

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	2021/9065 - Redbank Plains
Section 1	
Summary of your proposed action	
1.1 Project industry type	Private
1.2 Provide a detailed description of the proposed action, including all proposed activities	
<p>The total area of the site is approximately 34.94 ha. The proposed action includes earthworks and vegetation clearing to facilitate the approved development.</p> <p>Spatial analysis indicates that the total area subject to earthworks and vegetation clearing is 30.35 ha, of this:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 22.49 ha of clearing is for residential development; and,• 7.86 ha of clearing within proposed areas of open space is to facilitate the development, including:<ul style="list-style-type: none">o Clearing to establish stormwater infrastructure; and,o Clearing to establish sports and recreation areas. <p>The development includes 12.45 ha of open space which includes a mixture of retained bushland, stormwater infrastructure and sports and recreation areas. Cleared areas within bushland and stormwater components of the open space areas are proposed to be rehabilitated in accordance with the approved development conditions.</p>	
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)	
<p>The site is described as 639 Redbank Plains Road, Redbank Plains (Lot 1 on RP102884) and is within the Ipswich City Council local government area.</p>	
1.6 What is the size of the proposed action area development footprint (or work area) including disturbance footprint and avoidance footprint (if relevant)?	
<p>The total area of the site is approximately 34.94 ha. The proposed development includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 22.49 ha of residential development;• 12.45 ha of open space (including retained bushland, stormwater infrastructure and sports and recreation park).	
1.7 Proposed action location	
Lot - Lot 1 on RP102884	
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?	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	
1.10 Is the proposed action subject to local government planning approval?	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
1.10.1 Is there a local government area and council contact for the proposal?	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
1.10.1.0 Council contact officer details	
1.10.1.1 Name of relevant council contact officer	Michael Simmons
1.10.1.2 E-mail	council@ipswich.qld.gov.au
1.10.1.3 Telephone Number	07 3810 6666



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	18/11/2021
	End Date	31/12/2023

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

The following were current at the time the development application was lodged:

FISHERIES ACT 1994

The Fisheries Act 1994 (Qld) and associated Fisheries Regulation 2008 (Qld) defines specific regulatory constraint rights and allocation requirements for the protection and disturbance of Queensland fisheries resources, in particular, development involving:

- Aquaculture in tidal water, marine and freshwater;
- Building or operational works in a declared fish habitat area;
- Constructing or raising a waterway barrier; and/or,
- Removal, destruction or damage of marine plants.

An assessment of the relevant fisheries resource mapping and the proposed development indicated that the proposed development is unlikely to involve or require fisheries development approval.

COASTAL PROTECTION AND MANAGEMENT ACT 1995

The Coastal Protection and Management Act 1995 (Qld) defines requirements for the protection of Queensland's coastal zone and coastal management districts.

An assessment of relevant mapping indicates that the site is located outside of the coastal management district.

VEGETATION MANAGEMENT ACT 1999

The Vegetation Management Act 1999 (Qld) (VM Act) regulates the clearing of vegetation on freehold land which is assessable development ('work') under the Planning Act 2016 (Qld) (Planning Act). The VM Act is administered by the Department of Natural Resources and Mines (DNRM). Under the VM Act, remnant vegetation and certain regrowth vegetation is classified and mapped according to the Regional Ecosystem methodology described by Sattler and Williams (1999). The Planning Regulation 2017 (Qld) (Planning Reg.) prescribes assessable (and exempt) clearing of native vegetation under the Planning Act. Vegetation which is regulated under the Act is indicated on the Regulated Vegetation Management Map. Department of Natural Resources and Mines (DNRM) regulatory mapping indicates that the site contains regulated vegetation containing least concern regional ecosystem (RE) 12.9-10.2 and essential habitat for the Powerful Owl (*Ninox strenua*). In this instance, clearing of regulated vegetation is exempt clearing work in accordance with Schedule 21, Part 2, Item 2 (g) of the Planning Reg. as the clearing is for an urban purpose in an urban area and is a least concern RE.

