EPBC Act referral

Australian Government
Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment

Note: PDF may contain fields not relevant to your application. These fields will appear blank or unticked. Please disregard these fields.

Title of proposal	2021/8946 - Coomera Hospital and Health Precinct

Section 1

Summary of your proposed action

1.1 Project industry type Science and Research

1.2 Provide a detailed description of the proposed action, including all proposed activities

The Gold Coast population is growing at a faster rate than the Queensland state average (2.4 per cent for the Gold Coast compared to 1.8 per cent for Queensland) with the north Gold Coast corridor experiencing the highest rate of growth. In response to the population growth data, Gold Coast Health undertook a health service-wide facility master planning process. The process assisted in planning for future development and delivery of new and expanded services including ambulatory, community-based and outpatient services to support growth, particularly in the northern Gold Coast.

Despite implementing a range of efficiency and effectiveness measures, the need for services to be delivered closer to northern corridor residents has been consistently identified through Gold Coast Health's planning processes.

It is proposed that The Gold Coast Hospital and Health Service will utilise the property at 41 George Alexander Way, Coomera to construct the new proposed Coomera Health Precinct which will deliver a much needed health facility to the Northern Gold Coast. The Health Precinct will consist of an ambulatory care health precinct incorporating a range of community and home-based programs such as chemotherapy and renal dialysis, space for community mental health services and a minor injuries clinic.

The Coomera Health Precinct is proposed on land described as Lot 900 on SP207822 and is approximately 13.5ha in size. The site is located within the proposed Coomera Town Centre in the rapidly developing Coomera locality. The site is primarily located within the Centre Zone under the City of Gold Coast 'City Plan' and which contemplates the proposed use.

The site is bound by the Coomera Railway Station and Brisbane Gold Coast railway line in the west and south, George Alexander Way in the east, and larger undeveloped forested lots in the north. These forested lots to the north have existing residential approvals and is the subject of a 'controlled action' decision. More broadly, the site is located approximately 800m west of the Pacific Motorway and central to the rapidly emerging Coomera/Pimpama urban growth area.

The subject site is predominantly forested with vegetation communities associated with open eucalypt forest Regional Ecosystem types that occur on metamorphosed sediments and interbedded volcanic-derived substrates. The site is moderately sloping to the south and is within the Oakey Creek catchment and broader Coomera River catchment.

To deliver the Coomera Health Precinct, the proposal will require:

- Operational works approvals for earthworks and vegetation clearing. Clearing will be approximately 11.13ha (8.5ha remnant vegetation)
- Installation of associated infrastructure including the road network and trunk water, sewer, stormwater, electrical and telecommunications infrastructure
- The project will contribute to increased traffic volumes on the urban collector roads of George Alexander Way and Foxwell Road
- The proposal will see approximately 2.2ha of remnant vegetation retained on site and contribute to the wider open space network
- The proposal will retain additional site vegetation within landscaped areas where feasible (note that this vegetation has not been included within the identified total retention figure)
- Installation of an appropriate site-based management system to ensure the site is stabilised and stormwater is appropriately treated prior to discharge from the site
- The proposed clearing, of approximately 8.5ha of remnant vegetation, is to be offset in accordance with the Qld Offsets Act 2014.

As illustrated in the attached concept, the site of the Health Precinct is intended to gain access ultimately from a proposed new road 'Road A'. This is a future trunk collector road through the Coomera locality.

This road is largely contained within the adjacent Lot 44 SP295239 to the north. This adjacent lot forms part of a larger proposed master planned residential development. The development has obtained various land use approvals to facilitate the development form the local authority and state. A referral under the EPBC Act was lodged and in 2016, it was declared a controlled action (Coomera Woods master planned residential development, Queensland – EPBC 2015/7610). This decision has been subject to legal action and is subject to further ongoing review.

Note: PDF may contain fields not relevant to your application. These fields will appear blank or unticked. Please disregard these fields.

Given the uncertainty with this and delivery of the subject road, the Health Precinct is able to operate under an interim access arrangement whereby the site gains access from the extent of proposed 'Road A' within the site and connect with George Alexander Way.

Note that the realigned George Alexander Way with 'Road A' also affects the allotment to the immediate south, 31 George Alexander Way, Lot 38 RP 187881. This lot does not form part of the application and the interim access arrangements will provide a direct access to George Alexander Way.

Refer to Section 1.2 of attached MNES Assessment Report for further details (Att 1 - MNES Assessment Report, Section 1.2, p9-10).

1.3 What is the extent and location of your proposed action?

See Appendix B

1.5 Provide a brief physical description of the property on which the proposed action will take place and the location of the proposed action (e.g. proximity to major towns, or for off-shore actions, shortest distance to mainland)

The site is located at 41 George Alexander Way, Coomera, situated in South East Queensland and within the City of Gold Coast Local Government Area. The site is approximately 30 kilometres north of Surfers Paradise. Coomera is a popular tourist destination, home to theme parks including Dreamworld and White Water World and has experienced notable expansion of urban development over recent years. Coomera Railway Station and Brisbane Gold Coast rail line line in the west and south, George Alexander Way in the east, and larger undeveloped forested lots in the north. These larger forested allotments have existing development approvals in place for a residential estate. More broadly, the site is located approximately 800m west of the Pacific Motorway and central to the rapidly emerging Coomera/Pimpama urban growth area.

See Att 1 - MNES Assessment Report, Section 1.5, p11-12.

1.6 What is the size of the proposed action area development footprint (or work area) including disturbance footprint and avoidance footprint (if relevant)?

The subject site is located within the City of Gold Coast Local Government Area and occurs within the suburb of Coomera.

The overall subject site (Lot 900 on 207822) is approximately 13.53ha.

The proposed action area development footprint is approximately 11.13ha.

The proposed avoidance area is approximately 2.4ha.

1.7 Proposed action location

Lot - Lot 900 SP207822

1.8 Primary jurisdiction Queensland

1.9 Has the person proposing to take the action received any Australian Government grant funding to undertake this project?

☐ Yes ☑ No

1.10 Is the proposed action subject to local government planning approval?

☐ Yes ☑ No

Note: PDF may contain fields not relevant to your application. These fields will appear blank or unticked. Please disregard these fields.

1.11 Provide an estimated start and estimated end date for the proposed action	Start Date	01/07/2022
	End Date	01/07/2032

1.12 Provide details of the context, planning framework and state and/or local Government requirements

In gaining approvals for the Coomera Health Precinct, Gold Coast Health is required to give due consideration to the likely environmental impacts of projects under a number of Commonwealth, State and Local Government laws, guidelines and policies.

The primary piece of legislation that determines Gold Coast Health's responsibilities regarding environmental management in Queensland is the Environmental Protection Act 1994 (EP Act). Section 319 of the EP Act imposes a general "duty of care" (or "general environmental duty") which specifies that a person must not undertake any activity that may harm the environment without taking reasonable and practical measures to prevent or minimise the harm. The table below outlines additional legislation relevant to the proposed action.

Other key legislative provisions guiding development are the Planning Act and the Nature Conservation Act at a state level.

AIR QUALITY
Legislation: Environmental Protection Act 1994; Environmental Protection (Air) Policy 1997
Triggers: Conducting an Environmentally Relevant Activity (ERA).

CULTURAL HERITAGE
Legislation: Queensland Heritage Act 1992; Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Act 2003
Triggers: Development relating to protected area, place on register.

FLORA AND FAUNA
Legislation: Environmental Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 (EPBC Act); Environmental Protection Act 1994; Land Protection (Pest and Stock Route Management) Act 2002; Nature Conservation Act 1992 (NCA); Vegetation Management Act 1999 (VMA); Coastal Protection and Management Act 1995; Offsets Act 2014
Triggers: Significant impact on MNES; Conducting an ERA; Class of pest found on site; Clearing of protected vegetation/ removal of protected wildlife; Clearing assessable vegetation outside land designated as road corridor; Proposed works within tidal area/ State Coastal Management District; Residual impacts to SMES.

