species name mandatory All other native and exotic species: Full species name where practicable	N, E or HTE	Cover	Abund	stratum	voucher
T	1 Eucalyptus pilularis	N	2	.111		
T	2 E. Tresinifera	N	2	iví.		
T	3 E. saligna	N	3	. 111		
T	4 FILVS rubiginosa.	N	0.5	•		۴.,
6	5 Optismenus aemulas	N	0.5	. 4	·	•
6	6 pichandra repens	N	0.5			
T	7 Pittosporun undulatum	N	2			1.
6	8 Asparagus gethiopicus	E	0:5			
VS	9 Ipome ea cairia	E	0.5	:	: .	1 .
T	10 Cunnamomum camphora.	E	2	· · ·		•
T	11 Legustra loudon	E	2			
V	12 Annedera cordifolia	E.	0.5			
G	13 Ehrharta erecta	E	0.5		•	•
5	14 Ochan servicity	E	0.5			
6.	15 Fumario Sp.	Ê	0.5		N., .	17
5.	16 Phibiscus sp.	6	0.5			. /
S	17 Solanum nigrim	E	0.5.	÷ •		
5	18 Cotoncaster 1p	E	0.5			
G	19 Allocasia macrenhiza	E	0.5			
V	20 Fabaceae Lpink Rower; tripliate leaf	E	0.5			•
Ś	21 Enouball free	E	0.5			
T	22 Erythrune & Sylkesii	6	3	•		
6	23 Profission	a	0.1		۱.	
T	24 Blochidion Lordinand, ferdinand,	N	0.5			
G	25 Councilies analysis	N	0.5			
G	26 Midiala capation and	E	2.5			·
. 6	27 Nucha Chrothenen	G	0.5			
	28 dedarate hat	G	0.5			-
V	20 Funder and Provide Milling	G	05		1	
5	20 Ligustrom simense	G	0.5			
	ou olea europaea	C	0.5			+
a	31 Lactuca serriola	C	0.1	1		
	32 Syaguris Nomanzoffiang (seeding		0.1			
G	33 Sida rhombifole	<u> </u>	0.5			
	34			-		
	35 .					
	36				,	
	37					
	38					
	39					
	40					
Summer and the second s		CALCULATION OF CALCULATION	CONTRACTOR OF A CONTRACTOR	THE REAL PROPERTY AND		And the second second second

GF Code: see Growth Form definitions in Appendix 1N: native, E: exotic, HTE: high threat exoticGF - circle code if 'top 3'.Cover:0.1, 0.2, 0.3, ..., 1, 2, 3, ..., 10, 15, 20, 25, ...100% (foliage cover); Note: 0.1% cover represents an area of approximately 63 x 63 cm or a circle about 71 cm across, 0.5% cover represents an area of approximately 1.4 x 1.4 m, and 1% = 2.0 x 2.0 m, 5% = 4 x 5 m, 25% = 10 x 10 mAbundance:1, 2, 3, ..., 10, 20, 30, ... 100, 200, ..., 1000, ...

1

BAM Site -	Field Survey F	orm			Site Sheet no:	1 of		
	Recorders	Recorders						
Date	18/10/21	Greenwich	BANOZ	Di	DI WARMAN			
Zone 56	6DA94	Plot ID	PCT 1778	Plot dimensions	Pho	to # BAMO2		
Easting	Northing	IBRA region	ln m	Midline bearing from 0 m		Magnetic °		
Vegetation Clas	S	Open Forest	•			Confidence: H M L		
Plant Community Type		1778.			EEC: tick	EEC: tick Confidence: H M L		

Record easting and northing at 0 m on midline. Dimensions (Shape) of 0.04 ha base plot.

BAM (400	Attribute m² plot)	Sum values
	Trees	
	Shrubs	
Count of Native Richness	Grasses etc.	
	Forbs	
	Ferns	
	Other	
	Trees	
Sum of	Shrubs	
of native	Grasses etc.	
plants by	Forbs	
form group	Ferns	
	Other	

and an and the second	BAW Attribute (1000 III	pioty
DBH	# Tree Stems Count	# Stems with Hollows
80 + cm		/
50 – 79 cm	111	
30 – 49 cm)	
20 – 29 cm	1	
10 – 19 cm	11/1 1	
5 – 9 cm	111	
< 5 cm	1	n/a
Length of log (≥10 cm diamete >50 cm in length	s (m) ^{sr,}	ally space

Counts apply when the number of tree stems within a size class is \leq 10. Estimates can be used when > 10 (eg. 10, 20, 30..., 100, 200, 300...). For a multi-stemmed tree, only the largest living stem is included in the count/estimate. Tree stems must be living.

For hollows, count only the presence of a stem containing hollows. For a multi-stemmed tree, only the largest stem is included in the count/estimate. Stems may be dead and may be shrubs.

BAM Attribute (1 x 1 m plots)		Litter cover (%)			Bar	e gro	und	cover	(%)	Cry	ptog	am c	over	(%)		Rock	cove	r (%)	
Subplot score (% in each)	4:0	90	5	50	马	60	Þ0	þ	35	59	a	b	c	d	l _æ	a	ھ	35	d	e
Average of the 5 subplots																				

Litter cover is assessed as the average percentage ground cover of litter recorded from five 1 m x 1 m plots centred at 5, 15, 25, 35, 45 m along the plot midline. Litter cover includes leaves, seeds, twigs, branchlets and branches (less than 10 cm in diameter). Assessors may also record the cover of rock, bare ground and cryptogams.

Physiography + site features that may help in determining PCT and Management Zone (optional)

Morphological Type		Landform Element		Landform Pattern	Microrelief
Lithology		Soil Surface Texture	sandy loan	Soil Colour	Soil Depth
Slope	450	Aspect	South	Site Drainage	Distance to nearest water and type

Plot Disturbance	Severity code	Age code	Observational evidence:
Clearing (inc. logging)	2	R	Bish Regeneration activity. (Lane Cove council)
Cultivation (inc. pasture)	-		track work signage and some plants
Soil erosion	-	_	poisoned
Firewood / CWD removal	-	_	
Grazing (identify native/stock)	-	_	
Fire damage	-	-	
Storm damage	L _		
Weediness	3	R	
Other	-	-	

Severity: 0=no evidence, 1=light, 2=moderate, 3=severe

-This document has not been endorsed or approved by Office of Environment and Heritage or Muddy Boots Environmental Training-

400 m² i	plot: Sheet 1 of 1	Survey Name	Plot Identifier		Re	corders		
Date	18/10/2021	1815A 08×	BAM 02	DI	WAR	ZMA	N	
GF Code	Top 3 native species in All other native and exc	each growth form group: Ful otic species: Full species nam	l species riamê mandatory je where practicable	N, E or HTE	Cover	Abund	stratum	voucher
T	1 FICUS A	rubraino sa		N	5			
Ť	2 Brachue	hiton acerit	olius	N	1			
Ť	3 Liaustru	n lucidum		E	21	•	×.	
G	4 Aspara	aus ae thiopic	US	E	1	•		· · · · ·
G	5 Tradesc	anta Lumu	renbis	E	1 .	. *	•	
T	6 Puttosporv	in undulate	im.	N	1			
V	7 I pomoca c	cairica		E	0.5			·
G-	8 Nephroles	nis cordifolia			0.5			
T	9 Liquestrin	sinense	<u></u>	E	0.5	1		e
T	10 Strelitzed	a regina		E	0.5			
V	11 Anredera	a cordefolia	Ą	E.	0.5			
G	12 asplenic	n auchralasic	in	N.	0.5			
S	13 Ochna s	serrulata		E	2		•	· · ·
T	14 Cinnam	nomum campi	borg	E	0.5			•
5.	15 Hibisevs	5 Spy			0.5		N., .	17
T.	16 Glochia	Tion ferdinandi	sing ferdinand,	N	0.5			. /
T	17 Podocari	OUS SPINULOSUS	0/	N	0.5			
V	18 Eustreph	us latifolius		N.	0.5			
5	19 Notelar	1 longibelig		N	0.5			
T	20 Placora	rp & repulat	rs.	Maria	05			•
G	21 Dolismer	nus acimulus		~N	05			
G	22 Ridens	pilosa		E	0.5			
T	23 Cocata	etalim aveta	lim	N	0.5		۱.	
V	24 Gunoch	thodes asmine	side 1	N	0.5			
F	25 Adjunt	in bunderly	IM	N	65			
V	26 Smilm	al chila		N	.0.5		-	· · · · ·
· · ·	27 Butte	Josephan	dhan.	N	0.5			
	28 1 chance	go rectra (1	N	0.5			1
1+	29 Fugla	Ahis plular	11	N	2		: :	
T	30 log	dia lawit	Mia	N.	AR			
6	31	ara rengip		11	0.5.			
	22	· · · ·				1		
	33		······					
	34			1.12		· · ·		· ·
	25		· · ·					· ·
			<u>6</u>	1				
	30						>	
	3/							
	38		•					
	39		· · ·					
	40							