NATURE CONSERVATION ACT 1992

The Nature Conservation Act 1992 (Qld) (NC Act) is the principal legislation for the protection of all native wildlife (flora and fauna) and the creation and management of protected areas in Queensland. Of relevance to the site is the potential presence of threatened wildlife (plant or animal) species. A search was undertaken to identify threatened wildlife that may occur, are likely to occur or are known to occur within 3km of the site. A search of the Queensland DEHP Wildlife Online database (Department of Science Information Technology Innovation and the Arts 2018) was undertaken for species recorded within a 3km radius of the site since 1980. The NC Act includes a risk-based approach to the management of protected plants. Where an area proposed to be cleared contains native plants in the wild and the area is shown as high risk area on the Protected Plants Flora Survey Trigger Map, a flora survey of the clearing impact area must be undertaken prior to any potential clearing. The protected plants requirements are independent of vegetation management requirements under other Acts and are intended to regulate the clearing of endangered, vulnerable and/or near threatened (collectively, EVNT) plants listed under the Nature Conservation (Wildlife) Regulation 2006 (Qld) that are, or are likely to be, present within the area to be cleared.

The Protected Plants Flora Survey Trigger Map (Department of Environment and Heritage Protection 2018) indicated that parts of the site are located within a high risk area. As such, a flora survey and flora survey report will need to be undertaken and submitted to the State prior to any vegetation clearing.

PLANNING ACT 2016 (KOALA ASSESSABLE DEVELOPMENT AREAS)

Certain development within koala assessable development areas is assessable under the Planning Reg. The koala assessable development areas mapping depicts koala habitat values occurring within certain areas defined under the Planning Act and Planning Reg.:

- Schedule 10 of the Planning Reg. prohibits development applications for an urban activity (MCU) which are wholly or partly located on land which is zoned for conservation, open space, rural or rural residential purposes and is located within a priority koala assessable development area.
- Schedule 11 of the Planning Reg. applies to certain types of development located within either an assessable development area or an identified koala habitat broad-hectare area.

An assessment of current State Government mapping indicates that the subject site is not located within an assessable development area, nor an identified broad hectare area.



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

1.13 Describe any public consultation that has been, is being or will be undertaken, including with Indigenous stakeholders
No public consultation has been/will be undertaken regarding the proposed action.
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
<p>A development application has been submitted to and approved by Ipswich City Council. Although the development application did not require submission of an Environmental Impact Statement under Queensland legislation; Ipswich City Council did require submission of an ecological assessment, which included assessment of potential environmental impacts of the proposed development on local, State and Commonwealth environmental values. An Ecological Assessment Report (EAR) was prepared by Litoria Consulting in accordance relevant Ipswich Planning Scheme guidelines and included assessment of environmental impacts of the development on local, State and Commonwealth environmental values.</p> <p>A number of additional plans have been prepared as part of the operational works applications required for the site. These will be assessed by Ipswich City Council.</p>
1.15 Is this action part of a staged development (or a component of a larger project)?
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
1.16 Is the proposed action related to other actions or proposals in the region?
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No



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

Moreton Bay

Impact

Given that the proposed development is, at its closest point, approximately 39 km (straight line) from the Moreton Bay Ramsar wetland (Figure 4), the development avoids direct impacts on the Moreton Bay.

With respect to indirect impacts on downstream water quality, the Ipswich City Council development permit (Section 7.2.1 and Appendix 1) associated with the proposed action contains relevant conditions relating to the environment and water quality.

As such, no significant impacts on Moreton Bay are expected as future development must comply with approval conditions.

Please refer to Attachment 3_211006 MNES Report v1.0 and Attachment 4_211006 MNES Report Appendices v1.0.

2.3.2 Do you consider this impact to be significant?

☐ Yes ☒ 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 ☐ No

Species or threatened ecological community

Koala / *Phascolarctos cinereus*

Impact

The subject site contains habitat critical to the survival of the koala. Habitat loss and fragmentation, vehicle strike and predation by dogs are key threats associated with the decline of this species, which may occur as a result of the proposed action. As such, referral is recommended.

Please refer to Attachment 3_211006 MNES Report v1.0 and Attachment 4_211006 MNES Report Appendices v1.0.