NOISE
Legislation: Environmental Protection Act 1994; Environmental Protection (Noise) Policy 1997
Triggers: Conducting an ERA

PLANNING
Legislation: Planning Act 2016; Regional Planning Interests Act 2014
Triggers: Development within areas of ecological significance; Development within areas of ecological significance, State Planning Policies (SPP), State Planning Regulatory Provisions (SPRP).

SOIL
Legislation: Environmental Protection Act 1994; Soil Conservation Act 1986
Triggers: Conducting an ERA, removing contaminated soil from sites listed on contaminated land register or Environmental Management Register (EMR); Development within areas that are prone to erosion.

WASTE
Legislation: Environmental Protection Act 1994; Environmental Protection (waste management) Policy 2000
Triggers: Conducting an ERA

WATER QUALITY
Legislation: Environmental Protection Act 1994; Environmental Protection (Water) Policy 1997; Water Act 2000
Triggers: Conducting an ERA; Consuming water from waterways for construction works; Destroying vegetation, excavation or placing fill in a watercourse.

ENVIRONMENTALLY RELEVANT ACTIVITIES (ERAs)
Legislation: Environmental Protection Act 1994
Triggers: Conducting an ERA.

As government supported State infrastructure, the proposed action is exempt from assessment against a local government planning scheme under the Queensland Planning Act 2016. This does not mean consideration of local government controls are ignored nor is consultation with the local government. As noted, the site is within the Centre Zone under the local planning

Note: PDF may contain fields not relevant to your application. These fields will appear blank or unticked. Please disregard these fields.

scheme and contemplates the uses proposed.

Environmental approvals will be obtained in accordance with the following applicable Queensland Government legislation and policy.

State environmental permits, approvals and/or processes applicable to the project include the following:

- a protected plant clearing permit and impact management plan for clearing conservation significant flora species under the Nature Conservation Act 1992
- development of a 'high risk' Species Management Program (SMP) under the Nature Conservation Act 1992
- general environmental duty to minimise environmental harm under the Environmental Protection Act 1994
- responsibilities to manage contaminated land under the Environmental Protection Act 1994
- cultural heritage management requirements under the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Act 2003
- offsets for residual impact on State Matters of Environment Significance

See Att 1 - MNES Assessment Report, Section 1.12, p13-15.

1.13 Describe any public consultation that has been, is being or will be undertaken, including with Indigenous stakeholders

The site is located on a freehold block of land within the emerging Coomera urban locality and specifically within the Centre Zone or Coomera Town Centre. The Coomera Town Centre has been identified within multiple Local Government strategic plans and has contemplated medical/hospital facilities as a potential use. The planning scheme process has undergone extensive and prolonged consultation with the Gold Coast community and traditional owners.

The Queensland State elections of 2020 saw the incumbent Labor government identify that the Coomera Hospital would be built on the subject site. They also committed funding for the development of the plans. The government was returned and the planning process commenced.

Given the significant urban growth in the northern Gold Coast corridor the community has been seeking commensurate facilities to service the expanding population be provided. There is a broad knowledge of the future facility.

Further consultation will occur as the project is advanced through the planning process and the concept is fully resolved.

See Att 1 - MNES Assessment Report, Section 1.13, p15-16.

1.14 Describe any environmental impact assessments that have been or will be carried out under Commonwealth, State or Territory legislation including relevant impacts of the project

In preparing the report, Planit has been able to draw on its extensive knowledge on the occurrence of flora and fauna species and ecological communities in the locality. This has been based upon multiple ecological assessments/reports/targeted surveys over a 20-year period undertaken on behalf of State government agencies i.e. Department of Transport and Main Roads, the local authority, public companies and private individuals.

This has included ecological assessments/surveying immediately adjacent to the site as well as multiple properties in the Coomera and Pimpama locality. Planit has also prepared multiple assessments and a number of referrals under the EPBC Act.

See Att 1 - MNES Assessment Report, Section 1.14, p16-17.

1.15 Is this action part of a staged development (or a component of a larger project)?

☐ Yes ☑ No

1.16 Is the proposed action related to other actions or proposals in the region?

☑ Yes ☐ No

1.16.1 Identify the nature/scope and location of the related action (Including under the relevant legislation)

The site of the Hospital and Health Precinct is intended to gain access ultimately from a proposed new road 'Road A'. This is a future trunk collector road through the Coomera locality (See Figure 1 of Att 1).

This road is largely contained within the adjacent Lot 44 SP295239 to the north. This adjacent lot forms part of a larger proposed master planned residential development. The development has obtained various land use approvals to facilitate the

Note: PDF may contain fields not relevant to your application. These fields will appear blank or unticked. Please disregard these fields.

development form the local authority and state. A referral under the EPBC Act was lodged and in 2016, it was declared a controlled action (Coomera Woods master planned residential development, Queensland – EPBC 2015/7610). This decision has been subject to legal action and is subject to further ongoing review.

Given the uncertainty with this and delivery of the subject road, the Health Precinct component of the development is able to operate under an interim access arrangement whereby the site gains access from the extent

Note: PDF may contain fields not relevant to your application. These fields will appear blank or unticked. Please disregard these fields.

Section 2

Matters of national environmental significance

2.1 Is the proposed action likely to have any direct or indirect impact on the values of any World Heritage properties?

☐ Yes ☑ No

2.2 Is the proposed action likely to have any direct or indirect impact on the values of any National Heritage places?

☐ Yes ☑ No

2.3 Is the proposed action likely to have any direct or indirect impact on the ecological character of a Ramsar wetland?

☑ Yes ☐ No

Wetland

The site is within 10km of the Moreton Bay Marine Park RAMSAR area, triggering this MNES.

As outlined in the Table 5, Section 2.3 of the MNES Assessment Report (Att 1 - MNES Assessment Report), the proposal is not considered to have an impact on the ecological character and functions of the wetland.

Impact

Refer to the Table 5, Section 2.3 of the MNES Assessment Report (Att 1 - MNES Assessment Report) for full details of the potential impact on the ecological character of a Ramsar wetland.

The proposed action is approximately 4km west from the Moreton Bay Ramsar Wetland. The proposal is anticipated to have a negligible impact on Moreton Bay.

This assumption is based upon the following:

- The site being located above RL 20 and not occurring on known acid sulphate soils. Thus, the potential for water quality impacts from this known potential influence of water quality is not present.
- The proposed earthworks/tree clearing disturbance area is relatively small at approximately 11.13ha and a suite of standard sediment and erosion control measures should sufficiently address the potential for onsite erosion and downstream sedimentation. A sediment and erosion control plan is a standard requirement for earthworks in Queensland and would be prepared.
- A stormwater management plan (SMP) for the site will also be required to be prepared to address potential quantity and quality impacts arising from the proposed development. Provision of a SMP is standard for earthworks in Queensland.
- All stormwater will discharge to a legal point of discharge and will enter the existing urban stormwater network. There is already substantial urban development within the catchment.
- Erosion and Sediment Control Plans and Stormwater Management Plans will be developed in accordance with State and Local Government water quality objectives, controls and management requirements. These State and Local Government requirements as embedded in the site's approvals and mandate water quality standards for run-off exiting the site.
- Given the separation of the site from the Moreton Bay RAMSAR, the relatively small scale of works/development footprint, a range of standard controls and plans to be implemented on site to prevent downstream sedimentation, and impacts on water quality, it is considered there is negligible impact to this MNES and its interdependent ecological communities and species.
- Given its distance from the RAMSAR wetland and existing development in the area, it is unlikely the that proposed action will lead to a substantial and measurable change in the water quality of the RAMSAR wetland.

2.3.2 Do you consider this impact to be significant?

☐ Yes ☑ No

Note: PDF may contain fields not relevant to your application. These fields will appear blank or unticked. Please disregard these fields.

