**Title of Proposal** - Williams Landing Residential Development, Changes to Reserves, 20 km south east Melbourne, VIC

# Section 1 - Summary of your proposed action

Provide a summary of your proposed action, including any consultations undertaken.

### 1.1 Project Industry Type

Residential Development

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

Galaway Holdings Pty Ltd, wholly owned subsidiary of Cedar Woods Properties Ltd, (the proponent) proposes to clear and develop Reserves A (9.75 ha) and B (9.29 ha) of the Williams Landing Residential Development (proposed action area) for urban purposes which includes clearing of the following Matters of National Environmental Significance (MNES)- Sections 18 and 18A (Listed threatened species and communities):
* 12.55 ha of Natural Temperate Grassland of the Victorian Volcanic Plain (NTGVVP)
* 575 Pimelea spinescens subsp. Spinescens (Spiny Rice-flower) plants
* 681 Senecio macrocarpus (Large-fruit Fireweed) plants.

Refer to Figures 1 and 2.

If the proposed action is approved, a variation to the current EPBC approval relating to the site (EPBC 2006/2504- Attachment B) will be required. The approval included the implementation of management actions, monitoring and reporting requirements outlines in the Conservation Management Plan for Grassland and Wetland Reserves at Laverton (CMP) (Attachment C). The implementation of the CMP has been through the approved Conservation Agreement (Attachment D) between the Commonwealth of Australia and Galaway Holdings which was signed in June 2007. This agreement would also need to be amended if the current proposed action is approved. Refer to Section 1.14 for further information.

### 1.3 What is the extent and location of your proposed action? Use the polygon tool on the map below to mark the location of your proposed action.

| Area | Point | Latitude | Longitude |
|---|---|---|---|
| Site location | 1 | -37.854149124721 | 144.74682834668 |
| Site location | 2 | -37.854149124721 | 144.74682834668 |
| Site location | 3 | -37.854657396478 | 144.75249317212 |
| Site location | 4 | -37.857164821263 | 144.75476768537 |
| Site location | 5 | -37.858249085752 | 144.75554016156 |

| Area | Point | Latitude | Longitude |
|---|---|---|---|
| Site location | 6 | -37.86512701709 | 144.75794342084 |
| Site location | 7 | -37.866990385512 | 144.75086238904 |
| Site location | 8 | -37.867125901377 | 144.75056198163 |
| Site location | 9 | -37.868752072323 | 144.75111988111 |
| Site location | 10 | -37.872275319586 | 144.73682907147 |
| Site location | 11 | -37.867769598335 | 144.73506954236 |
| Site location | 12 | -37.864212255349 | 144.73249462171 |
| Site location | 13 | -37.862958674521 | 144.73197963758 |
| Site location | 14 | -37.861366257316 | 144.73494079633 |
| Site location | 15 | -37.861162967537 | 144.73494079633 |
| Site location | 16 | -37.855978888716 | 144.74438217206 |
| Site location | 17 | -37.854149124721 | 144.74682834668 |

**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 proposed action area (i.e. Reserve A and Reserve B) is located within the Williams Landing Master Plan (including residential and mixed commercial) which is situated adjacent to the Princess Freeway approximately 20km south west of Melbourne's CBD. The conservation reserves are owned by Galaway Holdings Pty Ltd (the proponent).

**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 proposed action area to be impacted includes Reserve A (9.75ha) and Reserve B (9.29ha). Refer to Figure 1.

**1.7 Is the proposed action a street address or lot?**

Street Address

Rothbury Parkway and Ashcroft Av
Williams Landing VIC 3027
Australia

**1.8 Primary Jurisdiction.**

Victoria

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

No

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

Yes

**1.10.1 Is there a local government area and council contact for the proposal?**

No

**1.11 Provide an estimated start and estimated end date for the proposed action.**

Start date 03/2019

End date 03/2029

**1.12 Provide details of the context, planning framework and State and/or Local government requirements.**

In 2000, following an EPBC referral (EPBC 2001/191) the site was rezoned to permit industrial development with the creation of three Reserves (A, B and C). In 2006, an EPBC referral (EPBC 2006/2504) was submitted to alter the zoning and approved development outcome for the site from mixed use comprising of commercial, industrial; and retail activities to a mixed-use including commercial, industrial, retail and residential. Upon completion, the Williams Landing development will comprise of approximately 3,000 residential dwelling and a Regional Activity Centre comprising of approximately 400,000m2 of mixed use (retail, commercial and community facilities).

The City of Wyndham Planning Scheme indicates that the William Landing site, including the Reserves (A, B and C) is currently zoned Priority Development Zone- Schedule 1 (PDZ1), which provides for the use and development of land for projects and areas of regional or State significance. The zoning also facilitates development in accordance with the Laverton Major Activity Centre and Employment Node Incorporated Plan (Deep end Services, 2014). The State Government (VIC) spent close to $110 million on the new William Landing train station, bus port, carpark and freeway interchange which is located in the southern section of the site (near Reserve C) (refer to Figure 2).

In 2014, The State of Victoria and the Department of Transport, Planning and Local Infrastructure released the Plan Melbourne: Metropolitan Planning Strategy. The Plan estimates that by 2050 the city will need to accommodate more than 7.7 million people and provide an additional 1.7 million jobs. There is also a provision for an integrated transport system connecting people to jobs and services and goods to the Market. The plan notes the requirement to protect natural assets and better plan for water energy and waste management to create a more sustainable outcome. Plan Melbourne specifically identified Williams Landing

as an existing Activity Centre in the Western Subregion where an estimated 370,000-430,000 people and 90,000 to 125,000 jobs will be accommodated by 2031 (Contour Consultants Australia Pty Ltd 2014 and Victoria Statement Government, 2014).

Under the planning scheme there are no environmental significance, vegetation protection matters identified within the site (including the Reserves) (Victoria State Government, 2018).

In accordance with Clause 37.06 of the Wyndham Planning Scheme, the Williams Landing Masterplan and Development Plan has been developed and approved and provides detailed guidance for development of the site. The Masterplan established four neighbourhood precincts, Ashcroft (developed), Kingwell (mostly development), Elmstead (developed) and Addison (currently under construction).

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

As part of the 2006 EPBC referral (Ref 2006/2504) extensive consultation with the Wurunjeri and Bunurong tribes was completed which resulted in the 'Consent to Disturb' to the site (Masterplan Area) (Cedar Woods, 2006). Under the Part 3 (Amendment of planning scheme) of the Planning and Environment Act 1987, there are requirements of exhibition and notice and amendment and public submission about the amendment. The site (Masterplan) area was rezoned in 2007 which the amendment (C82) being gazetted in 1 March 2007.

**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.**

Development within the site (Masterplan) has been previously approved under the EPBC Act, via referrals EPBC 2001-191 and EPBC 2006/2504, as follows:

**EPBC 2001/191**

In 2001 the Williams Landing development (previously Westpoint Business Park, Laverton and formally known as the RAAF Williams Laverton Airfield) was referred and determined to be not a controlled action (EPBC 2001/191) under the Environment Protection Biodiversity and Conservation 1999 (EPBC Act). The proponent was AMP Asset Management Australia. The proposed action included the clearing and development for industrial subdivision of 275ha with 55.4ha to be set aside within three reserves for the conservation of rare and threatened flora and fauna. Management of these reserves (A, B and C) were to be undertaken in accordance with Conservation Management Plan for three rare species Reserves RAAF Williams, Laverton (May 1998). The remainder of the site was to be subject to ecological burning and rare species salvage operations (outside Reserve, A, B and C) (refer to Attachment A).