GF Code: see Growth Form definitions in Appendix 1 N: native, E: exotic, HTE: high threat exotic GF - circle code if 'top 3'. **Cover:** 0.1, 0.2, 0.3, ..., 1, 2, 3, ..., 10, 15, 20, 25, ...100% (foliage cover); Note: 0.1% cover represents an area of approximately 63 x 63 cm or a circle about 71 cm across, 0.5% cover represents an area of approximately 1.4 x 1.4 m, and 1% = 2.0 x 2.0 m, 5% = 4 x 5 m, 25% = 10 x 10 m Abundance: 1, 2, 3, ..., 10, 20, 30, ... 100, 200, ..., 1000, ...

ł,

-This document has not been endorsed or approved by Office of Environment and Heritage or Muddy Boots Environmental Training-

BAM Site - I	Field Survey F	orm			Site S	heet	no:	2
		Survey Name	Zone ID		Re	ecorde	rs	
Date	3222	18TSK GRENWI	it	GP				
Zone	Datum	Piot ID	3	Plot dimensions	202	ųς.	Photo #	1
Easting	Northing	IBRA region		Midline bearing from 0 m				
Vegetation Class	3						С	onfidence: M L
Plant Communit	у Туре					EEC:	Са	onfidence: M L

Record easting and northing at 0 m on midline. Dimensions (Shape) of 0.04 halbasis plot

BAM (400	Attribute m² plot)	Sum values	DBH	
	Trees			ī
	Shrubs		80 + cm	
Count of Native	Grasses etc.		50 – 79 cm	ļ
Richness	Forbs		30 – 49 cm	
	Ferns		20 – 29 cm	
	Other			
	Trees		10 – 19 cm	
Sum of	Shrubs		5 – 9 cm	
of native	Grasses etc.		< 5 cm	
plants by growth form group	Forbs		Length of logs (n
	Ferns		(≥10 cm diameter, >50 cm in length)	
	Other		Counts apply when when > 10 (eq. 10	122
High Threat	Weed cover		stem is included in t	ľ

	BAM Attribute (1000 m	n² plot)
DBH	# Tree Stems Count	# Stems with Hollows
80 + cm	1	
50 – 79 cm	1	
30 – 49 cm		
20 – 29 cm		
10 – 19 cm		
5 – 9 cm	1	
< 5 cm	/	n/a
Length of logs (≥10 cm diameter, >50 cm in length)	^(m) 5	

Counts apply when the **number of tree stems** within a size class is ≤ 10. Estimates can be used when > 10 (eg. 10, 20, 30, ..., 100, 200, 300....). For a **multi-stemmed tree**, only the largest living stem is included in the count/estimate. **Tree stems must be living**.

For hollows, count only the presence of a stem containing hollows. For a multi-stemmed tree, only the largest stem is included in the count/estimate. Stems may be dead and may be shrubs.

BAM Attribute (1 x 1 m plots)	Litter cover (%)	Bare ground cover (%)	Cryptogam cover (%)	Rock cover (%)
Subplot score (% in each)	95 195 100 80 95			
Average of the 5 subplots				

Litter cover is assessed as the average percentage ground cover of litter recorded from five 1 m x 1 m plots centred at 5, 15, 25, 35, 45 m along the plot midline. Litter cover includes leaves, soeds, twigs, branchlets and branches (less than 10 cm in diamater). Assossors may also record the cover of rock, bare ground and cryptogams.

Physiography + site features that may help in determining PCT and Management Zone (optional)

Morphological Type		Landform Element		Landform Pattern	N.korurehel
Litho'ogy		Soil Surface Texture		Colour	Depth
Slope		Ascect		Site Drainage	Distance to neares: wator and type
Plot Disturbance	Severity code	Age code	Observational e	vidence:	
Clearing (inc. logging)					
Cultivation (inc. pasture)					
Soil erosion					
Firewood / CWD removal					
Grazing (identify native/stock)					
Fire damage					
Storm damage		:			

.....

COLORADOR MANAGEMENT

المدينين المساريين

Severity: 0-no evidence, 1+light, 2×moderate, 3+severe

Weediness

Other

Age: Rerecent (<3yrs), NR-not recent (3-10yrs), Onold (>10yrs)

te	plot: Sneet of	Survey Name	Cupping the Hastat	Plot Identifie	r		Rec	corders		
:	Top 3 hatives in each G	GF: Full species nan	ne mandatory. All others where	e practicable	N	E	ITEC	over %	Abund	vouche
	1 1	nempluse (ostata		\checkmark			30	7	
	2	PHADGEININ	1 inderlations		1	/		20	10	
	3	alachidilor	Calinandi					5	2	
	4	Acolourina	+ HEICANDOUCI		1	/	-	0.1	1	
-	5	Succession -	A		1		-	2	10	
	6	Jers your the	0000			1	-	I	20	
-	7	pichtown of	alinea		1		-	4	20	
_	8 1	and	ena quoiz			/	-	2	30	
-	9 1	omanara	long tolig		1			5	0	
-	10 P	identia di	enterin		-	_	X	7	5	
-	11 6	chines ser	ulaba				-	2	D	
_	11 0	plisment	aemilio		V	/		5	50	
_	12 (4	rtología	stricta		~			2	20	
_	10 Ac	Reporthy				V	+	4	20	
_	14 Aš	paragus.	ashipping				1	1	5	1
	15 F	adestant	or furmensio				1	5	20	
	16 Ol	ea cerrop	toch				1	1	1	
	17 Ci	namomin	n comphora				1	8	5	
	18 11	restrum	Jucidum				\checkmark	1	2	
	19 era	Arc shre	16- Khaphidepis	indica		1		2	10	
	20 P-	teridium	esculentin	/	-			0.1	3	
	21 Fi	cus rubig	Nosa		V			8	5	
	22. A	lantum	actionicum	and the second second	1	/		4	100	
	23 501	de plut	P ==-		X	1	\checkmark	4	200	
	24 L	epidesne	roma lentera	ile	1			0.1	3	
	25 P	a atini)		/	2		0.1	3	
	26 M	icolaen	a stingidan		/			n	500	
	27 1	my Dea	(a) Files				1	0.1	7	
	28 A.	Dering an	Carrier			1	\square	2	10	
	29	ine on on	nogen			./	4	1	5	ah
-	30	The - Co	ampsig			٧	1	2	6	P
-	31	enna pe	natura			./		5	2	
-	32 6	entio	Da I An			×		1	1000	
-	33	groan	daropen	· · ····	-		1	4	1000	
-	24 11	nicelera c	oraliotic Arou	LIA Serientera			-	2	2	
-	35 H	pascheere	perdicata	0		-	-	6.1	20	
_	00 <u>Ce</u>	ngras	marienso			-	-	0.1	10	
_	00 SI	da phon	noitelia			~		6.1	10	
	37 Ibic	ens pilo	sa			2	-	511	20	
_	38	mmelina	a younea		~			1	50	
	39 Eh	rherta	creites			_	~	3	100	
	40 Ce	ngthan p	moscens		-		_	2	10	
	41 Arv	hortophi	enis auningh	amian	1			0.1	1	
	42 Pha	servix can	rariensis U				1	2	1	
	43 La	whana ce	amora			1	1	0.1	1	
	44 aver	illea rob	unda		1			4	1	
	45 Bra	cheschita	aceritalins		\checkmark		0	3.1	1	
	46	9								
_	47									

Cover: 0.1, 0.2, 0.3...., 1, 2, 3....., 10, 15, 20, 25......100% (foliage cover): Note: 0.1% cover = 63×63 cm or a circle 71 cm across, 0.5% cover = 1.4×1.4 m, and $1\% = 2.0 \times 2.0$ m, $5\% = 4 \times 5$ m, $25\% = 10 \times 10$ m. Abundance: 1, 2, 3...10, 20, 30....100, 200...1000...