Species or threatened ecological community

Greater Glider / *Petauroides volans*

Impact

Results of the assessment indicated the proposed action will not lead to a significant impact on the Greater Glider as:

- There was no direct or indirect evidence of the Greater Glider during the surveys;
- The site is not a montane environment and does not contain suitable 'den' habitat trees;
- The site does not support an important population of the species; and,



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

- The proposed action is unlikely to adversely affect habitat critical to the survival of this species.

Please refer to Attachment 3_211006 MNES Report v1.0 and Attachment 4_211006 MNES Report Appendices v1.0.

Species or threatened ecological community

Grey-headed Flying-fox / *Pteropus poliocephalus*

Impact

Results of the assessment indicated the proposed action will not lead to a significant impact on the Grey-headed Flying-fox as:

- The proposed development does not impact directly on roosting habitats;
- The species is known to feed and roost in a wide range of habitats;
- The site does not support an important population of the species; and,
- The development includes ~7.77 ha of land to be retained or rehabilitated as bushland, which will include native vegetation species used by the Grey-headed Flying-fox for foraging.

Please refer to Attachment 3_211006 MNES Report v1.0 and Attachment 4_211006 MNES Report Appendices v1.0.

Species or threatened ecological community

Squatter Pigeon / *Geophaps scripta* subsp. *scripta*

Impact

Although referral should be considered due potential habitat loss and/or threatening processes, the result of the assessment suggest that the development will not result a significant impact on the species as:

- No direct or indirect evidence of the species was recorded during the field surveys;
- The species has not been recorded within 3 km of the site within the last 40 years (Department of Science Information Technology Innovation and the Arts 2021, National Research Infrastructure for Australia 2021);
- The proposed action is unlikely to adversely affect habitat critical to the survival of this species; and,
- The site does not support an important population of the species.

Please refer to Attachment 3_211006 MNES Report v1.0 and Attachment 4_211006 MNES Report Appendices v1.0.

Species or threatened ecological community

White-throated Needletail / *Hirundapus caudacutus*

Impact

Results of the assessment indicate the proposed action will not lead to a significant impact on the White-throated Needletail as:

- The species is an intermittent visitor to Australia in the non-breeding season and is mainly aerial;
- The site does not support an important population of the species or an ecologically significant proportion of the population;
- The proposed action is unlikely to adversely affect habitat critical to the survival of this species; and,
- The site does not contain an area of important habitat for the species.

Please refer to Attachment 3_211006 MNES Report v1.0 and Attachment 4_211006 MNES Report Appendices v1.0.

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

Migratory species

White-throated Needletail / *Hirundapus caudacutus*

Impact

Results of the assessment indicate the proposed action will not lead to a significant impact on the White-throated Needletail



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

as:

- The species is an intermittent visitor to Australia in the non-breeding season and is mainly aerial;
- The site does not support an important population of the species or an ecologically significant proportion of the population;
- The proposed action is unlikely to adversely affect habitat critical to the survival of this species; and,
- The site does not contain an area of important habitat for the species.

Please refer to Attachment 3_211006 MNES Report v1.0 and Attachment 4_211006 MNES Report Appendices v1.0.

Migratory species

Rufous Fantail / *Rhipidura rufifrons*

Impact

Results of the assessment indicate the proposed action will not lead to a significant impact on the Rufous Fantail as:

- There was no direct or indirect evidence of the Rufous Fantail during the surveys;
- The site does not support an important population of the species or an ecologically significant proportion of the population;
- The proposed action is unlikely to adversely affect habitat critical to the survival of this species; and,
- The site does not contain an area of important habitat for the species.

Please refer to Attachment 3_211006 MNES Report v1.0 and Attachment 4_211006 MNES Report Appendices v1.0.