In 1998, the land was purchased from the Commonwealth by Galaway Holdings Pty Ltd. Galaway Holdings Pty Ltd proposed to alter the zoning and approved development outcome for

the site to a mixed use including commercial, industrial, retail and residential development.

**EPBC 2006/2504**

In 2006, a second EPBC (2006/2504) referral was submitted by Galaway Holdings Pty Ltd that related to the alteration of the zoning and did not change Reserves A, B and C- a total of 55.4ha which were subject to the conservation management plan (1998). An additional salvage operations and ecological burn was also proposed for Reserves A, B and C. The proposed action was deemed a controlled action based on the controlling provisions of listed threatened species and communities (Section 18 and 18A) in March 2006 (EPBC 2006/2504). Refer to Attachment B. A notification of decision to approve the proposed action was issued by the Department of the Environment and Water Resources (now Department of Environment and Energy-DEE) in June 2007, which included conditions relating to:

* management of Reserves A, B And in accordance with the Conservation Management Plan (CMP) for Grassland and Wetland Reserves at Laverton (Practical Ecology Ltd, 2006)

* CMP to be implemented through a Conservation Agreement under the EPBC Act

* survey for flora and fauna requirements, salvage plans and relocated prior to excavation/construction works

* design requirements to minimise impact of action on Reserves A, B and C

* monetary trust for the purchase and conservation of native grasslands containing EPBC Act listed species.

The Conservation Agreement between the Commonwealth of Australia and Galaway Holdings Pty Ltd required by the conditions of this approval were signed in June 2007. The agreement continues in perpetuity after its commencement unless terminated in accordance with the EPBC Act or by written agreement between the Minister and Galaway Holdings Pty Ltd.

Reserves (A, B and C) remain in the ownership of Galaway Holdings Pty Ltd and were not transferred to the Crown. Clause 10 of the Agreement, contemplates that it may be terminated by Agreement between parties in accordance with Section 308(3) of the EPBC Act, while Clause 11.1 gives the Minister the discretion of varying the Agreement in a way the Minister thinks necessary to ensure that it becomes capable of achieving its purpose. Based on the above there is flexibility in amending or terminating the Conservation Agreement.

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

Yes

**1.15.1 Provide information about the larger action and details of any interdependency between the stages/components and the larger action.**

The proposed action (development of Reserves A and B) is part of the Williams Master Plan (subject to EPBC approval 2006/2504), upon completion, Williams Landing will comprise approximately 3 000 residential dwellings and a Regional Activity Centre ("the Town Centre") comprising approximately 400,000m2 of mixed use, comprising retail, commercial and community facilities.

A new railway station was completed at Williams Landing in 2013, and the State (VIC) Government has spent close to $110 m on this station, including a bus port, commuter car park and freeway interchange. The State Government also spent around $50 m creating a freeway interchange to create access to the site. Galaway Holdings Pty Ltd has spent around $150 m servicing the site and several multi storey office, apartment and retail buildings are now either complete or under construction. The Town Centre has a Priority Development Zone attached to it and has previously been declared as a project of State Significance by the State's Premier.

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

Yes

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

In accordance with the EPBC approval (EPBC 2006/2504) Williams Landing, includes an area of 275 ha for residential and mixed commercial development. In accordance with a Conservation Management Plan and Conservation Agreement three reserves (A, B and C – a total of 55.4ha) for the conservation of Matters of National Environmental Significance (MNES) including the Spiny Rice-flower Pimelea spinescens subsp. spinescens, Large-fruit Fireweed Senecio macrocarpus and the threatened ecological community (TEC) Natural Temperate Grassland of the Victorian Volcanic Plain (NTGVVP) (Figure 1 and Figure 2) have been allocated.

Since the establishment of the Conservation Agreement and CMP, there has been substantial development in the area and Williams Landing now represents a significant urban renewal project within the metropolitan region of Melbourne (one of Melbourne's major growth corridors). There has been major State Government and Private investment and development of new infrastructure in the William's Landing area, in accordance with State Planning Strategies i.e. Plan Melbourne: Metropolitan Planning Strategy and to coincide with the State Government strategic approach in maximising existing and planning infrastructure and socioeconomic requirements for the area.

Due to the increasing demand for housing and other community and civic infrastructure, and limited availability within the William's Landing development and local catchment, Galaway Holdings Pty Ltd recognises an opportunity to clear and develop Reserves A (9.75 ha) and B (9.29 ha) (the proposed action area) for urban purposes which includes clearing 12.55 ha of NTGVVP, 575 Pimelea spinescens subsp. Spinescens (Spiny Rice-flower) plants and 681 Senecio macrocarpus (Large-fruit Fireweed) plants.

# Section 2 - Matters of National Environmental Significance

Describe the affected area and the likely impacts of the proposal, emphasising the relevant matters protected by the EPBC Act. Refer to relevant maps as appropriate. The interactive map tool can help determine whether matters of national environmental significance or other matters protected by the EPBC Act are likely to occur in your area of interest. Consideration of likely impacts should include both direct and indirect impacts.

Your assessment of likely impacts should consider whether a bioregional plan is relevant to your proposal. The following resources can assist you in your assessment of likely impacts:

• Profiles of relevant species/communities (where available), that will assist in the identification of whether there is likely to be a significant impact on them if the proposal proceeds;

• Significant Impact Guidelines 1.1 – Matters of National Environmental Significance;

• Significant Impact Guideline 1.2 – Actions on, or impacting upon, Commonwealth land and Actions by Commonwealth Agencies.

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

No

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

No

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

No

**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

**2.4.1 Impact table**

| Species | Impact |
|---|---|
| Grassy Eucalypt Woodland of the Victorian | The grassy plain woodland within Reserve A |

| Species | Impact |
|---|---|
| Volcanic Plain | and B does not meet the condition threshold and vegetation within the reserves do not match the diagnostic characteristics for the Grassy Eucalypt Woodland of the Victorian Volcanic Plain (Ecology and Heritage Partners [EHP] 2014). Therefore the clearing of Reserves A and B will not impact upon the woodland. |
| Natural Temperate Grassland of the Victorian Volcanic Plain (NTGVVP) | Vegetation within Reserves A and B is consistent with the diagnostic characteristics and condition thresholds for the NTGVVP (Ecology and Heritage Partners, 2014). Reserve A consists of 9.75 ha and Reserve B consists of 2.8 ha of NTGVVP. The 12.55ha proposed to be removed is moderate quality in accordance with the Department of Sustainability and Environment (2004a) habitat scoring system (Ecology and Heritage Partners, 2018). EHP (2014a:) reports that there is approximately 1,000 ha of good quality grassland (assumed to qualify as NTGVVP) remaining within the Victorian Volcanic Plan. The proposed loss of 12.55 ha equates to 1.25% of the TEC in Victoria. |
| Pimelea spinescens subsp. Spinescens (Spiny Rice-flower) | Spiny Rice-flower is predominantly associated with two threatened ecological communities, Natural Temperate Grassland of the Victorian Volcanic Plain and 'Natural Grasslands of the Murray Valley Plains'. Several surveys have been completed in Reserves A and B. For Reserve A, a targeted survey by Ecology and Heritage Partners (2015) recorded 200 plants while 375 plants were recorded in Reserve B (Ecology and Heritage Partners, 2018). There is a state-wide population of approximately 88,000 individuals, therefore the population within Reserve A and B (575 plants) equates to approximately 0.65% of the known population of the Spiny Rice-flower. |
| Senecio macrocarpus (Large-fruit Fireweed, Large-fruit Groundsel) | The species occurs in a variety of habitats, including grasslands, sedgelands, shrublands and woodlands, generally on sparsely vegetated sites on sandy loam to heavy clay soils, often in depressions that are waterlogged in winter (Sinclair, 2010). A targeted search in Reserve A recorded 199 plants, while 482 plants were recorded in Reserve B (Ecology |