-This document has not been endorsed or approved by Office of Environment and Heritage or Muddy Boots Environmental Training-

BAM Site - F	Field Survey Fo	orm			Site Sheet	no:	2
		Survey Name	Zone ID		Recorde	rs	
Date	8222	18TSA Gilen	with	Gp			
Zone	Datum	Plot ID	4	Plot dimensions	20240	Photo #	1
Éasting	Northing	IBRA region		Midline bearing from 0 m			
Vegetation Class						- Co	nfidence: M L
Plant Community	у Туре	1			EEC:	Co H	onfidence: M L

Record easing and northing at 0 m on midline. Dimensions (Shape) of 0.04 halbase plot

BAM (400	Attribute m² plot)	Sum values
	Trees	
Count of Native Richness	Shrubs	
	Grasses etc.	
	Forbs	
	Ferns	
	Other	
	Trees	
Sum of	Shrubs	
of native	Grasses etc.	
plants by	Forbs	
form group	Ferns	
	Other	
High Threat	Weed cover	

BAM Attribute (1000 m ² plot)								
DBH	# Tree Stems Count	# Stems with Hollows						
80 + cm	1///							
50 – 79 cm								
30 – 49 cm	\checkmark							
20 – 29 cm								
10 – 19 cm								
5 – 9 cm								
< 5 cm		n/a						
Length of logs (≥10 cm diameter, >50 cm in length)	^(m) (7)							

Counts apply when the number of tree stems within a size class is ≤ 10 . Estimates can be used when > 10 (eg. 10, 20, 30..., 100, 200, 300...). For a multi-stemmed tree, only the largest living stem is included in the count/estimate. Tree stems must be living.

For hollows, count only the presence of a stem containing hollows. For a multi-stemmed tree, only the largest stem is included in the count/estimate. Stems may be dead and may be shrubs.

BAM Attribute (1 x 1 m plots)	Litter cover (%)	Bare ground cover (%)	Cryptogam cover (%)	Rock cover (%)
Subplot score (% in each)	5030 10 205			
Average of the 5 subplots				

Litter cover is assessed as the average percentage ground cover of litter recorded from five 1 m x 1 m plots centred at 5, 15, 25, 35, 45 m along the plot midlino. Litter cover includes leaves, seeds, twigs, branchtets and branches (less than 10 cm in diameter). Assessors may also record the cover of rock, baro ground and cryptogams

Physiography + site features that may help in determining PCT and Management Zone (optional)

Morphological Type	La FI	andform Ament		Landform Patiens	Microreliaf
Lithology	S:	of Surface exture	· ····, •· · · · · · · · · · ·	Soil Colour	Soil Dapth
Slope	A	spect	i	Site Drainage	Distance to nearest water and type
Plot Disturbance	Severity code	Age code	Observational evide	ince:	
Clearing (inc. logging)	1				
Cultivation (inc. pasture)	:		1		
Soil erosion					
Firewood / CWD removal	1				
Grazing (deatify native/stock)					
Fire damage					
Storm damage					
Weediness					
Other					

Severity: 0-no evidence: 1=/ght, 2=moderate, 3=severe

Age, Rerecont (
(
byrs), NR=not recent (3-10yrs), Omuld (>10yrs)

SILVE ISTS Creation to what	Plot Identifier		Recorders		la sua a sua
Top 3 natives in each GF: Full species name mandatory. All others where	practicable N	EH	TECover %	Abund	vouch
Ficus rubiginosa	\checkmark		50	4-	
2 I philosphilon centestus	1		R	2	
3 Grina Seculata			1	3	
4 Lamandra longitulia	/		1	5	
5 Decharger	1		4	2	
6 Constant googici	V		40	2000	
7 Gradin Deserved 1			OA	20	
8 Oplismanting demanting			15	200	
9 Numaena Alasidas	1		JE.	7000	
10 Cida Montaital		1	0.1	5	
11 Dictional a repense	1		1	200	
12 Elidado ereita			12	30	
13 Sinchun de accourse		1	01	5	
14 In a			1011	5	
15 Avantalia Emitalian			13	1000	
16 Autor Bibling Stars				7	
17 Selection process		1	01	2	
18 COLL:		1	0.1	7	
19 Area and Market		V	101	2	
20 Aspagas aesmoora	0.		V UI		
21 about terdiner	d v	1	0.5	(
22 Joint and Stand		1	12		
23 Distantin undum		1		1	
24 Dillaresta spinlipsa		/	1	1	
25 Mittosporum innerin oturn	V		4	- 1	
28					
20		-			
28					
29					
30					
21					
22					
32					
33					
04					
00 26					
07					
- 37 - 20					
30					
22					
40					
41					
42					
43					
44					
45					
46					
47					



Proposal Details		
Assessment Id	Proposal Name	BAM data last updated *
00031474/BAAS19010/22/00031475	Greenwich Hospital Redevelopment Masterplan	24/11/2021
Assessor Name	Report Created	BAM Data version *
George Thomas Plunkett	14/04/2022	50
Assessor Number	BAM Case Status	Date Finalised
BAAS19010	Finalised	14/04/2022
Assessment Revision	Assessment Type	
4	Major Projects	

* Disclaimer: BAM data last updated may indicate either complete or partial update of the BAM calculator database. BAM calculator database may not be completely aligned with Bionet.

Ecosystem credits for plant communities types (PCT), ecological communities & threatened species habitat

Zone	Vegetatio n zone name	TEC name	Current Vegetatio n integrity score	Change in Vegetatio n integrity (loss / gain)	Are a (ha)	Sensitivity to loss (Justification)	Species sensitivity to gain class	BC Act Listing status	EPBC Act listing status	Biodiversit y risk weighting	Potenti al SAII	Ecosyste m credits
Coasta	al enriched	sandstone moist	forest									
1	1841_rem nant	Not a TEC	31.2	21.3	0.64	PCT Cleared - 67%	High Sensitivity to Potential Gain			1.75		6

Assessment Id



BAM Credit Summary Report

2	1841_man aged	Not a TEC	36.7	27.1	0.29	PCT Cleared - 67%	High Sensitivity to Potential Gain	1.7	5	3
									Subtot al	9
									Total	9

Species credits for threatened species

Vegetation zone name	Habitat condition (Vegetation Integrity)	Change in habitat condition	Area (ha)/Count (no. individuals)	Sensitivity to loss (Justification)	Sensitivity to gain (Justification)	BC Act Listing status	EPBC Act listing status	Potential SAII	Species credits
Callocephalon f	ïmbriatum / Gang	g-gang Cockato	o (Fauna)						
1841_remnant	21.3	21.3	0.5			Vulnerable	Not Listed	False	5
1841_managed	27.1	27.1	0.12			Vulnerable	Not Listed	False	2
								Subtotal	7
Calyptorhynchu	s lathami / Glossy	/ Black-Cockato	o (Fauna)						
1841_remnant	21.3	21.3	0.5			Vulnerable	Not Listed	False	5
1841_managed	27.1	27.1	0.12			Vulnerable	Not Listed	False	2
								Subtotal	7
Cercartetus nan	us / Eastern Pygm	ny-possum (Fau	ına)						
1841_remnant	21.3	21.3	0.64			Vulnerable	Not Listed	False	7
1841_managed	27.1	27.1	0.29			Vulnerable	Not Listed	False	4
								Subtotal	11