2.4 Is the proposed action likely to have any direct or indirect impact on the members of any listed species or any threatened ecological community, or their habitat?

☑ Yes ☐ No

Species or threatened ecological community

Koala (Phascolarctos cinereus)

Impact

The action is not likely to have a significant impact upon the Koala.

Direct and indirect impacts which may arise as a result of the project includes the removal of potential habitat and potential forage trees, habitat fragmentation and barriers to dispersal and mortality associated with roads/vehicle strike.

Further discussions regarding potential impacts upon the Koala have been provided within Section 3.1.2, p92-119 of the MNES Assessment Report (Att 1 – MNES Assessment Report).

Additional discussions regarding potential have been provided within Attachment 3 of the MNES Assessment Report (Att 1 – MNES Assessment Report).

Species or threatened ecological community

Grey-headed Flying-fox (Pteropus poliocephalus)

Impact

Direct and indirect includes the removal of potential Flying-fox foraging resources and potential increase in vehicle strikes.

The action is not likely to have a significant impact upon the Grey-headed Flying-fox given no roost camps will be impacted upon and the abundance of available foraging resources within the broader landscape for this highly nomadic species.

Further discussions regarding potential impacts upon the Grey-headed Flying-fox have been provided within Section 3.1.2, p120-129 of the MNES Assessment Report (Att 1 – MNES Assessment Report).

2.4.2 Do you consider this impact to be significant?

☐ Yes ☑ No

2.5 Is the proposed action likely to have any direct or indirect impact on the members of any listed migratory species or their habitat?

☐ Yes ☑ No

2.6 Is the proposed action to be undertaken in a marine environment (outside Commonwealth marine areas)?

☐ Yes ☑ No

2.7 Is the proposed action likely to be taken on or near Commonwealth land?

☐ Yes ☑ No

Note: PDF may contain fields not relevant to your application. These fields will appear blank or unticked. Please disregard these fields.

2.8 Is the proposed action taking place in the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park?

☐ Yes ☑ No

2.9 Is the proposed action likely to have any direct or indirect impact on a water resource from coal seam gas or large coal mining development?

☐ Yes ☑ No

2.10 Is the proposed action a nuclear action?

☐ Yes ☑ No

2.11 Is the proposed action to be taken by a Commonwealth agency?

☐ Yes ☑ No

2.12 Is the proposed action to be undertaken in a Commonwealth Heritage place overseas?

☐ Yes ☑ No

2.13 Is the proposed action likely to have any direct or indirect impact on any part of the environment in the Commonwealth marine area?

☐ Yes ☑ No

Note: PDF may contain fields not relevant to your application. These fields will appear blank or unticked. Please disregard these fields.

Section 3

Description of the project area

3.1 Describe the flora and fauna relevant to the project area

A description of the flora and fauna relevant to the project area has been provided within Section 3 of the MNES Assessment Report (Att 1 – MNES Assessment Report, Section 3).

A summary is provided below.

The flora and fauna in the project area has been subject to multiple studies over the years. In 2021, Planit Consulting conducted additional flora and fauna surveys utilised a variety of recognised techniques which ground-truthed the vegetation mapping over the site, identified any Threatened Ecological Communities (TECs), as well as targeted potentially occurring threatened flora and fauna species listed under the EPBC Act.

Flora

The majority of project area is mapped as containing remnant vegetation with minor areas of non-remnant vegetation occurring proximate to the existing dwelling, and areas along the northern boundary which were historically disturbed.

A total of two (2) individual Regional Ecosystems (RE's
) were ground-truthed within the project area. These area identified as the following:

- 12.11.24: Eucalyptus carnea, E. tindaliae, Corymbia intermedia +/- E. siderophloia or E. crebra woodland on metamorphics +/- interbedded volcanics; and

- 12.11.5: Corymbia citriodora subsp. variegata woodland to open forest +/- Eucalyptus siderophloia/E. crebra, E. carnea, E. acmenoides, E. propinqua on metamorphics +/- interbedded volcanics

No threatened flora species or TECs scheduled under the EPBC Act was recorded within the project area.

Fauna

A total of fifty-one (51) fauna species were recorded within, or within close proximity to the proposal area during Planit Consulting's 2021 fauna survey efforts. This comprised of thirty-six (36) bird, three (3) amphibians, ten (10 mammals) and two (2) reptiles.

From the above, two of the fauna species recorded are scheduled as 'Vulnerable' under the EPBC Act, being the Koala (Phascolarctos cinerues) and the Grey-headed Flying-fox (Pteropus poliocephalus).

A number of pest animals were recorded within the project area, such as Common Myna (Sturnus tristis), Cane Toad (Rhinella marina), Black Rat (Rattus rattus), Red Fox (Vulpes vulpes) and Hare (Lepus europaeus).

3.2 Describe the hydrology relevant to the project area (including water flows)

The site falls largely within the Oakey Creek Catchment a small sub catchment to the Coomera River. Oakey Creek is a small stream that runs into the Coomera River. It has good riparian condition, however freshwater fish and macroinvertebrate diversity is low. Dense development in the upper catchment has impacted on the creek health. The section of Oakey Creek adjacent to the developing Coomera Town Centre has been realigned to a managed channel.

No defined waterways are present within the site. Currently the majority of the site flows as uncontrolled sheet flow in a north-south direction, towards the rail corridor and Lot 38 on RP187881. Drainage form the site ultimately enters the urban stormwater network on Foxwell Road. The site is within the mid freshwater section of the catchment which is characterised as urban with fragmented future urban allotments.

A small dam occurs within the central area of the site. This dam does not contain any aquatic vegetation and is regularly driven through by trespassing 4WD vehicles. The dam is not considered to be environmentally significant.

The proposal will not impact or alter any waterways.

Refer to of the MNES Assessment Report for full details (Att 1 - MNES Assessment Report, Section 3.2, P130).

3.3 Describe the soil and vegetation characteristics relevant to the project area

The majority of the project area is predominantly remnant (Cat B) vegetation but includes patches of disturbed or regrowth (Cat X) vegetation which can be attributed to the existing urban land uses of surrounding properties. The remnant vegetation within the site is classed as 'least concern' regional ecosystem.

Two (2) Regional Ecosystems are mapped over the site. These are:

- RE 12.11.24: Eucalyptus carnea, E. tindaliae, Corymbia intermedia +/- E. siderophloia or E. crebra woodland on metamorphics +/- interbedded volcanics
- RE 12.11.5: Corymbia citriodora subsp. variegata woodland to open forest +/- Eucalyptus siderophloia/E. crebra, E. carnea, E. acmenoides, E. propinqua on metamorphics +/- interbedded volcanics

The Regional Ecosystems mapped over the site was ground-truthed to be largely accurate.

Further details regarding the site's vegetation characteristics is provided within Section 3.1 above.

A review of the South-east Queensland Region Geoscience Data Set (DNRME, 2005) notes that the site footprint consists entirely of one lithostratigraphic group (Neranleigh-Fernvale beds).

Neranleigh-Fernvale beds (DCf)

Feldspathic and lithic meta-arenite, metasiltstone and conglomerate proximal turbidites, with structurally intercalated or stratigraphically underlying chert, jasper and basic meta- volcanics. It is mapped throughout the entirety of the proposal footprint.

Landform:

A review of the state governments (DES/DNRM) regional ecosystem mapping for the site identifies one land zones which are described by Wilson and Taylor (2012) as:

Land Zone 11 - Hills and lowlands on metamorphic rocks

Metamorphosed rocks, forming ranges, hills and lowlands. Primarily lower Permian and older sedimentary formations which are generally moderately to strongly deformed. Includes low to high-grade and contact metamorphics such as phyllites, slates, gneisses of indeterminate origin, serpentinite, and interbedded volcanics. Soils are mainly shallow, gravelly Rudosols and Tenosols, with Sodosols and Chromosols on lower slopes and gently undulating areas. Soils are typically of low to moderate fertility.