| Species | Impact |
|---|---|
| | and Heritage Partners, 2018). Within Victoria and South Australia, it is reported that there are 15 populations containing 36,000 plants of which 35,000 of these plants are located in one population at Messent Conservation Park in SA (Sinclair, 2010). Consequently, Reserves A and B contain 1.89% of the known Large-fruit Fireweed population. |
| Dianella amoena (Matted Flax-lily) | The species has been recorded within the vicinity of the project area and suitable habitat does occur in Reserves A and B. The numerous surveys completed to date has not recorded the species in Reserves A or B, therefore unlikely to occur within the reserves (Ecology and Heritage Partners, 2014). |
| Delma impar (Striped Legless Lizard) | This species is a grassland specialist and is found in areas of native grassland, grassy woodland and exotic pasture and its primary habitat is associated with four TECs including the NTGVVP (Threatened Species Scientific Committee, 2016). Habitat for this species is limited within Reserve A, and during the salvage and translocation works (during 2004-2009) adjacent to Reserve A no Striped Legless Lizards were detected. Only one incidental sighting and two shed skins have been recorded in Reserve A (EHP, 2014). For Reserve B the species has not been previously detected or found adjacent (EHP, 2014). Given the species known distribution and absence in site surveys, it is highly unlikely that clearing Reserves A and B will significantly impact the species population. |
| Synemon plana (Golden Sun Moth) | In 2008/2009 one female Golden Sun Moth was recorded in Reserve A, however, subsequent surveys have not detected it (EHP, 2014). No individuals have been detected within Reserve B (EHP, 2014a). EHP, (2014a) reports that there are over 100 known sites supporting the species and habitat within Victoria. The species has not been recorded since 2008/2009, therefore the clearing of Reserves A and B will not significantly impact upon the species. |

**2.4.2 Do you consider this impact to be significant?**

Yes

**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?**

No

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

No

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

Yes

**2.7.1 Is the proposed action likely to have ANY direct or indirect impact on the Commonwealth land?**

No

**2.7.2 Describe the nature and extent of the likely impact on the whole of the environment.**

The Planning Scheme indicates that there is a parcel of Commonwealth land located to the east which abuts the Williams Landing (Masterplan) eastern boundary associated with the RAAF Williams Laverton Base. The proposed action (Reserves A and B) are located approximately 1.4km and 1km respectively west of the RAAF Williams Laverton Base and are centrally located within the Williams Land development (Master Plan) area (refer to Figure 2). There are no predicted direct or indirect impacts to the RAAF Williams Laverton Base associated with the proposed action. It is noted that the Base consists of a high modified environment which includes a golf course, cleared areas and buildings and associated infrastructure.

**2.7.3 Do you consider this impact to be significant?**

No

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

No

**2.9 Is the proposed action likely to have ANY direct or indirect impact on a water resource related to coal/gas/mining?**

No

**2.10 Is the proposed action a nuclear action?**

No

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

No

**2.12 Is the proposed action to be undertaken in a Commonwealth Heritage Place Overseas?**

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?**

No

# Section 3 - Description of the project area

Provide a description of the project area and the affected area, including information about the following features (where relevant to the project area and/or affected area, and to the extent not otherwise addressed in Section 2).

**3.1 Describe the flora and fauna relevant to the project area.**

**Flora**

EHP (2014) conducted a flora survey in March 2014 and recorded 67 flora species (38 indigenous and 29 non indigenous) in the reserves.

Pimelea spinescens subsp. Spinescens (Spiny Rice-flower)

It is important to note that the Spiny Rice-flower present in the Reserves is represented by remnant, translocated and propagated plants. Monitoring and surveys for the Spiny Rice-flower have been undertaken on several occasions over several years in Reserves A and B (EHP 2014 and 2015).

There has been a downward trend in the number of translocated and propagated plants. For Reserve A, Annual monitoring reported 70 plants in 2006, 136 plants in 2008 and 131 plants in 2009 and 52 plants in 2010/2011 (EHP 2014). EHP (2014) suggest that the decrease in recorded species numbers may be due to a change in survey methods and monitoring of translocated plants rather than a change of in-situ plants. A more recent targeted survey EHP (2015) recorded 200 plants in Reserve A (EHP, 2018).

Originally 377 plants were recorded in Reserve B, with 151 plants translocated into the disturbed areas within Reserve B (referenced Biosis Research Pty Ltd 1998 in EHP, 2014). A targeted search recorded 317 plants in 2008 and 283 in 2009. The decline of fluctuation of individual numbers was attributed to ongoing drought conditions EHP (2014). Further to the above a targeted survey by EHP (2015) recorded 375 plants in Reserve B (EHP, 2018).

There are 36 plants (11 remnant and 25 translocated) located within Reserve C (EHP, 2015).

Senecio macrocarpus (Large-fruit Fireweed)

Original survey data for Reserve A, indicated 290 plants with estimates reaching 550-600 in 2009. In 2011, the number of estimated plants was revised to 150. Further to the above a more recent targeted survey by EHP (2015) recorded 199 plants in Reserve A (EHP, 2015 and 2018).

A targeted survey was completed by EHP (2015) for Reserve B, during the survey 482 plants were recorded (EHP, 2018). There are 281 plants recorded within Reserve C.

**Fauna**

Fauna species were also recorded which consisted of three introduced mammals, 26 birds (22 native) and two native reptiles. EHP (2014) reports that there are patches of native grassland within the reserves which vary in floristic composition and quality. Synemon plana (Golden Sun Moth) and Delma impar (Striped Legless Lizard) has been recorded within Reserve A in 2008/2009 (Only one incidental sighting and two shed skins have been recorded), however no recordings of these species have occurred since. There are many records of mammals, birds, reptiles, amphibians and fish in databases (from a greater search area i.e. not just from the Reserves) and from reports, consequently, a number of these species are likely to occur. However, these Reserves are now surrounded by extensive Urban development and many of the records in the databases are from prior to this development (EHP, 2014).

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

Most of the Masterplan are including the project area is relatively flat, (which is reflective of previous land use of an airfield). There are no viable natural drainage lines an overland flow (Cedar Woods, 2006).

There is a stormwater drainage sump located in the south west corner adjacent to Reserve A and north west corner adjacent to Reserve B. A significant portion of the surface water catchment drains into to Forsyth Road drain which then discharges into the wetland (Cedar Woods, 2006).

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

The project area is within the Victoria Volcanic Plains Bioregion and the soils are deeply cracking clays derived from basalt (Cedar Woods, 2006). The Victoria State Government (2018) reports that the soil within this bioregion are generally shallow reddish-brown to black loams and clays. They are fertile and high in available phosphorous. Soils are also variable ranging from red friable earths and acidic texture contrast soils (Ferrosols and Kurosols) on the higher fertile plain to scoraceous material, and support Plains Grassy Woodland and Plains Grassland ecosystems.