2.5.2 Do you consider this impact to be significant?

☐ 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

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



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

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

The flora survey and botanical assessment indicated that the subject site was characterised by four (4) distinct vegetation survey units (VSUs):

- VSU 1: VSU 1 can be described as remnant vegetation of mixed eucalypt, open forest consisting of *Eucalyptus fibrosa* subsp. *fibrosa*, *Corymbia citriodora*, *E. siderophloia*, *E. crebra* ± *E. acmenoides*, *Corymbia intermedia*, *Corymbia henryi*, *Angophora leiocarpa* and *E. major*. Understorey vegetation within VSU 1 was very sparse and consisted of shrubs such as *Bursaria spinosa*, *Acacia julifera* and *Acacia penninervis* with native and exotic grasses.
- VSU 2: VSU 2 was native regrowth vegetation characterised by a dominant mid-stratum consisting of mostly *Acacia* spp. and *Alphitonia excelsa* with emergent eucalypts. Emergent eucalypts included species observed with the adjoining remnant vegetation (VSU 1).
- VSU 3: VSU 3 comprised non-remnant vegetation that had been historically cleared. VSU 3 can be described as disturbed vegetation containing predominantly native canopy species including, inter alia, *Eucalyptus moluccana*, *Eucalyptus tereticornis* and *Corymbia tessellaris*.
- VSU 4: Cleared and degraded areas containing isolated to sparse trees and small isolated patches of vegetation.

No threatened species or threatened ecological communities were positively identified as part of the survey.

Fauna surveys identified a total of 74 species. Of the 74 species observed during the field surveys, 12 species have an EPBC Act listing status of Marine, which are known as Other Matters of Environmental Significance under the EPBC Act. These species only require assessment if a project is within a Commonwealth Marine Area, and therefore are not assessable for the purposes of the subject site, as the subject site is not within a Commonwealth Marine Area. During the targeted surveys, a single species listed as vulnerable (Koala), was recorded as utilising the site. Indirect evidence was identified by OWAD Environment via the Koala detection dogs.

Please refer to Attachment 3_211006 MNES Report v1.0 and Attachment 4_211006 MNES Report Appendices v1.0 for full details.

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

The subject site is located adjacent to Six Mile Creek and is approximately 76 km upstream from Moreton Bay. The subject site, at its nearest point, is approximately 39 km (straight line) from Moreton Bay, with water draining off the subject site into Six Mile Creek which flows into the Brisbane River.

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

Geological data was obtained from the Geological Survey of Queensland (2011). The geology of the site can be described as a mixture of Redbank Plains Formation (Tbr), Silkstone Formation-Tbs/1 (basalt) (Tbs/1), Raceview Formation (Rbwc) and Quaternary Alluvium (Qa) along the floodplain areas adjoining Six Mile Creek. Whilst Redbank Plains Formation, Raceview Formation and Quaternary Alluvium were all identified as present on the site, the existence of Silkstone Formation (basalt) was not obvious; however there are easily observable instances of this material within the Redbank Plains locality.

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

No outstanding features that have not been otherwise described above.

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

Vegetation on the site can be categorised into four (4) distinct vegetation survey units (VSUs) based on a combination of species composition, vegetation structure and land zone / geology:

- VSU 1: Remnant vegetation consistent with least concern RE 12.9-10.2;
- VSU 2: Native regrowth vegetation;
- VSU 3: Disturbed, non-remnant vegetation that has been historically cleared; and,
- VSU 4: Cleared / disturbed areas.

The VSUs can be described as follows.

VSU 1: VSU 1 can be described as remnant vegetation of mixed eucalypt, open forest consisting of *Eucalyptus fibrosa* subsp. *fibrosa*, *Corymbia citriodora*, *E. siderophloia*, *E. crebra* ± *E. acmenoides*, *Corymbia intermedia*, *Corymbia henryi*, *Angophora leiocarpa* and *E. major*. Understorey vegetation within VSU 1 was very sparse and consisted of shrubs such as *Bursaria spinosa*, *Acacia julifera* and *Acacia penninervis* with native and exotic grasses.

VSU 2: VSU 2 was native regrowth vegetation characterised by a dominant mid-stratum consisting of mostly *Acacia* spp. and *Alphitonia excelsa* with emergent eucalypts. Emergent eucalypts included species observed with the adjoining remnant



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

vegetation (VSU 1).

VSU 3: VSU 3 comprised non-remnant vegetation that had been historically cleared. VSU 3 can be described as disturbed vegetation containing predominantly native canopy species including, inter alia, *Eucalyptus moluccana*, *Eucalyptus tereticornis* and *Corymbia tessellaris*.