00031474/BAAS19010/22/00031475



Chalinolobus d	wyeri / Large-eare	d Pied Bat (Fau	na)					
1841_remnant	21.3	21.3	0.64		Vulnerable	Vulnerable	True	10
1841_managed	27.1	27.1	0.29		Vulnerable	Vulnerable	True	6
							Subtotal	16
Deyeuxia appr	essa / Deyeuxia ap	pressa (Flora)						
1841_remnant	N/A	N/A	5		Endangered	Endangered	True	15
							Subtotal	15
Hieraaetus mo	rphnoides / Little E	agle (Fauna)						
1841_remnant	21.3	21.3	0.64		Vulnerable	Not Listed	False	5
1841_managed	27.1	27.1	0.29		Vulnerable	Not Listed	False	3
							Subtotal	8
Litoria aurea /	Green and Golden	Bell Frog (Faun	a)					
1841_remnant	21.3	21.3	0.64		Endangered	Vulnerable	False	7
1841_managed	27.1	27.1	0.29		Endangered	Vulnerable	False	4
							Subtotal	11
Miniopterus au	stralis / Little Bent	t-winged Bat (Fo	una)					
1841_remnant	21.3	21.3	0.04		Vulnerable	Not Listed	True	1
1841_managed	27.1	27.1	0.06		Vulnerable	Not Listed	True	1
							Subtotal	2
Miniopterus or	ianae oceanensis /	Large Bent-wing	ged Bat (Fau	ına)				
1841_remnant	21.3	21.3	0.04		Vulnerable	Not Listed	True	1
1841_managed	27.1	27.1	0.06		Vulnerable	Not Listed	True	1
							Subtotal	2

Assessment Id



BAM Credit Summary Report

Myotis macropus / So	outhern Myotis (F	auna)					
1841_remnant	21.3	21.3	0.33	Vulnerable	Not Listed	False	4
1841_managed	27.1	27.1	0.14	Vulnerable	Not Listed	False	2
						Subtotal	6
Ninox connivens / Ba	rking Owl (Faun	a)					
1841_remnant	21.3	21.3	0.6	Vulnerable	Not Listed	False	6
1841_managed	27.1	27.1	0.23	Vulnerable	Not Listed	False	3
						Subtotal	9
Ninox strenua / Powe	erful Owl (Fauna)					
1841_remnant	21.3	21.3	0.6	Vulnerable	Not Listed	False	6
1841_managed	27.1	27.1	0.23	Vulnerable	Not Listed	False	3
						Subtotal	9
Petaurus norfolcensis	: / Squirrel Glider	(Fauna)					
1841_remnant	21.3	21.3	0.64	Vulnerable	Not Listed	False	7
1841_managed	27.1	27.1	0.29	Vulnerable	Not Listed	False	4
						Subtotal	11
Pseudophryne austra	lis / Red-crowned	l Toadlet (Fau	na)				
1841_remnant	21.3	21.3	0.64	Vulnerable	Not Listed	False	5
1841_managed	27.1	27.1	0.29	Vulnerable	Not Listed	False	3
						Subtotal	8
Tyto novaehollandiae	e / Masked Owl (Fauna)					
1841_remnant	21.3	21.3	0.6	Vulnerable	Not Listed	False	6
1841_managed	27.1	27.1	0.23	Vulnerable	Not Listed	False	3
						Subtotal	9

Assessment Id



BAM Vegetation Zones Report

Proposal Details BAM data last updated * Assessment Id Assessment name 00031474/BAAS19010/22/00031475 **Greenwich Hospital Redevelopment** 24/11/2021 Masterplan Assessor Name **Report Created** BAM Data version * George Thomas Plunkett 14/04/2022 50 Assessor Number Assessment Type BAM Case Status **Major Projects** Finalised BAAS19010 Assessment Revision Date Finalised 14/04/2022 4 * Disclaimer: BAM data last updated may indicate either complete or partial update of the BAM calculator database. BAM calculator database may not be completely aligned with

Vegetation Zones

#	Name	PCT	Condition	Area	Minimum number of plots	Management zones
1	1841_remnant	1841-Coastal enriched sandstone moist forest	remnant	0.64	1	Dev (0.21 ha) APZ (0.43 ha)

Assessment Id

Proposal Name

00031474/BAAS19010/22/00031475

Greenwich Hospital Redevelopment Masterplan

Bionet.

Page 1 of 2



BAM Vegetation Zones Report

2 1	841_managed	1841-Coastal enriched sandstone moist	managed	0.29	1	Dev (0.13 ha)
		forest				APZ (0.16 ha)

Assessment Id

Proposal Name

00031474/BAAS19010/22/00031475

Greenwich Hospital Redevelopment Masterplan

Page 2 of 2



BAM Predicted Species Report

Proposal Name	BAM data last updated
Greenwich Hospital Redevelopment Masterplan	24/11/2021
Report Created	BAM Data version *
14/04/2022	50
Assessment Type	BAM Case Status
Major Projects	Finalised
	Date Finalised
	14/04/2022
	Proposal Name Greenwich Hospital Redevelopment Masterplan Report Created 14/04/2022 Assessment Type Major Projects

* Disclaimer: BAM data last updated may indicate either complete or partial update of the BAM calculator database. BAM calculator database may not be completely aligned with Bionet.

Threatened species reliably predicted to utilise the site. No surveys are required for these species. Ecosystem credits apply to these species.

Common Name	Scientific Name	Vegetation Types(s)
Barking Owl	Ninox connivens	1841-Coastal enriched sandstone moist forest
Dusky Woodswallow	Artamus cyanopterus cyanopterus	1841-Coastal enriched sandstone moist forest
Eastern Coastal Free-tailed Bat	Micronomus norfolkensis	1841-Coastal enriched sandstone moist forest
Eastern Osprey	Pandion cristatus	1841-Coastal enriched sandstone moist forest
Gang-gang Cockatoo	Callocephalon fimbriatum	1841-Coastal enriched sandstone moist forest
Grey-headed Flying- fox	Pteropus poliocephalus	1841-Coastal enriched sandstone moist forest
Koala	Phascolarctos cinereus	1841-Coastal enriched sandstone moist forest
Large Bent-winged Bat	Miniopterus orianae oceanensis	1841-Coastal enriched sandstone moist forest
Little Bent-winged Bat	Miniopterus australis	1841-Coastal enriched sandstone moist forest
Little Eagle	Hieraaetus morphnoides	1841-Coastal enriched sandstone moist forest
Little Lorikeet	Glossopsitta pusilla	1841-Coastal enriched sandstone moist forest

Assessment Id

Proposal Name



BAM Predicted Species Report

Masked Owl	Tyto novaehollandiae	1841-Coastal enriched sandstone moist forest
Powerful Owl	Ninox strenua	1841-Coastal enriched sandstone moist forest
Regent Honeyeater	Anthochaera phrygia	1841-Coastal enriched sandstone moist forest
Rosenberg's Goanna	Varanus rosenbergi	1841-Coastal enriched sandstone moist forest
Spotted-tailed Quoll	Dasyurus maculatus	1841-Coastal enriched sandstone moist forest
Superb Fruit-Dove	Ptilinopus superbus	1841-Coastal enriched sandstone moist forest
Swift Parrot	Lathamus discolor	1841-Coastal enriched sandstone moist forest
Varied Sittella	Daphoenositta chrysoptera	1841-Coastal enriched sandstone moist forest
White-throated Needletail	Hirundapus caudacutus	1841-Coastal enriched sandstone moist forest
Yellow-bellied Sheathtail-bat	Saccolaimus flaviventris	1841-Coastal enriched sandstone moist forest

Threatened species Manually Added

None added

Threatened species assessed as not within the vegetation zone(s) for the PCT(s)

Common Name	Scientific Name	Plant Community Type(s)
Glossy Black- Cockatoo	Calyptorhynchus lathami	1841-Coastal enriched sandstone moist forest

Threatened species assessed as not within the vegetation zone(s) for the PCT(s) Refer to BAR for detailed justification

Common Name	Scientific Name	Justification in the BAM-C
Glossy Black-Cockatoo	Calyptorhynchus lathami	Habitat constraints



Proposal Details

Assessment Id	Proposal Name	BAM data last updated *
00031474/BAAS19010/22/00031475	Greenwich Hospital Redevelopment Masterplan	24/11/2021
Assessor Name	Report Created	BAM Data version *
George Thomas Plunkett	14/04/2022	50
Assessor Number	Assessment Type	BAM Case Status
BAAS19010	Major Projects	Finalised
Assessment Revision	Date Finalised	
4	14/04/2022	

* Disclaimer: BAM data last updated may indicate either complete or partial update of the BAM calculator database. BAM calculator database may not be completely aligned with Bionet.