Vegetation within the reserves is dominated by native grassland which is consistent with Heavier-soils Plans Grassland (EVC 132_61) which is characterised by treeless vegetation mostly less than 1 m tall dominated by largely graminoid and herb life forms. Occupies fertile cracking basalt soils prone to seasonal waterlogging in areas receiving at least 500 mm annual rainfall (Department of Sustainability and Environment, 2006). The Victorian State Government (2018b) also indicates that the project area is dominated by Plains Grassland.

An assessment in accordance with the Department of Sustainability and Environment (2004a) Vegetation Quality Assessment Manual- the habitat hectares scoring methods was undertaken for the Reserves. The habitat hectares value is a measure of both the quality (habitat score) and quantity (hectares) of the vegetation (Department of Sustainability and Environment, 2004a).

The habitat points (value) for Reserve A the vegetation zone PG1 has a value of 55.6/100. Within Reserve B Vegetation Zone PG2 and PG3 have values of 44/100 and 26.32/100 respectively (EHP, 2014).

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

Parts of the project area has Spiny Rice-flower and Large-fruit Fireweed habitat which comprises grassland or open shrubland on basalt-derived soils, usually comprising sandy loam to heavy grey-black clay loams on generally flat topography (Sinclair 2010, TSSC Conservation Advice 2016b).

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

Reserve A consists of 9.75 ha of the TEC NTGVVP and Reserve B contains 2.8 ha of the TEC NTGVVP and the remaining 6.25 ha of Reserve B did not meet the condition thresholds for the TEC. Contour Town Planners (2014) identified that there is a Native Vegetation Offset Agreement (dated 22 March 2008) between the State of Victoria and the proponent. This agreement satisfies and discharges any and all native vegetation obligations under the local councils planning scheme and/or Victoria's Native Vegetation Framework.

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

Not applicable.

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

Vegetation condition within Reserve A was recorded as good with minimal weed cover. In Reserve B vegetation ranges from poor, moderate to good condition, with a moderate to high cover of weed (EHP, 2014).

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

Not applicable.

**3.9 Describe any Indigenous heritage values relevant to the project area.**

The Victoria State Government (2018) indicates that there are areas of Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Sensitivity within Reserves A and B.

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

Freehold.

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

Previous assessment under the EPBC Act relating to the project area includes: EPBC 2001/191 and EPBC 2006/2504.

# Section 4 - Measures to avoid or reduce impacts

Provide a description of measures that will be implemented to avoid, reduce, manage or offset any relevant impacts of the action. Include, if appropriate, any relevant reports or technical advice relating to the feasibility and effectiveness of the proposed measures.

Examples of relevant measures to avoid or reduce impacts may include the timing of works, avoidance of important habitat, specific design measures, or adoption of specific work practices.

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

**Impact Avoidance**

The proposal action is to clear and develop Reserves A and B which are surrounded by Urban development, within a growing activity centre associated with the Laverton Major Activities Centre and Employment Node Incorporated Plan. It has been approximated that the ongoing effects of developing Reserve A and B for both residential and commercial activities will increase the local population and will support 80 new jobs or 40 jobs when measured in equivalent full time, with a further 50 jobs (EFT) generated indirectly by additional non-retail activity. The additional residential population may generate total retail spending of $23.9m of which approximately $16.8m to be retained at William Landing Town Centre. (Deepend Services, 2014). The actual number of jobs may be surpassed by higher updated development densities that can be considered.

As per Plan Melbourne (2014) there is significant economic potential and growth required in Williams Landing to accommodate future needs and requirements. To accommodate the strategic directions plans for the vicinity it is proposed to develop all of Reserves A and B. This will result in the clearing of 12.55 ha of NTGVVP.

On this basis, impact avoidance is focused on the ongoing retention and management of Reserve C.

**Impact Reduction**

Spiny Rice-flower

As identified by Carter and Walsh (2006), the following are key threats to the Spiny Rice-flower:

* weed invasion

* road and rail maintenance

* grazing

* inappropriate fire regimes

* changing landuse.

The CMP (Practical Ecology, 2006) states that prior to the land within the site (Masterplan area) being cleared and development, a salvage and translocation programme of the species from unreserved areas to Reserve B in was undertaken in 1998, and 144 translocated individual survived when monitoring was undertaken in 2000 (Practical Ecology Pty Ltd, 2006). Surveys for Reserve A have indicated that there has been natural recruitment of the species from 2000-2009. Prior to 2009, 40 plants were translocated into Reserve A as part of the Salvage and Translocation Plan for Williams Landing conservation reserves (EHP, 2014).

EHP (2014) reported that the survival of translocated individual plants and seedlings has been low in Reserve A (20% survival rate for 40 plants and 7% for 100 seedlings). This has been attributed to undeveloped root systems to dry conditions, clay soils and deeps cracks and low water content in the soils. According to EHP (2018) there have been successfully rehabilitation programmes where seedlings produced from seed have been successfully reintroduced at four sites with survival rates ranging from 30% to 50% at the end of the monitoring period.

While there are detailed criteria for determining the short and long-term success of translocated species specified by the Pimelea spinescens Recovery Team, due to existing translocation data and low survival rates of this species, this mitigation measure is no longer supported by DEE to compensate impacts to this species (EHP, 2018)

It is proposed that to compensate for the loss of 575 Spiny Rice-flower, that approximately 2,100 individuals will be protected off site (through a conservation reserve and/or agreement) (EHP, 2018).

Senecio macrocarpus (Large-fruit Fireweed)

Sinclair (2010) noted that the key treats to the Senecio macrocarpus (Large-fruit Fireweed) to the population on site includes:

* urban development

* weed invasion.

It is also noted that populations of Large-fruit Fireweed growing in native grassland habitats are at risk of decline or extinction if dense grassy swards develop in the absence of periodic disturbance such as fire, as the species needs open ground for seed germination and seedling establishment (Sinclair, 2010).

Historically, Large-fruit Fireweed seeds have been collected from unreserved areas within the site (Masterplan area) and used to grow seedlings which have been planted within Reserves A and B. Initial survival rates of the plants were influenced by external factors such as an

ecological burn of the Reserve A. However, monitoring data from 2012 and 2014 have indicated survival rates of 50% and 44% respectively at particular monitoring locations in Reserve A and B. While long-term seedling survival is low, once stablished the species can self-seed and sustain populations within native grasslands (EHP, 2018).

According to studies completed by EHP, the Large-fruit Fireweed species can be propagated and successfully reintroduced into suitable habitat (with a management regime). Consequently, the following translocation programme is proposed:

* seed collection (from Reserves A and B)

* propagation in accordance with recovery objective 6.1 in the National Recovery Plan and planting within Reserve C

* development of a research programme e.g. to examine aspects such as the survival and success of translocated seeds and seedlings.

It is proposed that to reduce the impact of the loss of 681 Spiny Rice-flower within Reserves A and B, that salvage and translocation of the 681 plants within Reserves A and B to Conservation Reserve C and/or agreement to an off-site location (EHP, 2018).

Natural Temperate Grassland of the Victorian Volcanic Plain- NTGVVP

Besides the acquirement of an offset there is no impact reduction option for the clearing of 12.55 ha of NTGVVP in Reserves A and B. There is 5.37ha of NTGVVP in Reserve C which will remain within the conservation reserve and is not proposed to be impacted from the proposed action.