The underlying geological units are utilised in association with the existing vegetation to ground-truth and classify regional ecosystem types. Analysis of the regional ecosystem types occurring within bushland on similar geology can provide insight on what pre-clearing vegetation communities previously occurred in cleared or developed areas.

Refer to the MNES Assessment Report for full details (Att 1 - MNES Assessment Report, Section 3.3, p130-131).

3.4 Describe any outstanding natural features and/or any other important or unique values relevant to the project area

Whilst the proposed action is within proximity to the Moreton Bay Ramsar Wetland (refer to Figure 3 of Att 1 - MNES Assessment Report), the project footprint does not intersect any areas of the Moreton Bay Ramsar Wetland.

The Moreton Bay Ramsar Wetland Comprises of approximately 113,314 hectares, including:

- Moreton Island
- Parts of North Stradbroke Island
- Parts of South Stradbroke Island
- Parts of Bribie Island
- Some of Southern Bay Islands
- Waters and tributaries of Pumicestone Passage
- Some intertidal and subtidal areas of the western bay, southern bay and sandy channels of the Broadwater Region
- Marine areas and sand banks within the central and northern bay
- Some beach habitats (DEE 2014d).

The project site is approximately 4.5km from any RAMSAR wetland. This development is not expected to significantly impact the RAMSAR wetland as mentioned previously in Section 2.3 of the referral form.

Refer to Section 3.4 of the attached MNES Assessment Report for full details (Att 1 - MNES Assessment Report, Section

3.2, p131).

3.5 Describe the status of native vegetation relevant to the project area

Queensland's Regulated Vegetation Management Map shows the majority of the project area is predominantly remnant (Cat B) vegetation but includes patches of disturbed or regrowth (Cat X) vegetation which can be attributed to the existing urban land uses of surrounding properties. The remnant vegetation within the site is classed as 'least concern' regional ecosystem.

Two (2) Regional Ecosystems are mapped over the site. These are:

- RE 12.11.24: Eucalyptus carnea, E. tindaliae, Corymbia intermedia +/- E. siderophloia or E. crebra woodland on metamorphics +/- interbedded volcanics
- RE 12.11.5: Corymbia citriodora subsp. variegata woodland to open forest +/- Eucalyptus siderophloia/E. crebra, E. carnea, E. acmenoides, E. propinqua on metamorphics +/- interbedded volcanics

The Regional Ecosystems mapped over the site was ground-truthed to be largely accurate.

Further details regarding the site's vegetation characteristics is provided within Section 3.1 of the referral form.

No EPBC Act or NC Act listed threatened flora species were identified on site during the site survey, and all were identified as having a low likelihood of occurrence on site. Consequently, the Project is not considered likely to impact upon any EPBCAct or NC Act listed threatened flora species.

Condition of the environment within the proposed development site varies greatly throughout. The vegetation consists of large remnant trees with a dense understory. The dense understory has resulted in a lower than expected coverage of weed species, with the majority of exotic species being invasive grasses, shrubs, vines and some scattered Lantana camara along the edges of tracks.

There is no evidence of recent bushfires (within the last five years) occurring within the project area.

Numerous 4wd tracks have established throughout the project area over the years.

Given the topography of project area, no wetland type vegetation communities occur within the project area. The project area does contain a small man-made dam, with lower-laying/flatter areas along the southern boundaries subject to minor ponding, in particularly deep 4wd ruts.

Although not significant, debris and rubbish were commonly noted throughout the project area.

3.6 Describe the gradient (or depth range if action is to be taken in a marine area) relevant to the project area

The project site area is not located in a marine area. The site is characterised as moderately sloping, falling from northeast to southwest. Levels range from approximately RL20m adjacent to the rail line to RL 60m near the northern property boundary.

There are no defined watercourses with drainage largely sheetflow.

3.7 Describe the current condition of the environment relevant to the project area

Condition of the environment within the proposed development site varies greatly throughout. The vegetation consists of large remnant trees with a dense understory. The dense understory has resulted in a lower than expected coverage of weed species, with the majority of species being invasive grasses, shrubs, vines and some scattered Lantana camara along the edges of tracks.

The land has several tracks (of varying quality) running through it, which are used by the public for leisure activities such as dog walking, riding motorbikes and driving off road vehicles. There is one (1) waterbody located in the middle of the site, which at the time of field studies, had a reasonably low water level.

Surrounding land uses range from residential, commercial and major infrastructure (rail and roads), with the Coomera Heavy Rail line and Coomera Westfield shopping center adjacent to the property boundaries.

Coomera is often shown to be one of the fastest growing areas in Queensland, with the corridor encompassing Coomera, Pimpama, Ormeau, Upper Coomera and Willowvale. The region grew by 23% between 2016 and 2019, with the $1.5 billion Coomera Town Centre being developed to support this growth. This community hub includes nine precincts – featuring a

Note: PDF may contain fields not relevant to your application. These fields will appear blank or unticked. Please disregard these fields.

$470 million Westfield Shopping Centre

The Local government planning instrument for Coomera recognises the requirements of a future community, in excess of 60,000 people.

This development has seen significant clearing of previously large rural land holdings which was vegetated to varying degrees. The resultant landscape consists or fragmented woodland/habitat and few large remnants.

The nearest waterway to the site is Qakey Creek which is a small sub catchment to the Coomera River Catchment. These waterways discharge into the Moreton Bay Marine Park RAMSAR wetland. Oakey Creek is approximately 400m from the site and runs through the Coomera Town Centre. This section of the waterway was recently realigned to facilitate the town centre.

Refer to Section 3.7 of the attached MNES Assessment Report for further details (Att 1 - MNES Assessment Report, Section 3.7, p132).

3.8 Describe any Commonwealth Heritage places or other places recognised as having heritage values relevant to the project

There are not any Commonwealth Heritage places or other places recognised as having heritage values relevant to the project area.

3.9 Describe any Indigenous heritage values relevant to the project area

There are no known places of Indigenous Heritage value located within the site or adjacent to it.

3.10 Describe the tenure of the action area (e.g. freehold, leasehold) relevant to the project area

The site is freehold land. The site is described as Lot 900 on SP207822.

3.11 Describe any existing or any proposed uses relevant to the project area

The proposed project site is currently undeveloped and improved by a single dwelling. The site is proposed for the Coomera Health Precinct development. As outlined a range of residential commercial and industrial uses are proposed around the site. Specifically, the site is located in the Centre Zone, under the GCCC Planning Scheme of the Coomera Town Centre.

Note: PDF may contain fields not relevant to your application. These fields will appear blank or unticked. Please disregard these fields.

Section 4

Measures to avoid or reduce impacts

4.1 Describe the measures you will undertake to avoid or reduce impact from your proposed action

AVOIDANCE

The 'avoid, mitigate, offset' approach is to be implemented for the Coomera Health precinct project.

The footprint for the development has been designed to avoid the clearance of the whole site and ensure retention of in part, the sites natural qualities and remnant vegetation. Approximately 2.2ha of this remnant vegetation is retained or 15%.

MITIGATION MEASURES

To ensure that clearing impacts do not occur outside the designated development footprint, the clearing zone boundaries will need to be clearly identified and marked. The designated clearance areas are to be pre-assessed by an experienced ecologist and wildlife spotter/catcher. The pre-assessment shall allow for an inventory of trees bearing birds nests and/or hollows (suitable for arboreal mammal or bat nesting) to be undertaken prior to clearing. A wildlife spotter/catcher is to be utilised during all phases of clearing to ensure safe dispersal and relocation of native fauna.

Additionally, all clearing should be in accordance with South East Queensland koala Conservation State Planning Regulatory Provisions (2014):

"Native vegetation clearing is undertaken as sequential clearing and under the guidance of a koala spotter where the native vegetation is a non-juvenile koala habitat tree."

This clearing will be subject to a Vegetation Management Plan detailing the extent of works, measures to ensure retained vegetation is not impacted upon.