List of Species Requiring Survey

Name	Presence	Survey Months
Callocephalon fimbriatum Gang-gang Cockatoo	Yes (assumed present)	□ Jan □ Feb □ Mar □ Apr
		🗆 May 🗆 Jun 🗖 Jul 🗖 Aug
		Sep Cct Nov Dec
		Survey month outside the specified months?
Calyptorhynchus lathami Glossy Black-Cockatoo	Yes (assumed present)	🗆 Jan 🗆 Feb 🗖 Mar 🗖 Apr
		🗆 May 🗆 Jun 🗆 Jul 🗆 Aug
		Sep Cct Nov Dec
		Survey month outside the specified months?
Cercartetus nanus Eastern Pygmy-possum	Yes (assumed present)	🗆 Jan 🗆 Feb 🗖 Mar 🗖 Apr
		🗆 May 🗆 Jun 🗖 Jul 🗖 Aug
		Sep Oct Nov Dec
		Survey month outside the specified months?

Proposal Name



Chalinolobus dwyeri	Yes (assumed present)	
Large-eared Pied Bat		□ Jan □ Feb □ Mar □ Apr
		□ May □ Jun □ Jul □ Aug
		Sep Oct Nov Dec
		Survey month outside the specified months?
Deyeuxia appressa	Yes (assumed present)	🗆 Jan 🗆 Feb 🗆 Mar 🗆 Apr
		🗆 May 🗆 Jun 🗖 Jul 🗖 Aug
		□ Sep □ Oct □ Nov □ Dec
		Survey month outside the specified months?
Epacris purpurascens var.	No (surveyed)	🗆 Jan 🗆 Feb 🗆 Mar 🗆 Apr
Epacris purpurascens var.		🗆 May 🗆 Jun 🗖 Jul 🗖 Aug
purpurascens		□ Sep ☑ Oct □ Nov □ Dec
		Survey month outside the specified months?
Grammitis stenophylla	No (surveyed)	🗆 Jan 🗹 Feb 🗆 Mar 🗆 Apr
		🗆 May 🗖 Jun 🗖 Jul 🗖 Aug
		□ Sep ☑ Oct □ Nov □ Dec
		Survey month outside the specified months?
<i>Hieraaetus morphnoides</i> Little Eagle	Yes (assumed present)	🗆 Jan 🗆 Feb 🗆 Mar 🗆 Apr
		🗆 May 🗆 Jun 🗖 Jul 🗖 Aug
		□ Sep □ Oct □ Nov □ Dec
		Survey month outside the specified months?
Leptospermum deanei Leptospermum deanei	No (surveyed)	🗆 Jan 🗆 Feb 🗆 Mar 🗆 Apr
		🗆 May 🗆 Jun 🗖 Jul 🗖 Aug
		□ Sep ☑ Oct □ Nov □ Dec
		□ Survey month outside the
		specified months?

Proposal Name

00031474/BAAS19010/22/00031475



<i>Litoria aurea</i> Green and Golden Bell Frog	Yes (assumed present)	🗆 Jan 🗆 Feb 🗆 Mar 🗖 Apr
		□ May □ Jun □ Jul □ Aug
		Survey month outside the specified months?
Miniopterus australis	Yes (assumed present)	□ Jan □ Feb □ Mar □ Apr
		🗆 May 🗆 Jun 🗖 Jul 🗖 Aug
		Sep Oct Nov Dec
		Survey month outside the specified months?
Miniopterus orianae oceanensis Large Bent-winged Bat	Yes (assumed present)	🗆 Jan 🗆 Feb 🗆 Mar 🗆 Apr
		🗆 May 🗆 Jun 🗖 Jul 🗖 Aug
		Sep Oct Nov Dec
		Survey month outside the specified months?
<i>Myotis macropus</i> Southern Myotis	Yes (assumed present)	□ Jan □ Feb □ Mar □ Apr
		🗆 May 🗆 Jun 🗖 Jul 🗖 Aug
		Sep Cot Nov Dec
		Survey month outside the specified months?
Ninox connivens Barking Owl	Yes (assumed present)	□ Jan □ Feb □ Mar □ Apr
		🗆 May 🗆 Jun 🗖 Jul 🗖 Aug
		□ Sep □ Oct □ Nov □ Dec
		Survey month outside the specified months?
Ninox strenua Powerful Owl	Yes (assumed present)	🗆 Jan 🗆 Feb 🗆 Mar 🗆 Apr
		🗆 May 🗆 Jun 🗖 Jul 🗖 Aug
		□ Sep □ Oct □ Nov □ Dec
		Survey month outside the specified months?

Proposal Name

00031474/BAAS19010/22/00031475



Persoonia mollis subsp. maxima Persoonia mollis subsp. maxima	No (surveyed)	□ Jan ☑ Feb □ Mar □ Apr □ May □ Jun □ Jul □ Aug □ Sep ☑ Oct □ Nov □ Dec □ Survey month outside the specified months?
Petaurus norfolcensis Squirrel Glider	Yes (assumed present)	□ Jan □ Feb □ Mar □ Apr □ May □ Jun □ Jul □ Aug □ Sep □ Oct □ Nov □ Dec □ Survey month outside the specified months?
Phascolarctos cinereus Koala	No (surveyed)	□ Jan ☑ Feb □ Mar □ Apr □ May □ Jun □ Jul □ Aug □ Sep ☑ Oct □ Nov □ Dec □ Survey month outside the specified months?
<i>Pseudophryne australis</i> Red-crowned Toadlet	Yes (assumed present)	□ Jan □ Feb □ Mar □ Apr □ May □ Jun □ Jul □ Aug □ Sep □ Oct □ Nov □ Dec □ Survey month outside the specified months?
Rhodamnia rubescens Scrub Turpentine	No (surveyed)	□ Jan ☑ Feb □ Mar □ Apr □ May □ Jun □ Jul □ Aug □ Sep ☑ Oct □ Nov □ Dec □ Survey month outside the specified months?
Rhodomyrtus psidioides Native Guava	No (surveyed)	□ Jan ☑ Feb □ Mar □ Apr □ May □ Jun □ Jul □ Aug □ Sep ☑ Oct □ Nov □ Dec □ Survey month outside the specified months?

Proposal Name

00031474/BAAS19010/22/00031475


BAM Candidate Species Report

Syzygium paniculatumNo (surveyed)Magenta Lilly Pilly*Survey months are outside of the months specified in Bionet.	□ Jan ☑ Feb □ Mar □ Apr □ May □ Jun □ Jul □ Aug □ Sep ☑ Oct □ Nov □ Dec			
		Survey month outside the specified months?		
Tyto novaehollandiae Yes (assumed present) Masked Owl Yes (assumed present)	 Jan Feb May Jun Jul Aug Sep Oct Nov Dec 			
		Survey month outside the specified months?		