**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.**

In accordance with the DSEWPC (2012) EPBC Environmental Offset Policy, an offset package to compensate for the residual significant impacts has been developed (EHP, 2016 and 2018). A summary of MNES which will be impacted within Reserves A and B, as follows:

Table 1: Summary of EPBC Act listed species and NTGVVP within the proposed action area

Species/TEC: Spiny Rice -flower
Conservation A: 200 plants
Conservation B: 375 plants
Total: 575 plants

Species/TEC: Large-fruit Fireweed
Conservation A: 199 plants
Conservation B: 482 plants
Total: 681 plants

Species/TEC: NTGVVP
Conservation A: 9.75 ha
Conservation B: 2.80 ha
Total: 12.55 ha

**Offset analysis**

An offset package comprising a combination of direct and indirect offsets has been developed in line with the EPBC Act Environmental Offset Policy.

Based on initial discussions with landowners, the following sites contain suitable offsets to mitigate for the removal of the ecological values detailed in Table 1 above. Based on interrogation of the EPBC Act offset calculator, it is anticipated that the potential offset sites detailed will either alone, or in combination, meet Commonwealth offset requirements for the impacted MNES as per Table 2 below.

Table 2: Potential offset sites for EPBC listed species and TEC

EPBC Matter: Spiny Rice Flower
Offset location: Bacchus Marsh, Vic
Available offset: Site contains approximately 2,500 plants (to be confirmed via targeted survey.
Offset location: Property in north western Vic
Available offset: Site supporting 750 plants.
Offset location: Echuca, Vic
Available offset: Site supporting 600 plants.

EPBC Matter: Large-fruit Fireweed
Offset location: Approx. 60km west of Geelong
Available offset: A known population of Large-fruit Fireweed available at a site approximately 60 km west of Geelong, Victoria. The total number of Large-fruit Fireweed unknown at this stage. Targeted surveys required in Spring 2018. In lieu of direct offsets meeting 100% of the impact, it is Proposed to:

* Translocate individuals into Reserve C (and other reserves where appropriate)

* Seed collection and propagation

* Research and development funding to an appropriate research organisation as determined by DEE.

EPBC Matter: NTGVVP
Offset location: Confirmed properties in the western district
Available offset: Over 200 hectares of which approximately 40 hectares will be required for direct offsets. 100 hectares also available in at least two additional sites.

Copies of the EPBC Act Offset calculations for each of these MNES is provided as Attachment F.

Details of the proposed EPBC Offset analysis (completed by EHP, 2018) for each of the impacted MNES is provided as a summary below and at Attachment F.

**NTGVVP**

Proposed Offset Site and Condition

An external property in western Victoria has been identified as containing over 200 hectares of NTGVVP, of which a direct offset of approximately 40 hectares will be required. The condition of native vegetation within the broader offset property is variable, with large areas previously assessed by Ecology and Heritage Partners to have an average condition score of 40 / 100.

Details of how the offset(s) will compensate for the unavoidable impacts to NTGVVP

Given the existing condition of the native grassland across the Williams Landing Site and ongoing development around the perimeter of the conservation reserves, it is likely that, even with ongoing, active conservation management, the existing grassland and NTGVVP remnants will continue to degrade.

The offset site is to be managed solely for the purposes of conservation, and will comprise a total area of 40 hectares of NTGVVP once established. Based on the EPBC Act offset calculator, the retention and management of 40 hectares of NTGVVP as an offset contributes 102.43% of the impact offset.

How the offset will ensure the protection, conservation and management of NTGVVP for the life of the impact

A management plan for the site will be prepared in accordance with Commonwealth approved guidance documents, and based on similar management plans prepared for other offset sites supporting the NTGVVP ecological community. The offset site will be managed and protected in perpetuity to ensure the ecological values within the offset site are retained and enhanced.

How the offset is consistent with the Commonwealth EPBC Act policy (October 2012)

Based on the EPBC Act offset calculator (DSEWPaC 2012c), the retention and management of 40 hectares of NTGVVP within the proposed offset site as an offset mitigates 102.43% of the impact of the removal of 12.55 hectares of the community. This exceeds the minimum 90% direct offset requirement.  Key calculator inputs are provided in Table 3 below.

Table 3:  EPBC Offsets Calculator- NTGVVP

Criteria: Offset location
Response: Warrambeen, Victoria.

Criteria: Habitat to be removed
Response: 12.55ha NTGVVP.

Criteria: Current Habitat quality (Reserves A and B)
Response: Average habitat value 4/10. NTGVVP to be removed is moderate quality. The patch condition of the Plains Grassland proposed to be removed varies between 16/100 and 48/100 (Ecology and Heritage Partners 2014). Large areas of the existing Conservation Reserve are dominated by annual and perennial weeds.

Criteria: Risk-re-related time horizon: 20 years
Response: The land will be managed in-perpetuity for conservation purposes for NTGVVP.

Criteria: Time until ecological benefit
Response: 10 years. Native vegetation is expected to improve in extent, species diversity and density over the course of the 10-year active management schedule to be detailed in the future Offset Management Plan.

Criteria: Start area and quality of offset site
Response: 40 hectares; with habitat value 4/10. The offset site supports Moderate Quality NTGVVP.

Criteria: Risk of loss without offset
Response: 80% . Without protection and ongoing management as an offset site, there is uncertainty regarding the future condition of the land. The property is currently grazed. Most likely the property would degrade without management, with a reduction in quality overtime likely, predominantly due to weed encroachment and lack of active land management.

Criteria: Future quality without offset
Response: Habitat value 3/10. Without protection as an offset site there is uncertainty regarding the future condition of the land. A reduction in quality overtime is likely due to continued weed encroachment and lack of land management.

Criteria: Future quality with offset
Response: Habitat value 6/10. The offset site is to be secured and managed for conservation purposes in perpetuity, with implementation of a management plan incorporating weed control and regular monitoring, aiming to maintain and enhance native biodiversity.

Criteria: Confidence in result
Response: 85%. Confidence in applied scores is relatively high due to careful consideration of the offset site, existing condition and know n experience that the land owner has in managing other offset sites in Victoria. The site will be protected through a Trust for Nature Covenant (or similar). Trust for Nature undertakes a rigorous quality assurance process for all offset sites to ensure the landowner agreements address the management commitments in the plan.

**Spiny Rice-Flower**

Location of the offset

As part of the proposed action, several offset sites have been identified. For this project, it is proposed to offset the loss of Spiny Rice-flower at a site in Bacchus Marsh that is known to

support more than 2,500 individuals. All specimens are medium to large, and flowered vigorously during the most recent flowering season (April – August 2017).

Details of how the offset will compensate for the unavoidable impacts to Spiny Rice-flower

The proposed offset site contains over 2,500 Spiny Rice-flower plants confirmed via targeted surveys. Based on the EPBC Act offset calculator, to compensate the removal of 575 individuals, approximately 1,500 plants will need to be protected elsewhere. Through ongoing management and biomass control, it is proposed to enhance recruitment opportunities for the 1,500 individuals resulting in an additional 600 specimens being added to the existing population.

It is understood that approximately 50 remnant Spiny Rice-flower specimens (as well as several translocated specimens) also occur within Conservation Reserve C (Practical Ecology 2009; 2010). However, at this stage, these specimens have not been included as part of the offset strategy.

Subject to approval, the translocation of 575 individuals into nearby reserves (e.g. the 15,000 hectare Western Grassland Reserve) will also occur where appropriate.