The development concept proposes the retention of additional vegetation within the development footprint to further mitigate change to the landscape character of the site and assist in retaining on site native vegetation. Retained vegetation will also be rehabilitated to remove weeds and provide onsite habitat through retention of hollows and logs form the cleared areas. A rehabilitation plan will accompany the VMP.

A Fauna Management Plan will also be prepared to ensure clearing reduces the potential for faunal injury or death. This plan will be implemented by the approved environmental superintendent for the works and registered spotter catcher.

COMPLIANCE WITH STATE AND REGIONAL CONTROLS

The mitigation measures are to comply with regional and state planning provisions:

- South East Queensland Koala Conservation State Planning Regulatory Provisions 2015 (SEQ SPRP)
- Nature Conservation (Koala) Conservation Plan 2006 & Nature Conservation (Koala) Conservation Plan 2017

The proposed action should comply with strict regional and state regulatory provisions for the carrying out of works within koala habitat areas. The ecological corridor will provide dispersal opportunities for koalas from the site following sequential clearing of the site supervised by a DEHP qualified spotter/catcher.

FAUNA EXCLUSION/DIRECTIONAL FENCING

High traffic/speed zones pose a number of threats which may have adverse impacts to fauna and facilitating access to these areas should be limited. Fauna exclusion fencing is to be installed around the retained remnant areas to discourage individuals from entering a high traffic/speed zone.

OFFSETS & COMPENSATORY WORKS

In addition to the onsite mitigation works the proposed clearing will be offset in accordance with the QLD Offsets policy.

Refer to Section 4.1 of the attached MNES Assessment Report for full details (Att 1 - MNES Assessment Report, Section 4.1, p134-135).

4.2 For matters protected by the EPBC Act that may be affected by the proposed action, describe the proposed environmental outcomes to be achieved

Note: PDF may contain fields not relevant to your application. These fields will appear blank or unticked. Please disregard these fields.

As outlined, the proposal is not considered to have a significant impact on MNES. The proposal does, however, retain 2.2ha of on-site remnant vegetation for continued use by MNES species and site works are to be undertaken to manage and avoid downstream impacts.

As noted, the vegetation to be cleared will be offset in accordance with the relevant state legalisation and that offset provided for in the GCCC local government area ensuring local impacts are offset locally.

Note: PDF may contain fields not relevant to your application. These fields will appear blank or unticked. Please disregard these fields.

Section 5

Conclusion on the likelihood of significant impacts

5.1 You indicated the below ticked items to be of significant impact and therefore you consider the action to be a controlled action

- ☐ World Heritage properties
- ☐ National Heritage places
- ☐ Wetlands of international importance (declared Ramsar wetlands)
- ☐ Listed threatened species or any threatened ecological community
- ☐ Listed migratory species
- ☐ Marine environment outside Commonwealth marine areas
- ☐ Protection of the environment from actions involving Commonwealth land
- ☐ Great Barrier Reef Marine Park
- ☐ A water resource, in relation to coal seam gas development and large coal mining development
- ☐ Protection of the environment from nuclear actions
- ☐ Protection of the environment from Commonwealth actions
- ☐ Commonwealth Heritage places overseas
- ☐ Commonwealth marine areas

5.2 If no significant matters are identified, provide the key reasons why you think the proposed action is not likely to have a significant impact on a matter protected under the EPBC Act and therefore not a controlled action

As detailed in the attached MNES Assessment report (Att 1 - MNES Assessment Report), the proposal does not represent a significant impact and is not considered a 'controlled action'. The proposal would see approximately 11.13ha disturbed through the action, of which 8.5ha is mapped remnant vegetation. This vegetation provides habitat to a number of MNES species. The proposal will see approximately 2.4ha retained on site. The vegetation to be removed does not constitute a listed threatened ecological community.

In respect to the Moreton Bay Marine Park RAMSAR wetland, given the separation of the site from the Moreton Bay RAMSAR, relatively small scale of works/development footprint and range of standard controls and plans to be implemented on site to prevent downstream sedimentation and impacts on water quality, it is considered there is negligible impact to this MNES and its interdependent ecological communities and species.

In respect of the MNES threatened species, as outlined above, most threatened species were not recorded on site as part of the surveying, and have not been recorded on adjoining site. Additionally, the preferred habitat for the majority of species does not occur on site.

Two MNES were recorded on site:

- Koala (Phascolarctos cinereus) (Combined populations of QLD, NSW and ACT)
- Grey-headed Flying Fox (Pteropus poliocephalus)

In respect to the Koala, an assessment against the guidelines illustrates the site does not provide critical habitat. The study site is not part of a contiguous landscape that is >300 ha. Whilst it is acknowledged there are areas of remnant vegetation and Koala habitat in Coomera, the remnants are fragmented by large areas of urban development and infrastructure which acts as barriers to movement/dispersal and /or are key threatening processes to the koala. Key barriers include Pacific Motorway and Gold Coast rail line. Recent studies have recognised the diminishing/diminished viability of koala in the Coomera urban areas. The referral site is already highly fragmented and isolated by surrounding roads and rail, and while some connectivity remains to the north and east, future approvals will remove connectivity opportunities between the site and areas of potential koala habitat. Further, this development will result in the isolated site surrounded by increased key threats to the species such as vehicles and domestic pets. The study site does adjoin a large contiguous area of koala habitat which is currently the subject of a controlled action but otherwise designated for development. Open space within the approved development is based on waterways and is for stormwater detention and treatment, diminishing the value of this for koalas.

In respect to the Grey-headed Flying Fox, the site provides potential forage area for the species. The locality has a high occurrence of preferred or adopted habitat including open forests, closed and open woodlands, Melaleuca swamps and urban landscaped areas. Conservation reserves within 10km of the closest roost include Nerang State Forest, Lake Coombabah Conservation Park, Southern Moreton Bay Islands, which are all large conservation reserves with preferred habitat and providing seasonal forage areas. These reserves and others in SEQ support a permanent and abundant population of the species given the high prevalence of natural forage resources/reserves. The removal of approximately 8.5ha of foraging habitat for the species is unlikely that this vegetation act as habitat for an important population of the flying fox. Additionally, the species is highly mobile and there is a wide range of alternative habitat available in the broader area.

In respect to migratory species, the site does not provide habitat for the majority of migratory species, due to the lack of

Note: PDF may contain fields not relevant to your application. These fields will appear blank or unticked. Please disregard these fields.

marine and riparian systems such as watercourses, shorelines, mudflats, sandflats or deep water. Additionally, the type of vegetation on site further restricts the number of MNES migratory species likely to be present.

For other threatened MNES and migratory species, whilst the 8.5ha of eucalypt forest to be removed does provide a forage resource for some species, it does not represent important habitat for migratory species as the type of habitat to be removed is widespread, the MNES species are highly mobile in the region, and large areas of alternative habitat is available.

Accordingly, it is unlikely the proposed action will significantly modify, destroy or isolate an area of important habitat for the MNES species. Additionally, it is unlikely the proposal will impact on an area of important habitat or disrupt the lifecycle of an ecologically significant proportion of any population of migratory species.

Refer to Section 5 of attached MNES Assessment report for details (Att 1 - MNES Assessment Report, Section 5.2, p136-138).

Note: PDF may contain fields not relevant to your application. These fields will appear blank or unticked. Please disregard these fields.

Section 6

Environmental record of the person proposing to take the action

6.1 Does the person taking the action have a satisfactory record of responsible environmental management? Explain in further detail

Yes. There is no record or nothing to suggest irresponsible environmental management.

6.2 Provide details of any past or present proceedings under a Commonwealth, State or Territory law for the protection of the environment or the conservation and sustainable use of natural resources against either (a) the person proposing to take the action or, (b) if a permit has been applied for in relation to the action – the person making the application

Planit Consulting is not aware of any actions against the proponent in the past or present.

6.3 If it is a corporation undertaking the action will the action be taken in accordance with the corporation's environmental policy and framework?