Threatened species Manually Added

None added

Threatened species assessed as not on site

Refer to BAR for detailed justification

Common name	Scientific name	Justification in the BAM-C
Biconvex Paperbark	Melaleuca biconvexa	Habitat degraded
Camarophyllopsis kearneyi	Camarophyllopsis kearneyi	Refer to BAR
Eastern Osprey	Pandion cristatus	Habitat constraints
Gosford Wattle, Hurstville and Kogarah Local Government Areas	Acacia prominens - endangered population	Refer to BAR
Grevillea shiressii	Grevillea shiressii	Refer to BAR
Grey-headed Flying-fox	Pteropus poliocephalus	Habitat constraints
Hygrocybe anomala var. ianthinomarginata	Hygrocybe anomala var. ianthinomarginata	Refer to BAR
Koala in the Pittwater Local Government Area	Phascolarctos cinereus - endangered population	Refer to BAR
Regent Honeyeater	Anthochaera phrygia	Habitat constraints
Squirrel Glider on Barrenjoey Peninsula, north of Bushrangers Hill	Petaurus norfolcensis - endangered population	Refer to BAR
Swift Parrot	Lathamus discolor	Habitat constraints

Proposal Name



BAM Candidate Species Report

Tadgell's Bluebell in the local government areas of Auburn.	Wahlenbergia multicaulis - endangered population	Refer to BAR
Bankstown, Baulkham Hills,		
Canterbury, Hornsby, Parramatta and		
Strathfield		

Proposal Name

Greenwich Hospital Redevelopment



Proposal Details

Assessment Id	Proposal Name	BAM data last updated *
00031474/BAAS19010/22/00031475	Greenwich Hospital Redevelopment Masterplan	24/11/2021
Assessor Name George Thomas Plunkett	Assessor Number BAAS19010	BAM Data version * 50
Proponent Names	Report Created 14/04/2022	BAM Case Status Finalised
Assessment Revision 4	Assessment Type Major Projects	Date Finalised 14/04/2022
* Disc BAM o	laimer: BAM data last updated may indicate either complete or calculator database. BAM calculator database may not be comp	partial update of the letely aligned with Bionet.

Potential Serious and Irreversible Impacts

Name of threatened ecological community	Listing status	Name of Plant Community Type/ID		
Nil				
Species				
Chalinolobus dwyeri / Large-eared Pied Bat				
Miniopterus australis / Little Bent-winged Bat				
Miniopterus orianae oceanensis / Large Bent-winged Bat				

Assessment Id

Proposal Name

00031474/BAAS19010/22/00031475

Greenwich Hospital Redevelopment Masterplan

Page 1 of 7



Deyeuxia appressa / Deyeuxia appressa

Additional Information for Approval

PCT Outside Ibra Added

None added

PCTs With Customized Benchmarks

PCT

No Changes

Predicted Threatened Species Not On Site

Name

Calyptorhynchus lathami / Glossy Black-Cockatoo

Ecosystem Credit Summary (Number and class of biodiversity credits to be retired)

Name of Plant Community Type/ID	Name of threatened ecological community	Area of impact	HBT Cr	No HBT Cr	Total credits to be retired
1841-Coastal enriched sandstone moist forest	Not a TEC	0.9	6	3	9

Assessment Id

Proposal Name

00031474/BAAS19010/22/00031475



1841-Coastal enriched	Like-for-like credit retirement options					
sandstone moist forest	Class	Trading group	Zone	НВТ	Credits	IBRA region
	North Coast Wet Sclerophyll Forests This includes PCT's: 661, 686, 694, 827, 1217, 1237, 1244, 1285, 1504, 1841, 1843, 1915	North Coast Wet Sclerophyll Forests >=50% and <70%	1841_remnant	Yes	6	Pittwater, Cumberland, Sydney Cataract, Wyong and Yengo. or Any IBRA subregion that is within 100 kilometers of the outer edge of the impacted site.
	North Coast Wet Sclerophyll Forests This includes PCT's: 661, 686, 694, 827, 1217, 1237, 1244, 1285, 1504, 1841, 1843, 1915	North Coast Wet Sclerophyll Forests >=50% and <70%	1841_managed	No	3	Pittwater, Cumberland, Sydney Cataract, Wyong and Yengo. or Any IBRA subregion that is within 100 kilometers of the outer edge of the impacted site.

Species Credit Summary

Species	Vegetation Zone/s	Area / Count	Credits
Callocephalon fimbriatum / Gang-gang Cockatoo	1841_remnant, 1841_managed	0.6	7.00
Calyptorhynchus lathami / Glossy Black-Cockatoo	1841_remnant, 1841_managed	0.6	7.00

Assessment Id

Proposal Name

00031474/BAAS19010/22/00031475

Greenwich Hospital Redevelopment Masterplan

Page 3 of 7



Cercartetus nanus / Eastern Pygmy-possum	1841_remnant, 1841_managed	0.9	11.00
Chalinolobus dwyeri / Large-eared Pied Bat	1841_remnant, 1841_managed	0.9	16.00
Deyeuxia appressa / Deyeuxia appressa	1841_remnant	5.0	15.00
Hieraaetus morphnoides / Little Eagle	1841_remnant, 1841_managed	0.9	8.00
Litoria aurea / Green and Golden Bell Frog	1841_remnant, 1841_managed	0.9	11.00
Miniopterus australis / Little Bent-winged Bat	1841_remnant, 1841_managed	0.1	2.00
Miniopterus orianae oceanensis / Large Bent-winged Bat	1841_remnant, 1841_managed	0.1	2.00
Myotis macropus / Southern Myotis	1841_remnant, 1841_managed	0.5	6.00
Ninox connivens / Barking Owl	1841_remnant, 1841_managed	0.8	9.00
Ninox strenua / Powerful Owl	1841_remnant, 1841_managed	0.8	9.00
Petaurus norfolcensis / Squirrel Glider	1841_remnant, 1841_managed	0.9	11.00
Pseudophryne australis / Red-crowned Toadlet	1841_remnant, 1841_managed	0.9	8.00

Assessment Id

Proposal Name

00031474/BAAS19010/22/00031475

Greenwich Hospital Redevelopment Masterplan

Page 4 of 7



Tyto novaehollandiae / Masked Owl		1841_remnant, 1841_managed	0.8	9.00
Credit Retirement Options	Like-for-like credit retirement options			
Callocephalon fimbriatum / Gang-gang Cockatoo	Ѕрр	IB	RA subregion	
	Callocephalon fimbriatum / Gang-gang Cod	ckatoo A	ny in NSW	
Calyptorhynchus lathami / Glossy Black-Cockatoo	Ѕрр	IB	RA subregion	
	Calyptorhynchus lathami / Glossy Black-Co	ockatoo A	ny in NSW	
Cercartetus nanus / Eastern Pygmy-possum	Ѕрр	IB	RA subregion	
	Cercartetus nanus / Eastern Pygmy-possum	А	ny in NSW	
Chalinolobus dwyeri / Large-eared Pied Bat	Ѕрр	IB	RA subregion	
	Chalinolobus dwyeri / Large-eared Pied Bat		Any in NSW	
Deyeuxia appressa / Deyeuxia appressa	Ѕрр	IB	RA subregion	
	Deyeuxia appressa / Deyeuxia appressa	A	ny in NSW	
Hieraaetus morphnoides / Little Eagle	Ѕрр	IB	RA subregion	
Assessment Id	Proposal Name			Page 5 of 7

00031474/BAAS19010/22/00031475

Greenwich Hospital Redevelopment Masterplan



	Hieraaetus morphnoides / Little Eagle	Any in NSW
Litoria aurea / Green and Golden Bell Frog	Spp	IBRA subregion
	Litoria aurea / Green and Golden Bell Frog	Any in NSW
Miniopterus australis / Little Bent-winged Bat	Spp	IBRA subregion
	Miniopterus australis / Little Bent-winged Bat	Any in NSW
Miniopterus orianae oceanensis / Large Bent-winged Bat	Spp	IBRA subregion
	Miniopterus orianae oceanensis / Large Bent-winged Bat	Any in NSW
Myotis macropus / Southern Myotis	Spp	IBRA subregion
	Myotis macropus / Southern Myotis	Any in NSW
Ninox connivens / Barking Owl	Spp	IBRA subregion
	Ninox connivens / Barking Owl	Any in NSW
Ninox strenua / Powerful Owl	Spp	IBRA subregion
	Ninox strenua / Powerful Owl	Any in NSW