How the offset will ensure the protection, conservation and management of Spiny Rice-flower for the life of the impact

A management plan for the 1,500 Spiny Rice-flower individuals will be prepared in accordance with Commonwealth approved guidance documents, and based on similar management plans prepared by Ecology and Heritage Partners for other offset sites supporting the Spiny Rice-flower. The offset site will be managed and protected in perpetuity to ensure the ecological values within the offset site are retained and enhanced, and the existing population increases.

How the offset is consistent with the Commonwealth EPBC Act policy (October 2012)

Based on the EPBC Act offset calculator, the direct offset of 575 Spiny Rice-flower plants requires approximately 1,500 plants to be protected, and an additional 600 recruits resulting from the management. This offset contributes 103.81% of the impact of the offset. This exceeds the minimum 90% minimum direct offset requirement. Key calculator inputs are provided in Table 4 below.

Table 4: EPBC Offsets Calculator- Spiny Rice Flower

Criteria: Offset location
Response: Bacchcus Marsh, Victoria.

Criteria: Number of individuals to be impacted (Reserves A and B)
Response: 575 plants.

Criteria: Proposed offset
Response: 1,500 Spiny Rice-flower.

Criteria: Time until ecological benefit
Response: 1 year. The existing 1,500 Spiny Rice-flower will be protected immediately. The ecological benefit will be achieved immediately.

Criteria: Future value without offset
Response: 1,250 plants. Without protection as an offset site there is uncertainty regarding the future use of the land. A reduction in quality overtime is likely, predominantly due to weed encroachment, biomass increase and lack of land management.

Criteria: Future value with offset
Response: 2,100 plants. The offset site is to be secured and managed for conservation purposes in-perpetuity, with implementation of a management plan incorporating weed control and regular monitoring, aiming to maintain and enhance native biodiversity. Through biomass management and ongoing monitoring, it is anticipated that an additional 600 recruits will be added to the population.

Criteria: Confidence in result
Response: 75%. Confidence in applied scores is relatively high due to careful consideration of the offset site, existing habitats, high survival rate of managed in-situ Spiny Rice-flower specimens. The site will be protected through a Trust for Nature Covenant (or similar) (EHP, 2018).

**Large-fruit Fireweed: Direct Offsets**

Ecology and Heritage Partners have become aware of a property in western Victoria near Cressy that supports an existing population of Large-fruit Fireweed. Whilst the size of the population is unknown, it is believed to support at least 500 individuals. A targeted survey will be required to be undertaken in Spring to determine how many existing Large-fruit Fireweed could potentially be protected, and contribute towards a direct offset for the project. In addition, further discussions are required with the landowner to ascertain the availability of these specimens to be acquired as an offset for the Williams landing project.

In the absence of a confirmation of species numbers on-site, the offset scenario detailed below is based on a total of 350 Large-fruit Fireweed available to contribute towards a direct offset. Additional indirect offset measure as detailed below are also proposed.

<u>Location of the offset</u>

An external property in western Victoria has been identified as containing at least 350 Large-fruit Fireweed. A targeted survey will be required to confirm numbers, and further discussions are required with the landowner to ascertain availability as an offset for the project.

<u>Details of how the offset will compensate for the unavoidable impacts to Large-fruit Fireweed</u>

Based on the EPBC Act offset calculator, the protection and management of 350 plants, resulting in the population increasing to 450 plant contributes 23.45% of the direct offset. An additional monetary contribution will be required to compensate for impact as an indirect offset.

These funds would be used for ongoing research, seed collection and propagation trials.

Subject to the DoEE position, the translocation of 681 individuals into nearby reserves (e.g. Conservation Reserve C and the 15,000-hectare Western Grassland Reserve) will also occur where appropriate. Further discussion with the Commonwealth is required to determine whether the salvage and translocation of the existing 681 Large-fruit Fireweed will contribute towards the offset and mitigate measures proposed, in addition to the direct protection and management of the 350 individuals.

Seed collection and propagation trials will also focus on collecting materials from the 681 specimens in Conservation Reserves A and B to ensure the genetic diversity of the population is maintained and perpetuated into the future through seed germination and propagation trials and ongoing re-introductions into suitable habitat throughout the west of Melbourne in accordance with the objectives and performance criteria detailed in the National Recovery Plan (DSE 2010a).

How the offset(s) will ensure the protection, conservation and management of Large-fruit Fireweed for the life of the impact

A management plan for the 350 Large-fruit Fireweed individuals will be prepared in accordance with Commonwealth approved guidance documents. The offset site will be managed and protected in perpetuity to ensure the ecological values within the offset site are retained and enhanced, and the existing population increases.

Preliminary discussions have been had with Trust for Nature regarding the establishment of a team similar to the Pimelea spinescens Recovery Team (PsRT), which would oversee and implement the over-arching Commonwealth strategic objectives and protocols relating to the conservation of the species in Victoria. This team would be funded by compensatory monies required to be paid as an indirect offset.

How the offset(s) is consistent with the Commonwealth EPBC Act policy (October 2012)

Based on the EPBC Act offset calculator, the direct offset of 350 Large-fruit Fireweed plants resulting in an additional 100 individuals recruiting into the population contributes a total of 23.45% of the direct offset. An additional payment will be required as a compensatory measure to mitigate the loss as an indirect offset.

Table 5:  EPBC Offsets Calculator- Large-fruit Fireweed

Criteria: Offset location
Response: Cressy, Victoria.

Criteria: Number of individuals to be impacted (Reserves A and B)
Response: 681 plants.

Criteria: Proposed offset
Response: 350 Large-fruit Fireweed.

Criteria: Time until ecological benefit
Response: 1 year. The existing 350 Large-fruit Fireweed will be protected immediately. The ecological benefit will be achieved immediately.

Criteria: Future value without offset
Response: 250 plants. Without protection as an offset site there is uncertainty regarding the future use of the land. A reduction in quality overtime is likely, predominantly due to weed encroachment, biomass increase and lack of land management.

Criteria: Future value with offset
Response: 450 plants (350 current plants plus 100 additional plants). The offset site is to be secured and managed for conservation purposes in perpetuity, with implementation of a management plan incorporating weed control and regular monitoring, aiming to maintain and enhance native biodiversity. Through biomass management and ongoing monitoring, it is anticipated that an additional 100 recruits will be added to the population.

Criteria: Confidence in result
Response: 80%. Confidence in applied scores is relatively high due to careful consideration of the offset site, existing habitats, moderate to high survival rate of managed in-situ Large- fruit Fireweed specimens. The site will be protected through a Trust for Nature Covenant (or similar). Trust for Nature undertakes a rigorous quality assurance process for all offset sites to ensure the landowner agreements address the management commitments in the plan.

Large-Fruit Fireweed Indirect Offset

As detailed above, it is proposed to establish a team similar to the Pimelea spinescens Recovery Team (PsRT) overseen by Trust for Nature and DELWP that would oversee and implement the over-arching Commonwealth strategic objectives and protocols relating to the conservation of the species throughout Victoria, and not just confined to the actions associated with this project. This team, potentially called the Large-fruit Fireweed Recovery Team (LhFRT) would be funded by compensatory monies required to be paid as an indirect offset.

Actions overseen by the LhFRT would include the funding of an Honours and/or post-graduate PhD research project examining various aspects of the ecology of the species, preparation of an up-to-date National Recovery Plan, seedling and propagation trials through various indigenous nursery’s and/or the Royal Botanic Gardens (RGB), overseeing salvage and translocation programs throughout Victoria, as well as being a long-term repository of data and research for the species, allowing population/germination/ecological trends to be better identified. Long-term data collation relating to the species is required to further understand and develop successful management and reintroduction programs.