☐ Yes ☑ No

6.4 Has the person taking the action previously referred an action under the EPBC Act, or been responsible for undertaking an action referred under the EPBC Act?

☐ Yes ☑ No

Note: PDF may contain fields not relevant to your application. These fields will appear blank or unticked. Please disregard these fields.

Section 7

Information sources

Reference source

Andrew, D. L. (2005). Ecology of the tiger quoll Dasyurus maculatus maculatus in coastal New South Wales. M.Sc. Thesis, University of Wollongong, Wollongong.

Reliability

Information is reliable and current

Uncertainties

Nil

Reference source

Andrews, A. (1990). Fragmentation of habitat by road and utility corridors: a review. Aust. J. Zool. 26-130.

Reliability

Information is reliable and current

Uncertainties

Nil

Reference source

Aumann, T. and D. Baker-Gabb (1991). RAOU Report 75. A Management Plan for the Red Goshawk. RAOU. Royal Australasian Ornithologists Union, Melbourne.

Reliability

Information is reliable and current

Uncertainties

Nil

Reference source

BA NRS (2002). Birds Australia Nest Record Scheme.

Reliability

Information is reliable and current

Uncertainties

Nil

Reference source

Barnard, C. A. and Barnard, H. G. (1925). A review of the bird life on Coomooboolaroo Station, Duaringa, Queensland, during the past fifty years. Emu 24:252-265.

Reliability

Information is reliable and current

Uncertainties

Nil

Reference source

Barrett, G., A. Silcocks, S. Barry, R. Cunningham and R. Poulter (2003). The New Atlas of Australian Birds. Melbourne, Victoria: Birds Australia.

Reliability

Information is reliable and current

Uncertainties

Nil

Reference source

Barrett, G., Silcocks, A., Barry, S., Cunningham, R. and Poulter, R. (2003). The New Atlas of Australian Birds. Birds Australia (Royal Australasian Ornithologists Union), Melbourne.

Reliability

Information is reliable and current

Uncertainties

Nil

Reference source

Belcher, C.L. (2000). The Ecology of the Tiger Quoll, Dasyurus maculatus in south-eastern Australia. PhD Thesis, Deakin University.

Reliability

Information is reliable and current

Uncertainties

Nil

Reference source

Bennett, A. F. (1993). Microhabitat use by the Long-nosed Potoroo, Potorous tridactylus, and other small mammals in remnant forest vegetation of south-western Victoria. Wildlife Research 20: 267–285.

Reliability

Information is reliable and current

Uncertainties

Nil

Reference source

Bennett, A. F. and Baxter, B. J. (1989). Diet of the Long-nosed Potoroo, Potorous tridactylus (Marsupialia, Potoroidae) in southwestern Victoria. Australian Wildlife Research 16: 263–271.

Reliability

Information is reliable and current

Uncertainties

Nil

Reference source

Bennett, S.C. (1985). The distribution and status of the Black-breasted Button-quail Turnix melanogaster (Gould, 1837). Emu: 157–162.

Reliability

Information is reliable and current

Uncertainties

Nil

Note: PDF may contain fields not relevant to your application. These fields will appear blank or unticked. Please disregard these fields.

Reference source

Benwell, A.S. (1994). Swamp Orchids - Phaius australis, Phaius tancarvilleae Recovery Plan. Hurstville: NSW NPWS.

Reliability

Information is reliable and current

Uncertainties

Nil

Reference source

Biolink. (2007). Koala Habitat and Population Assessment for Gold Coast City LGA. Report to Gold Coast City Council. Biolink Ecological Consultants. Uki, NSW.

Reliability

Information is reliable and current

Uncertainties

Nil

Reference source

Biolink. (2016). Aspects of the distribution and abundance of koalas in the Port Stephens Local Government Area 1920 – 2015. Report to Port Stephens Council. Biolink Ecological Consultants. Uki, NSW.

Reliability

Information is reliable and current

Uncertainties

Nil

Reference source

Biolink. (2017a). East Coomera Koala Population Study 2017. Final report prepared for Gold Coast City Council. Biolink Ecological Consultants. Uki, NSW.

Reliability

Information is reliable and current

Uncertainties

Nil

Reference source

Biolink. (2017b). Parkwood-Coombabah Koala Population Study 2017. Final report prepared for Gold Coast City Council. Biolink Ecological Consultants. Uki. NSW.

Reliability

Information is reliable and current

Uncertainties

Nil

Reference source

Birdlife (2002). Painted Snippets: Newsletter of the Australian Painted Snipe Project.

Reliability

Information is reliable and current

Note: PDF may contain fields not relevant to your application. These fields will appear blank or unticked. Please disregard these fields.

Uncertainties

Nil

Reference source

Birt, P., Markus, N., Collins, L. and Hall, L.S. (1998). Urban flying-foxes. Nature Australia 26: 54-59.

Reliability

All information referenced is reliable and current.

Uncertainties

Nil.

Reference source

Blakers, M., S.J.J.F. Davies and P.N. Reilly (1984). The Atlas of Australian Birds. Melbourne, Victoria: Melbourne University Press.

Reliability

All information referenced is reliable and current.

Uncertainties

Nil

Reference source

Boehm, E.F. (1944). The Fork-tailed Swift (Micropus pacificus Lathan 1801): with special reference to its occurrence in South Australia. S. Aust. Orn., 17:21.

Reliability

All information referenced is reliable and current.

Uncertainties

Nil

Reference source

Cameron, A.C. (1952). At what height do birds fly?, Emu 52, 86–88.

Reliability

All information referenced is reliable and current.

Uncertainties

Nil

Reference source

City of Gold Coast Council. (2017). Koala Conservation Plan for Elanora-Currumbin Waters. Planning, Environment and Transport Directorate. City of Gold Coast, QLD.

Reliability

All information referenced is reliable and current.

Uncertainties

Nil

Note: PDF may contain fields not relevant to your application. These fields will appear blank or unticked. Please disregard these fields.

Reference source

Claridge, A. W., Tanton, M. T. and Cunningham, R. B. (1993). Hypogeal fungi in the diet of the Long-nosed Potoroo (Potorous tridactylus) in mixed-species and regrowth eucalypt forest stands in south-eastern Australia. Wildlife Research 20: 321–337.

Reliability

All information referenced is reliable and current.

Uncertainties

Nil

Reference source

Clark S, deLacey C, Chamberlain S. (2004). Using environmental variables and multivariate analysis to delineate preferred habitat for Cryptostylis hunteriana, the leafless tongue orchid, in the Shoalhaven local government area, NSW. Cunninghamia 8:467–476.

Reliability

All information referenced is reliable and current.

Uncertainties

Nil

Reference source

Cohn, J.S. (2004) Effects of slashing and burning on Thesium australe R.Br. (Santalaceae) in coastal grasslands of NSW. Proceedings of the Linnaean Society of New South Wales 125: 57-65.

Reliability

All information referenced is reliable and current.

Uncertainties

Nil

Reference source

Cooper, R.P. (1971). High flying swifts. Australian Bird Watcher. 4:79-80.

Reliability

All information referenced is reliable and current.

Uncertainties

Nil

Reference source

Corben, C.J. and Ingram, G.J. (1987). A new barred river frog (Myobatrachidae: Mixophyes). Memoirs of the Queensland Museum, 25, 233-237.

Reliability

All information referenced is reliable and current.

Uncertainties

Nil

Reference source

Coventry, P. (1989). Comments on airborne sightings of White-throated Needletails Hirundapus caudacutus. Australian Bird Watcher. 13:36-37.

Note: PDF may contain fields not relevant to your application. These fields will appear blank or unticked. Please disregard these fields.

Reliability

All information referenced is reliable and current.

Uncertainties

Nil

Reference source

Crompton, A. (1936). Spine-tailed Swift Hirundapus caudacutus. South Australian Ornithologist. 13:183-184.