Assessment Id

Proposal Name

00031474/BAAS19010/22/00031475

Greenwich Hospital Redevelopment Masterplan

Page 6 of 7



Petaurus norfolcensis / Squirrel Glider	Ѕрр	IBRA subregion
	Petaurus norfolcensis / Squirrel Glider	Any in NSW
Pseudophryne australis / Red-crowned Toadlet	Spp	IBRA subregion
	Pseudophryne australis / Red-crowned Toadlet	Any in NSW
Tyto novaehollandiae / Masked Owl	Spp	IBRA subregion
	Tyto novaehollandiae / Masked Owl	Any in NSW

Assessment Id

Proposal Name

00031474/BAAS19010/22/00031475

Greenwich Hospital Redevelopment Masterplan

Page 7 of 7



Proposal Details

Assessment Id	Proposal Name	BAM data last updated *
00031474/BAAS19010/22/00031475	Greenwich Hospital Redevelopment Masterplan	24/11/2021
Assessor Name	Assessor Number	BAM Data version *
George Thomas Plunkett	BAAS19010	50
Proponent Name(s)	Report Created	BAM Case Status
	14/04/2022	Finalised
Assessment Revision	Assessment Type	Date Finalised
4	Major Projects	14/04/2022
	* Disclaimer: PAM data last updated may indicate either complete or	partial update of the PANA

* Disclaimer: BAM data last updated may indicate either complete or partial update of the BAM calculator database. BAM calculator database may not be completely aligned with Bionet.

Name of threatened ecological community	Listing status	Name of Plant Community Type/ID
Nil		
Species		
Chalinolobus dwyeri / Large-eared Pied Bat		
Miniopterus australis / Little Bent-winged Bat		
Miniopterus orianae oceanensis / Large Bent-wi	nged Bat	
Deyeuxia appressa / Deyeuxia appressa		
Additional Information for Approval		
PCT Outside Ibra Added		
None added		

Potential Serious and Irreversible Impacts



PCTs With Customized Benchmarks

PCT
No Changes
Predicted Threatened Species Not On Site
Name
Calyptorhynchus lathami / Glossy Black-Cockatoo

Ecosystem Credit Summary (Number and class of biodiversity credits to be retired)

Name of Plant Community T	ype/ID	Name of threatened ecologic	al communit	у	Area of impac	t HBT Cr	No HBT Cr	Total credits to be retired
1841-Coastal enriched sands	tone moist forest	Not a TEC			0.	9 6	3	9.00
1841-Coastal enriched	Like-for-like credit retire	ement options						
sandstone moist forest	Class	Trading group	Zone	НВТ	Credits	IBRA regior	ı	
	North Coast Wet Sclerophyll Forests This includes PCT's: 661, 686, 694, 827, 1217, 1237, 1244, 1285, 1504, 1841, 1843, 1915	North Coast Wet Sclerophyll Forests >=50% and <70%	1841_remn ant	Yes	6	Pittwater,Cu Wyong and Any IBRA su kilometers impacted si	umberland, S Yengo. or ubregion that of the outer of te.	ydney Cataract, t is within 100 edge of the
	North Coast Wet Sclerophyll Forests This includes PCT's: 661, 686, 694, 827, 1217, 1237, 1244, 1285, 1504, 1841, 1843, 1915	North Coast Wet Sclerophyll Forests >=50% and <70%	1841_mana ged	No	3	Pittwater,Cu Wyong and Any IBRA su kilometers impacted si	umberland, S Yengo. or ubregion that of the outer of te.	ydney Cataract, t is within 100 edge of the



1841-Coastal enriched	Variation options						
sandstone moist forest	Formation	Trading group	Zone	HBT	Credits	IBRA region	
	Wet Sclerophyll Forests (Shrubby sub-formation)	Tier 3 or higher threat status	1841_remn ant	Yes (includi ng artificia I)	6	IBRA Region: Sydney Basin, or Any IBRA subregion that is within 100 kilometers of the outer edge of the impacted site.	
	Wet Sclerophyll Forests (Shrubby sub-formation)	Tier 3 or higher threat status	1841_mana ged	No	3	IBRA Region: Sydney Basin, or Any IBRA subregion that is within 100 kilometers of the outer edge of the impacted site.	

Species Credit Summary

Species	Vegetation Zone/s	Area / Count	Credits
Callocephalon fimbriatum / Gang-gang Cockatoo	1841_remnant, 1841_managed	0.6	7.00
Calyptorhynchus lathami / Glossy Black-Cockatoo	1841_remnant, 1841_managed	0.6	7.00
Cercartetus nanus / Eastern Pygmy-possum	1841_remnant, 1841_managed	0.9	11.00
Chalinolobus dwyeri / Large-eared Pied Bat	1841_remnant, 1841_managed	0.9	16.00
Deyeuxia appressa / Deyeuxia appressa	1841_remnant	5.0	15.00
Hieraaetus morphnoides / Little Eagle	1841_remnant, 1841_managed	0.9	8.00
Litoria aurea / Green and Golden Bell Frog	1841_remnant, 1841_managed	0.9	11.00
Miniopterus australis / Little Bent-winged Bat	1841_remnant, 1841_managed	0.1	2.00
Miniopterus orianae oceanensis / Large Bent-winged Bat	1841_remnant, 1841_managed	0.1	2.00
Myotis macropus / Southern Myotis	1841_remnant, 1841_managed	0.5	6.00
Ninox connivens / Barking Owl	1841_remnant, 1841_managed	0.8	9.00



Ninox strenua / Powerful Owl	1841_remnant, 1841_managed	0.8	9.00
Petaurus norfolcensis / Squirrel Glider	1841_remnant, 1841_managed	0.9	11.00
Pseudophryne australis / Red-crowned Toadlet	1841_remnant, 1841_managed	0.9	8.00
Tyto novaehollandiae / Masked Owl	1841_remnant, 1841_managed	0.8	9.00

Credit Retirement Options Like-for-like options

Callocephalon fimbriatum/	Spp		IBRA region			
Gang-gang Cockatoo	Callocephalon fimbriatum/Gang-gang Cockatoo		Any in NSW			
	Variation options					
	Kingdom	Any species with same or higher category of listing under Part 4 of the BC Act shown below		IBRA region		
	Fauna	Vulnerable		Pittwater, Cumberland, Sydney Cataract, Wyong and Yengo. or Any IBRA subregion that is within 100 kilometers of the outer edge of the impacted site.		
Calyptorhynchus lathami/	Spp		IBRA region			
Glossy Black-Cockatoo	Calyptorhynchus lathami/Glossy Black-Cockatoo		Any in NSW			
	Variation options					
	Kingdom	Any species with same or higher category of listing		IBRA region		



		under Part 4 o shown below	f the BC Act					
	Fauna	Vulnerable		Pittwater, Cumberland, Sydney Cataract, Wyong and Yengo. or Any IBRA subregion that is within 100 kilometers of the outer edge of the impacted site.				
Cercartetus nanus/	Spp		IBRA region					
Eastern Pygmy-possum	Cercartetus nanus/Easter	ercartetus nanus/Eastern Pygmy-possum						
	Variation options	Variation options						
	Kingdom	Any species wi higher categor under Part 4 o shown below	th same or y of listing f the BC Act	IBRA region				
	Fauna	Vulnerable		Pittwater, Cumberland, Sydney Cataract, Wyong and Yengo. or Any IBRA subregion that is within 100 kilometers of the outer edge of the impacted site.				
Chalinolobus dwyeri/	Spp		IBRA region					
Large-eared Pied Bat	Chalinolobus dwyeri/Larg	halinolobus dwyeri/Large-eared Pied Bat						
	Variation options							
	Kingdom	Any species wi higher categor	th same or y of listing	IBRA region				