The establishment of such a group within Victoria will address several key recovery objectives identified in the National Recovery Plan for Large-fruit Fireweed (DSE 2010a), particularly research on the successful cultivation and propagation of the species, and an improved understanding of effective land management and rehabilitation techniques.

The proposed indirect offset may also include the translocation of 681 Large-fruit Fireweed

individuals into Reserve C and /or other reserves, including the Western Grassland Reserve (subject to approval from the Commonwealth and DELWP). This program would be overseen by the proposed LhFRT and comprise a seed collection and propagation program, and the development of a research program.

It is acknowledged that Large-fruit Fireweed is relatively easy to propagate and can be successfully reintroduced into suitable recipient sites with an appropriate management regime. The propagation and translocation of this species is a recommendation contained within the National Recovery Plan for the species (DSE 2010a), and as such, it is considered that provided appropriate funding is in place, and on-site management and monitoring methods utilise the most up to date scientific research available, it is considered that a successful future translocation and propagation program can be implemented in accordance with the recovery actions and performance criteria detailed in the national recovery plan for the species (DSE 2010a).

These measures are considered to be an appropriate indirect offset measure to compensate for the impact to the species as part of the proposed action.

# Section 5 – Conclusion on the likelihood of significant impacts

A checkbox tick identifies each of the matters of National Environmental Significance you identified in section 2 of this application as likely to be a significant impact.

Review the matters you have identified below. If a matter ticked below has been incorrectly identified you will need to return to Section 2 to edit.

### 5.1.1 World Heritage Properties

No

### 5.1.2 National Heritage Places

No

### 5.1.3 Wetlands of International Importance (declared Ramsar Wetlands)

No

### 5.1.4 Listed threatened species or any threatened ecological community

Listed threatened species and communities - Yes

### 5.1.5 Listed migratory species

No

### 5.1.6 Commonwealth marine environment

No

### 5.1.7 Protection of the environment from actions involving Commonwealth land

No

### 5.1.8 Great Barrier Reef Marine Park

No

### 5.1.9 A water resource, in relation to coal/gas/mining

No

### 5.1.10 Protection of the environment from nuclear actions

No

### 5.1.11 Protection of the environment from Commonwealth actions

No

### 5.1.12 Commonwealth Heritage places overseas

No

### 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.

Not applicable as there is a significant impact identified above.

# Section 6 – Environmental record of the person proposing to take the action

Provide details of any proceedings under Commonwealth, State or Territory law against the person proposing to take the action that pertain to the protection of the environment or the conservation and sustainable use of natural resources.

**6.1 Does the person taking the action have a satisfactory record of responsible environmental management? Please explain in further detail.**

Galaway Holdings Pty Ltd (wholly owned subsidiary of Cedar Woods Properties Ltd) has a record of responsible environmental management through the implementation of the CMP at Williams Landing, at a community level. Cedar Woods Properties Ltd actively seeks to remediate, protect and enhance areas of environmental significance and protect biodiversity in all projects it undertakes. While the sites on which these projects are developed feature a range of ecological values, the Cedar Woods Properties Limited only proceeds with considerable care and sensitivity to the environment while always endeavouring to protect, conserve and improve the land as a part of its project delivery.

In accordance with environmental legislation and project requirements it also fulfils environmental obligations and commitments.

The following are examples of projects that Cedar Woods Properties Limited has undertaken, where successful environmental outcomes have been achieved:

* Bushmead Development - Two thirds of Bushmead’s land will be reserved as parks and recreational reserve.  This conservation area is currently being rehabilitated (revegetated and weed control) in accordance with a Conservation Management Plan and agreement with the Department of Biodiversity, Conservation and Attractions (DBCA)

* Mariners Cove – this project won the State and National Urban Development Institute of Australia Environmental Excellence Awards following the rehabilitation of a 93ha wildlife reserve which formed part of the Creery Wetlands, an internationally recognised migratory water bird habitat

* Carlingford Project – two significant River Red Gum specimens were retained within local parks. A mass translocation of flora species was undertaken into designated conservation reserves which have been integrated within the development with shared paths and buffer planting along their interface.

Cedar Woods Properties Limited’s Kestrels project was also awarded a City of Wanneroo Environmental Excellence Award in Western Australia.

**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.**

There are no past or present proceedings under Commonwealth, State or Territory Law.

**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

**6.3.1 If the person taking the action is a corporation, please provide details of the corporation's environmental policy and planning framework.**

As noted, Galaway Holdings Pty Ltd is a wholly owned subsidiary of Cedar Woods Properties Ltd. The philosophy of Galaway Holdings operations is undertaken in accordance with Cedar Woods operational procedures and policies. The following is reported within Cedar Woods (2014) Sustainability Strategy:

"A key value of the company is to be recognised as an environmentally responsible developer. In all projects Cedar Woods actively seeks to remediate, protect and enhance areas of environmental significance and protect biodiversity" (Cedar Woods, 2014).

**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

**6.4.1 EPBC Act No and/or Name of Proposal.**

Galaway Holdings has referred the following actions under the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999:

* EPBC 2006/2504 Galaway Holdings Pty Ltd/Residential Development/Laverton/Victoria/Laverton activity centre and residential development.

In addition, parent company Cedar Woods Properties (and associated subsidiaries) have referred the following actions:

* EPBC 2010/5659 CRANFORD PTY LTD (wholly owned subsidiary of Cedar Woods Properties Ltd)/Commercial Development/City of Rockingham, 40km South-West of Perth /Western Australia/Mangles Bay Marina Based Tourist Precinct

* EPBC 2007/3339 Jarrah Property Pty Ltd/C/-Cedar Woods Properties Limited/Residential development/Lalor/VIC/Residential/possible industrial development

* EPBC 2014/7338 Huntsman Property Pty Ltd (wholly owned subsidiary of Cedar Woods Properties Ltd)/Commercial development/Upper Kedron, Brisbane City Council LGA/QLD/Proposed Master Planned Development, Upper Kedron, Qld

* EPBC 2015/7414 DUNLAND PROPERTY PTY LTD (wholly owned subsidiary of Cedar Woods Properties Ltd)/Residential Development/Lot 911 Midland Road, Hazelmere/Western Australia/Bushmead Residential Development, Hazelmere, WA.

# Section 7 – Information sources

You are required to provide the references used in preparing the referral including the reliability of the source.

### 7.1 List references used in preparing the referral (please provide the reference source reliability and any uncertainties of source).