Reliability

All information referenced is reliable and current.

Uncertainties

Nil

Reference source

Czechura, G.V. (1996). Status and distribution of the Red Goshawk Erythrotriorchis radiatus in southern Queensland. Report to the Queensland Department of Environment.

Reliability

All information referenced is reliable and current.

Uncertainties

Nil

Reference source

Czechura, G.V. (1997). A preliminary study of Red Goshawk Erythrotriorchis radiatus community relationships. Conondale Range, south-east Queensland. Report to the Queensland Department of Environment.

Reliability

All information referenced is reliable and current.

Uncertainties

Nil

Reference source

Czechura, G.V., and Hobson, R.G. (2000). The red goshawk Erythrotriorchis radiatus in northern Queensland: status and distribution. Report to Queensland Parks and Wildlife Service.

Reliability

All information referenced is reliable and current.

Uncertainties

Nil

Reference source

Dawson, P., D. Dawson, I. Reynolds and S. Reynolds (1991). Notes on the birds of Logan Reserve, southeast Queensland, 1967-1990. Sunbird. 21:93--111.

Reliability

All information referenced is reliable and current.

Uncertainties

Nil

Note: PDF may contain fields not relevant to your application. These fields will appear blank or unticked. Please disregard these fields.

Reference source

Debus, S. and G. Czechura (1988). The Red Goshawk Erythrotriorchis radiatus: a review. Australian Bird Watcher. 12:175-199.

Reliability

All information referenced is reliable and current.

Uncertainties

Nil

Reference source

Debus, S.J.S. (1993). The status of the Red Goshawk (Erythrotriorchis radiatus) in New South Wales. Olsen, P., ed. Australasian Raptor Studies. Page(s) 182-191. ARA-RAOU, Melbourne.

Reliability

All information referenced is reliable and current.

Uncertainties

Nil

Reference source

del Hoyo, J., A. Elliott and J. Sargatal, eds. (1996). Handbook of the Birds of the World. Volume 3, Hoatzin to Auks. Barcelona: Lynx Edicions.

Reliability

All information referenced is reliable and current.

Uncertainties

Nil

Reference source

Department of Environment and Climate Change (DECC) NSW (2005), Hairy Jointgrass profile.

Reliability

All information referenced is reliable and current.

Uncertainties

Nil

Reference source

Department of Environment, Climate Change and Water NSW (2010), Northern Rivers Regional Biodiversity Management Plan.

Reliability

All information referenced is reliable and current.

Uncertainties

Nil

Reference source

DEWHA (2008) Department of Environment, Water, Heritage and Arts Approved Conservation Advice for Omphalea celata.

Reliability

All information referenced is reliable and current.

Note: PDF may contain fields not relevant to your application. These fields will appear blank or unticked. Please disregard these fields.

Uncertainties

Nil

Reference source

Dique, D.S., Thompson, J., Preece, H.J., and de Villiers, D.L. (2003). Dispersal patterns in a regional Koala population in south east Queensland. Wildlife Research 30(3).

Reliability

All information referenced is reliable and current.

Uncertainties

Nil

Reference source

Department of Natural Resources & Mines (2005) Southeast Queensland: Geoscience Data Set. State of Queensland, Brisbane.

Reliability

All information referenced is reliable and current.

Uncertainties

Nil

Reference source

Eby, P. and Lunney, D. (eds) (2002). Managing the grey-headed flying-fox as a threatened species in NSW. The Royal Zoological Society of New South Wales.

Reliability

All information referenced is reliable and current.

Uncertainties

Nil

Reference source

Eby, P. (1995). The biology and management of flying-foxes in NSW; Species management report number 18. Llewellyn, L. (ed). NPWS, Hurstville.

Reliability

All information referenced is reliable and current.

Uncertainties

Nil

Reference source

Eby, P. (1996). Interactions between the Grey-headed Flying-fox Pteropus poliocephalus (Chiroptera: Pteropodidae) and its diet plants – seasonal movements and seed dispersal. PhD Thesis, University of New England, Armidale, NSW.

Reliability

All information referenced is reliable and current.

Uncertainties

Nil

Note: PDF may contain fields not relevant to your application. These fields will appear blank or unticked. Please disregard these fields.

Reference source

Eby, P. (2000). The results of four synchronous assessments of relative distribution and abundance of Grey-headed Flying-fox Pteropus poliocephalus. Proceedings of a Workshop to Assess the Status of the Grey-headed Flyingfox in New South Wales. Richards, G. (ed).

Reliability

All information referenced is reliable and current.

Uncertainties

Nil

Reference source

Ecosure. (2013). Burleigh Heads koala assessment and city-wide monitoring advice. Final report prepared for City of Gold Coast. Ecosure Pty Ltd, Burleigh Heads, QLD.

Reliability

All information referenced is reliable and current.

Uncertainties

Nil

Reference source

Edgar, R.J. and Belcher, C. (1995). Spotted-tailed Quoll Dasyurus maculatus. Pp 67-9 in: Strahan, R. (ed). The Mammals of Australia. Australian Museum and Reed Books, Sydney.

Reliability

All information referenced is reliable and current.

Uncertainties

Nil

Reference source

Ellis, E.A., Melzer, A., Carrick, F.N. and Hasegawa, M. (2002). Tree use, diet and home range of the koala (Phascolarctos Cinereus) at Blair Athol, central Queensland. Wildlife Research, 29(3).

Reliability

All information referenced is reliable and current.

Uncertainties

Nil

Reference source

Additional references found within Section 6 of the MNES Assessment Report (Att 1 - MNES Assessment Report, Section 6, p139-142).

Reliability

All information referenced is reliable and current.

Uncertainties

Nil

Note: PDF may contain fields not relevant to your application. These fields will appear blank or unticked. Please disregard these fields.

Section 8

Proposed alternatives

Do you have any feasible alternatives to taking the proposed action?

Yes ☑ No

Australian Government
Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment

Note: PDF may contain fields not relevant to your application. These fields will appear blank or unticked. Please disregard these fields.

Section 9

Person proposing the action

9.1.1 Is the person proposing the action an organisation or business?

☑ Yes ☐ No

Organisation

Organisation name (as registered for ABN/ACN)	Gold Coast Hospital and Health Service
Business name	
ABN	82616992416
ACN	
Business address	1 Hospital Blvd, Southport, 4215, QLD, Australia
Postal address	
Main Phone number	0431492221
Fax	
Primary email address	GCCoomeraPlanning@health.qld.gov.au
Secondary email address	

9.1.2 I qualify for exemption from fees under Regulation 5.23(1)(ii) of the EPBC Regulations because I am:

☐ Small business
☑ Not applicable

9.1.2.2 I would like to apply for a waiver of full or partial fees under Regulation 5.21A of the EPBC Regulations

☐ Yes ☑ No

9.1.3 Contact (for an organisation - the contact details of the person authorised to sign on behalf of the organisation)

First name	Richard
Last name	Christensen
Job title	Senior Director, Partnerships and Strategic Development
Phone	0756290936
Mobile	0431492221
Fax	
Email	richard.christensen@health.qld.gov.au
Primary address	1 Hospital Blvd, Southport, 4215, QLD, Australia
Address	

Declaration: Person proposing the action (To be signed by the person at 9.1.3)

I, Richard Christensen, declare that to the best of my knowledge the information I have given on, or attached to the EPBC Act Referral is complete, current and correct. I understand that giving false or misleading information is a serious offence. I declare that I am not taking the action on behalf or for the benefit of any other person or entity.

Signature: ..... Date: 9/06/21

I, Richard Christensen, the person proposing the action, consent to the designation of myself as the proponent for the purposes of the action described in this EPBC Act Referral.

Signature:..... Date: 9/06/21

Australian Government
Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment

Note: PDF may contain fields not relevant to your application. These fields will appear blank or unticked. Please disregard these fields.