		under Part 4 of the BC Act shown below		
	Fauna	Vulnerable		Pittwater, Cumberland, Sydney Cataract, Wyong and Yengo. or Any IBRA subregion that is within 100 kilometers of the outer edge of the impacted site.
Deyeuxia appressa/	Spp		IBRA region	
Deyeuxia appressa	Deyeuxia appressa/Deyeuxia appressa	Any in NSW		
	Variation options			
	Kingdom	Any species with same or higher category of listing under Part 4 of the BC Act shown below		IBRA region
	Flora	Endangered		Pittwater, Cumberland, Sydney Cataract, Wyong and Yengo. or Any IBRA subregion that is within 100 kilometers of the outer edge of the impacted site.
Hieraaetus morphnoides/	Spp		IBRA region	
Little Eagle	Hieraaetus morphnoides/Little Eagle		Any in NSW	
	Variation options			
	Kingdom	Any species with same or higher category of listing		IBRA region



		under Part 4 of shown below	f the BC Act				
	Fauna	Vulnerable		Pittwater, Cumberland, Sydney Cataract, Wyong and Yengo. or Any IBRA subregion that is within 100 kilometers of the outer edge of the impacted site.			
Litoria aurea/	Spp		IBRA region				
Green and Golden Bell Frog	Litoria aurea/Green and Golden Bell I	Frog	Any in NSW				
	Variation options						
	Kingdom	Any species wi higher categor under Part 4 of shown below	th same or y of listing f the BC Act	IBRA region			
	Fauna	Endangered		Pittwater, Cumberland, Sydney Cataract, Wyong and Yengo. or Any IBRA subregion that is within 100 kilometers of the outer edge of the impacted site.			
Miniopterus australis/	Spp		IBRA region				
Little Bent-winged Bat	Miniopterus australis/Little Bent-wing	ged Bat	Any in NSW				
	Variation options						
	Kingdom	Any species wi higher categor	th same or y of listing	IBRA region			



	under Part 4 of the BC Act shown below		the BC Act				
	Fauna	Vulnerable		Pittwater, Cumberland, Sydney Cataract, Wyong and Yengo. or Any IBRA subregion that is within 100 kilometers of the outer edge of the impacted site.			
Miniopterus orianae oceanensis/	Spp		IBRA region				
Large Bent-winged Bat	Miniopterus orianae oceanensis/Large Bent-winged Bat		Any in NSW				
	Variation options						
	Kingdom	Any species with same or higher category of listing under Part 4 of the BC Act shown below		IBRA region			
	Fauna	Vulnerable		Pittwater, Cumberland, Sydney Cataract, Wyong and Yengo. or Any IBRA subregion that is within 100 kilometers of the outer edge of the impacted site.			
Myotis macropus/ Southern Myotis	Ѕрр		IBRA region				
	Myotis macropus/Southern Myotis		Any in NSW				
	Variation options						
	Kingdom	Any species wi	th same or	IBRA region			



		higher category of listing under Part 4 of the BC Act shown below				
	Fauna	Vulnerable		Pittwater, Cumberland, Sydney Cataract, Wyong and Yengo. or Any IBRA subregion that is within 100 kilometers of the outer edge of the impacted site.		
Ninox connivens/ Barking Owl	Spp IBRA region					
	Ninox connivens/Barking Owl	Any in NSW				
	Variation options					
	Kingdom	Any species with same or higher category of listing under Part 4 of the BC Act shown below		IBRA region		
	Fauna	Vulnerable		Pittwater, Cumberland, Sydney Cataract, Wyong and Yengo. or Any IBRA subregion that is within 100 kilometers of the outer edge of the impacted site.		
Ninox strenua / Powerful Owl	Spp		IBRA region			
	Ninox strenua/Powerful Owl		Any in NSW			
	Variation options					
	Kingdom	Any species with same or		IBRA region		

00031474/BAAS19010/22/00031475



		higher category of listing under Part 4 of the BC Act shown below				
	Fauna	Vulnerable		Pittwater, Cumberland, Sydney Cataract, Wyong and Yengo. or Any IBRA subregion that is within 100 kilometers of the outer edge of the impacted site.		
Petaurus norfolcensis/	Spp		IBRA region	IBRA region		
Squirrel Glider	Petaurus norfolcensis/Squirrel Glider	Any in NSW				
	Variation options					
	Kingdom	Any species with same or higher category of listing under Part 4 of the BC Act shown below		IBRA region		
	Fauna	Vulnerable		Pittwater, Cumberland, Sydney Cataract, Wyong and Yengo. or Any IBRA subregion that is within 100 kilometers of the outer edge of the impacted site.		
Pseudophryne australis/	Spp		IBRA region			
Red-crowned Toadlet	Pseudophryne australis/Red-crowned Toadlet		Any in NSW			
	Variation options					
	Kingdom	Any species with same or		IBRA region		



		higher catego under Part 4 o shown below	ory of listing of the BC Act			
	Fauna	Vulnerable		Pittwater, Cumberland, Sydney Cataract, Wyong and Yengo. or Any IBRA subregion that is within 100 kilometers of the outer edge of the impacted site.		
Tyto novaehollandiae / Masked Owl	Spp	Spp IBRA regio				
	Tyto novaehollandiae /Ma	asked Owl Any in NSW				
	Variation options					
	Kingdom	Any species w higher catego under Part 4 o shown below	vith same or ory of listing of the BC Act	IBRA region		
	Fauna	Vulnerable		Pittwater, Cumberland, Sydney Cataract, Wyong and Yengo. or Any IBRA subregion that is within 100 kilometers of the outer edge of the impacted site.		

Appendix 5. MICROBAT CALL ANALYSIS



Client Address: 97-115 River Road, Greenwich, NSW 2065

Client Name: Brian Tran

Client Contact: 0437 120 772

MICROBAT ANALYSIS REPORT

Drop off Location for SIME and Data: THE Mailing address: Email Address for submitting recordings: servicedesk@teversecology.com.su Our Contact details:

52 The Avenue, Mt Penang Parklands, Karlong NSW 2250 PO Box 7138, Karlong, NSW 2250 (ph) 1300 896 998

Project Name: Greenwich Ecological Survey TBE Quote Ref No: Q18TSA08X Detector 1 Location: 33.827975 S, 151.183540 E Detector 2 Location: 33.828067 S, 151.184501 E Date of Survey: 07-15 March 2021 (8 nights)

SUMMARY OF RESULTS					
ID Method	Result	Threatened	ID Confidence (Probability low to high)		
Alternating pulses around 30 kHz	Chalinolobus gouldii	No	High		

METHOD DESCRIPTION

An Anabat Swift (full-spectrum) with a unidirectional microphone and a SM4Bat (zero-crossing) with an omnidirectional microphone was used to record bat calls. All recorded files were run through a per-pulse decision tree in Anabat Insight, which filtered out non-bat files and labelled bat files with either a species or species complex. Each automatically labelled file was then manually verified. The call from each species/species complex that was most confidently identified was selected to be used as the image in the "Results" section of this report. All images were taken from within Anabat Insight and shown in either compressed or uncompressed mode, depending on what image best highlighted the diagnostic features.

HABITAT & SURVEY CONDITIONS

The survey period had 70 mm of rain (5 nights with no rain), average wind speed of approximately 20 km/h, and an average maximum temperature of 27.1°C. The Anabat Swift was deployed in a narrow, semi-cluttered potential flyway surrounded with predominantly Angophora costata. The SM4Bat was deployed next to a small rocky overhang facing along a planted, exotic, potential flyway.

CALL REFERENCE LIBRARY

Calls were identified using 1) "Bat Calls of NSW" by Pennay et al. (2004) regional guide, 2) "Key to the bat calls of south-east Queensland and north-east New South Wales" by Reinhold et al. (2001), 3) "Bat Calls of Central Eastern NSW" by Chris Corben (2009), 4) Call metrics obtained from discussions with recognised bat experts including Michael Pennay, Brad Law, and Greg Ford, and 4) Travers Bushfire & Ecology collected reference calls were also added to the library. The combined reference calls from these five sources results in a comprehensive, local, reference-call library for all species of microbat that occur in the greater Sydney region.