| Reference Source | Reliability | Uncertainties |
|---|---|---|
| Carter, O. and Walsh, N. 2006. National Recovery Plan for the Spiny Rice-flower Pimelea spinescens subsp. spinescens. Department of Sustainability and Environment, Melbourne. | Reliable- Published | N/A |
| Cedar Woods Properties Limited, 2006. EPBC referral form. For submission under the EPBC Act 1999. | Reliable | N/A |
| Contour Town Planners, 2014. Williams Landing Conservation Resources: Town Planning and Urban Context Report. Prepared for Cedar Woods Properties. | Reliable | N/A |
| Deep End Services, 2014. Williams Landing Economic analysis of conservation reserves. Prepared for Cedar Woods. | Reliable | N/A |
| Department of Sustainability and Environment (2006) EVC/Bioregion Benchmark for Vegetation Quality Assessment [online] https://www.environment.vic.gov.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0029/48755/VVP_EVCs_combined.pdf. | Reliable | N/A |
| Department of Sustainability and Environment (2004a) Native Vegetation: Sustaining a living landscape. Vegetation Quality Assessment Manual-Guidelines for applying the | Reliable | N/A |

| Reference Source | Reliability | Uncertainties |
|---|---|---|
| habitat hectares scoring methods. Version 1.3. | | |
| Ecology and Heritage Partners, 2014. Flora and Fauna Assessment of the Williams Landing Conservation Reserves. Prepared for Cedar Woods Properties Limited. Project No. 5757. | Reliable | N/A |
| Ecology and Heritage Partners, 2014a. Ecological values and response to questions relating to the Williams land conservation reserve. | Reliable | N/A |
| EHP, 2015 Targeted Surveys for Spiny Rice-flower and Stripped Legless Lizard, Conservation Reserves A, B and C Williams Land, Prepared for Cedar Woods Properties Limited Project No. 6206. | Reliable | N/A |
| EHP, 2016. Offsets for matters of National Environmental Significance under the EPBC Act. Conservation Reserves A and B, Williams Landing, Victoria. Report Reference No. 6707. | Reliable | N/A |
| Ecology and Heritage Partners, 2018. Commonwealth and State Offset advice for the proposed development of conservation reserve (Reserves A and B). Prepared for Cedar Woods Properties Limited. Report Ref: 10208. | Reliable | N/A |
| Practical Ecology Pty Ltd, 2006. Conservation Management Plan for Grassland and Wetland Reserves at Laverton. | Reliable- part of EPBC approval | N/A |
| Threatened Species Scientific Committee, 2016a. Conservation Advice- Delma impar. Established under the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act | Reliable | N/A |

| Reference Source | Reliability | Uncertainties |
|---|---|---|
| 1999. | | |
| Threatened Species Scientific Committee, 2016b. Conservation Advice - Pimelea spinescens subsp. spinescens. Established under the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999. | Reliable | N/A |
| The Victoria State Government (2018) Planning Maps Online http://services.land.vic.gov.au/maps/pmo.jsp. | Government website-Reliable | N/A |
| The Victoria State Government (2018a) Bioregions and EVC benchmarks [online] https://www.environment.vic.gov.au/biodiversity/bioregions-and-evc-benchmarks. | Government website-Reliable | N/A |
| The Victoria State Government (2018b) Nature tool Kit [online] http://maps.biodiversity.vic.gov.au/viewer/?viewer=NatureKit. | Government website-Reliable | N/A |
| Sinclair, S.J.2010 National Recovery Plan for the Large-fruit Groundsel Senecio macrocarpus. Department of Sustainability and Environment, Melbourne. | Reliable- Published Recovery Plan | N/A |
| Victoria State Government, 2014. Plan Melbourne: Metropolitan Planning Strategy 2017-2050. | Reliable | N/A |
| Cedar Woods Properties Limited 2014. Sustainability Report. | Reliable | N/A |

# Section 8 – Proposed alternatives

You are required to complete this section if you have any feasible alternatives to taking the proposed action (including not taking the action) that were considered but not proposed.

**8.1 Select the relevant alternatives related to your proposed action.**

**8.27 Do you have another alternative?**

# Section 9 – Contacts, signatures and declarations

Where applicable, you must provide the contact details of each of the following entities: Person Proposing the Action; Proposed Designated Proponent and; Person Preparing the Referral. You will also be required to provide signed declarations from each of the identified entities.

**9.0 Is the person proposing to take the action an Organisation or an Individual?**

Organisation

**9.2 Organisation**

**9.2.1 Job Title**

Development Director

**9.2.2 First Name**

Lloyd

**9.2.3 Last Name**

Collins

**9.2.4 E-mail**

Lloyd.collins@cedarwoods.com.au

**9.2.5 Postal Address**

PO Box 7350 St Kilda Road
Melbourne VIC 8004
Australia

**9.2.6 ABN/ACN**

ABN

38078663993 - GALAWAY HOLDINGS PTY LTD

**9.2.7 Organisation Telephone**

03 9820 1777

**9.2.8 Organisation E-mail**

email@cedarwoods.com.au

**9.2.9 I qualify for exemption from fees under section 520(4C)(e)(v) of the EPBC Act because I am:**

Not applicable

**Small Business Declaration**

I have read the Department of the Environment and Energy's guidance in the online form concerning the definition of a small a business entity and confirm that I qualify for a small business exemption.

Signature:..... Date: .....

**9.2.9.2 I would like to apply for a waiver of full or partial fees under Schedule 1, 5.21A of the EPBC Regulations**

No

**9.2.9.3 Under sub regulation 5.21A(5), you must include information about the applicant (if not you) the grounds on which the waiver is sought and the reasons why it should be made**

**Person proposing the action - Declaration**

I, LLOYD COLLINS, 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 of or for the benefit of any other person or entity.

Signature:..... Date: 6 JULY 2018

I, LLOYD COLLINS, the person proposing the action, consent to the designation of GALAWAY HOLDINGS PTY LTD as the proponent of the purposes of the action describe in this EPBC Act Referral.

Signature:..... Date: 6 July 2018

**9.3 Is the Proposed Designated Proponent an Organisation or Individual?**

Organisation

**9.5 Organisation**

**9.5.1 Job Title**

Development Director

**9.5.2 First Name**

Lloyd

**9.5.3 Last Name**

Collins

**9.5.4 E-mail**

Lloyd.collins@cedarwoods.com.au

**9.5.5 Postal Address**

PO Box 7350 St Kilda Road
Melbourne VIC 8004
Australia

**9.5.6 ABN/ACN**

ABN

38078663993 - GALAWAY HOLDINGS PTY LTD

**9.5.7 Organisation Telephone**

03 9820 1777

**9.5.8 Organisation E-mail**

email@cedarwoods.com.au

**Proposed designated proponent - Declaration**

I, LLOYD COLLINS, 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: ...06...Jun...2018.....

**9.6 Is the Referring Party an Organisation or Individual?**

Organisation

**9.8 Organisation**

**9.8.1 Job Title**

CEO

**9.8.2 First Name**

Darren

**9.8.3 Last Name**

Walsh

**9.8.4 E-mail**

D.walsh@strategen.com.au

**9.8.5 Postal Address**

PO Box 243
Subiaco WA 6904
Australia

**9.8.6 ABN/ACN**

ABN

32056190419 - STRATEGEN ENVIRONMENTAL CONSULTANTS PTY LTD

**9.8.7 Organisation Telephone**

08 9380 3100

**9.8.8 Organisation E-mail**

info@strategen.com.au

**Referring Party - Declaration**

I, ____Darren Walsh_____, I 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: 6/7/18……

## Appendix A - Attachments

The following attachments have been supplied with this EPBC Act Referral:

1. attachment_a_2001_referral.pdf
2. attachment_a_2001_referral_and_decision.pdf
3. attachment_b_2006_epbc_referral.pdf
4. attachment_b_2006_epbc_referral_and_decision.pdf
5. attachment_c_conservation_agreement.pdf
6. attachment_c_conservation_mp.pdf
7. attachment_d_conservation_agreement2.pdf
8. attachment_d_flora_and_fauna_assessment_of_conservation_reserves.pdf
9. attachment_e_flora_and_fauna_assessment_of_conservation_reserves2.pdf
10. attachment_e_offsets_tables.pdf
11. attachment_f_offsets_tables.pdf
12. figure_1_site_location.pdf
13. figure_1_site_location_updated_upload.pdf
14. figure_2_master_plan.pdf
15. figure_3_priority_development_zones.pdf