Proposed designated proponent

9.2.1 Is the proposed designated proponent an organisation or business?

☑ Yes ☐ No

Organisation	
Organisation name (as registered for ABN/ACN)	Gold Coast Hospital and Health Service
Business name	
ABN	82616992416
ACN	
Business address	1 Hospital Blvd, Southport, 4215, QLD, Australia
Postal address	
Main Phone number	0431492221
Fax	
Primary email address	GCCoomeraPlanning@health.qld.gov.au
Secondary email address	

9.2.2 Contact (for an organisation - the contact details of the person authorised to sign on behalf of the organisation)	
First name	Richard
Last name	Christensen
Job title	Senior Director, Partnerships and Strategic Development
Phone	0756290936
Mobile	0431492221
Fax	
Email	richard.christensen@health.qld.gov.au
Primary address	1 Hospital Blvd, Southport, 4215, QLD, Australia
Address	

Declaration: Proposed Designated Proponent

I, Richard Christensen **,the proposed designated proponent, consent to the designation of myself as the proponent for the purposes of the action described in this EPBC Act Referral.**

Signature: ..... **Date:** 9/06/21

Australian Government
Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment

Note: PDF may contain fields not relevant to your application. These fields will appear blank or unticked. Please disregard these fields.

Referring party (person preparing the information)

9.3.1 Is the referring party an organisation or a business?

☑ Yes ☐ No

Organisation

Organisation name (as registered for ABN/ACN)	PLANIT CONSULTING PTY. LTD.
Business name	
ABN	20099261711
ACN	
Business address	PO 206, Nobby Beach, 4218, Queensland, Australia
Postal address	
Main Phone number	07 55261500
Fax	
Primary email address	bede@planitconsulting.com.au
Secondary email address	

9.3.2 Contact (for an organisation - the contact details of the person authorised to sign on behalf of the organisation)

First name	Bede
Last name	Emmett
Job title	Director
Phone	0755261500
Mobile	
Fax	
Email	boyd@planitconsulting.com.au
Primary address	2247 Gold Coast Highway, Nobby Beach, 4218, Qld, Australia
Address	

Declaration: Referring party (person preparing the information)

I, Bede Emmett **, declare that to the best of my knowledge the information I have given on, or attached to this EPBC Act Referral is complete, current and correct. I understand that giving false or misleading information is a serious offence.**

Signature: ..... **Date:** 09/06/2021

Note: PDF may contain fields not relevant to your application. These fields will appear blank or unticked. Please disregard these fields.

Appendix A

Attachment

Document Type		File Name
impact_reduction_docs	NOT PUBLISHED - SUPERSEDED	EPBC Act Referral Form - MNES Assessment Report.pdf
impact_reduction_docs	NOT PUBLISHED - SUPERSEDED	Att 1 - Coomera Hospital and Health Precinct Preliminary Concept.pdf
impact_reduction_docs	NOT PUBLISHED - SUPERSEDED	Att 2 - EPBC Act Protected Matters Report.pdf
impact_reduction_docs	NOT PUBLISHED - SUPERSEDED	Att 3 - Previous Terrestrial Flora and Fauna Surveys.pdf
impact_reduction_docs	NOT PUBLISHED - SUPERSEDED	Att 4 - Flora Species List.pdf
impact_reduction_docs		Att 1 - MNES Assessment Report - V2 - 2021-06-08.pdf

Appendix B

Coordinates

Area 1
-27.848340821286,153.31353398658
-27.848196849897,153.31369513628
-27.848058003022,153.31385054942
-27.847864886462,153.31406670636
-27.847671591334,153.31428325902
-27.847425802055,153.31456699361
-27.847239533793,153.31478417032
-27.847004366209,153.31506003671
-27.847109413902,153.31512503557
-27.847310452422,153.31525136253
-27.847389493517,153.3153033288
-27.847455764878,153.31534689959
-27.847595056684,153.315442934
-27.847705802545,153.3155244278
-27.847881496984,153.31565598851
-27.84795965942,153.3157139956
-27.848055577875,153.31579237483
-27.848187576974,153.31590023716
-27.848349483425,153.31604040928
-27.84844588628,153.3161390843
-27.848522478625,153.31622081152
-27.84857657194,153.3162883854
-27.848641655982,153.31637266206
-27.84865745904,153.31639507052
-27.848677976198,153.31642777886
-27.848721424325,153.31649704371
-27.84875285726,153.31654715399
-27.848789961798,153.31661296195
-27.848802296462,153.31663873386
-27.848822082102,153.31668007377
-27.848846910307,153.3167319496
-27.848883047716,153.31680745484
-27.848886049375,153.31681372649
-27.848902371567,153.31685808808
-27.848908038375,153.31687436786
-27.848925419802,153.31692430178
-27.848944600025,153.31697940337
-27.848974359719,153.3170648982
-27.848983485253,153.31710224389
-27.849010205179,153.3172187118
-27.849037798917,153.31734879425
-27.849040500958,153.31737171391
-27.849050164511,153.31745626699
-27.84905902062,153.31756225978
-27.849067473711,153.31767404198
-27.849067509077,153.31777832741

Note: PDF may contain fields not relevant to your application. These fields will appear blank or unticked. Please disregard these fields.

-27.849061674381,153.31794096141
-27.849052918694,153.31800670129
-27.849041773349,153.31809466361
-27.849033728607,153.31812392546
-27.849016361609,153.31818709589
-27.848995896735,153.31826647689
-27.848979294325,153.31832869737
-27.848944560268,153.3184588809
-27.848927846863,153.31852482147
-27.848908589043,153.31860147916
-27.848887484715,153.31868548687
-27.848860635642,153.31880985707
-27.848841848094,153.31890157574
-27.848811516084,153.31904965252
-27.848804679729,153.31908302657
-27.848789626888,153.3191746007
-27.848774444276,153.31926979883
-27.848758361312,153.31938102037
-27.848751102309,153.31943105761
-27.84873815314,153.31952031757
-27.848726674063,153.31960610875
-27.848718563773,153.31967669228
-27.84870552905,153.31979013227
-27.848699031653,153.31985067773
-27.848694108787,153.31990841328
-27.848688176498,153.31999203397
-27.848682293161,153.32007496394
-27.848677501297,153.32014250826
-27.848671656275,153.32023300082
-27.848669228083,153.32029026959
-27.848665615261,153.32041355303
-27.848660074279,153.32063230131
-27.848658948688,153.320758671
-27.848746777847,153.32083968096
-27.848862327627,153.32081286111
-27.849079330034,153.32076249331
-27.84931387766,153.32070805291
-27.849426135177,153.32068199694
-27.849431366329,153.32064435683
-27.849465155125,153.32040124771
-27.849531639741,153.31992289065
-27.849577376414,153.31959380818
-27.849629431245,153.3192192587
-27.84965845323,153.31901044129
-27.849730493738,153.31849211197
-27.849771441974,153.31819748436
-27.849854179623,153.31760216308
-27.849895285037,153.31730641398
-27.850157408378,153.31733993746
-27.850545632603,153.31738958818
-27.850919195567,153.31743735796
-27.851259975179,153.31725002953

Note: PDF may contain fields not relevant to your application. These fields will appear blank or unticked. Please disregard these fields.

-27.851483158688,153.317127399
-27.851272037281,153.31689723478
-27.851066333939,153.31667297872
-27.850660204688,153.316230223
-27.850690292937,153.31619105699
-27.850607586076,153.31611358345
-27.850503868862,153.3160127079
-27.850288991142,153.31580355701
-27.850257329058,153.31577172996
-27.850177170494,153.31566818231
-27.850080254079,153.31554632759
-27.849906231648,153.3153321479
-27.849664205983,153.31502903553
-27.849530650093,153.3148617714
-27.849381123826,153.31467326495
-27.849154072068,153.31438746709
-27.848935530729,153.31411627879
-27.848902288389,153.31407978729
-27.848694474451,153.31387776099
-27.848340821286,153.31353398658