VSU 4: Cleared and degraded areas containing isolated to sparse trees and small isolated patches of vegetation.

All VSUs showed signs of disturbance including historical clearing, thinning, grazing, fire and weed invasion. Environmental weeds were present in all VSUs; however, were more abundant in VSU 3 and VSU 4.

Please refer to Attachment 3_211006 MNES Report v1.0 and Attachment 4_211006 MNES Report Appendices v1.0 for full details.

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

Varies across the site - approximately 1.5% to 8%.

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

The project is located to both existing native vegetation areas containing remnant vegetation as well as urban areas and roads.

Please refer to Attachment 3_211006 MNES Report v1.0 and Attachment 4_211006 MNES Report Appendices v1.0 for full details.

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

Not applicable.

3.9 Describe any Indigenous heritage values relevant to the project area

None known.

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

The site has been previously used as residential land; however is now vacant. The south east corner of the site contains existing sports fields.



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

IMPACT AVOIDANCE

The proposed development avoids impacts on environmental values by conserving 4.59 ha of observed vegetation within the 12.45 ha of open space which equates to approximately 13% of the subject land. The area to be conserved includes areas of:

- Remnant vegetation of mixed eucalypt, open forest consisting of *Eucalyptus fibrosa* subsp. *fibrosa*, *Corymbia citriodora*, *E. siderophloia*, *E. crebra* ± *E. acmenoides*, *Corymbia intermedia*, *Corymbia henryi*, *Angophora leiocarpa* and *E. major*.
- Native regrowth vegetation characterised by a dominant mid-stratum consisting of mostly *Acacia* spp. and *Alphitonia excelsa* with emergent eucalypts.
- Cleared and degraded areas containing isolated to sparse trees and small isolated patches of vegetation, which will be rehabilitated and/or retained as sports park.

The vegetation is protected by the conditions of the Ipswich City Council approval, which are outlined in the MNES Report.

In addition to the permit conditions listed above, the following management practices and mitigation strategies which aim to reduce impacts of the proposed development on native vegetation and fauna will be implemented by the developer and/or their contractors as part of vegetation clearing. The measures are expected to be effective through the use of best practice management strategies to further minimise impacts on vegetation and fauna.

- i. Vegetation clearing extents are clearly identified on-site prior to the commencement of works.
- ii. Vegetation protection fencing is established at the interface between all works areas and vegetation to be retained / conserved during clearing works.
- iii. Vegetation removal to be undertaken by suitably qualified contractors.
- iv. Vegetation clearing is staged or takes place sequentially, allowing animals to move to adjoining habitats.
- v. Any tree pruning or maintenance works is carried out by qualified arborist in accordance with AS 4373 2007 Pruning of amenity trees.
- vi. All cleared native vegetation is mulched on-site and recycled for use in landscape treatments.
- vii. Mulch stockpiles are to be located in existing cleared areas, outside of TPZs and at least 40m from waterway / wetland areas.
- viii. Mulch stockpiles are subject to erosion / sediment control measures in accordance with best practice design standards.
- ix. Best practice weed management protocols are developed to prevent the introduction and/or spread of pest species e.g. exotic vegetation mulch, in particular mulch containing declared pest plant material, is to be disposed of as green waste at landfill or recycled via composting.
- x. A Wildlife Spotter Catcher is to inspect all areas to be cleared prior to the commencement of works.
- xi. Wildlife Spotter Catcher is to supervise and be present on each day that vegetation clearing takes place.
- xii. All areas containing ponded water are to be dewatered under the supervision of the Wildlife Spotter Catcher.
- xiii. Where identified, active hollows, nests or other breeding places are not to be interfered with. Tampering with an animal breeding place is in violation of the Nature Conservation Act 1999 under section 332 of the Nature Conservation (Wildlife Management) Regulation 2006. However, this does not apply to a person removing or otherwise tampering with the breeding place if the removal or tampering is part of an approved species management program for animals of the same species, or, the person holds a damage mitigation permit for the animal and the permit authorises the removal or tampering.
- xiv. Declared pest mammals are contained and eradicated from the site according to current best practice management techniques.
- xv. Best practice fauna management protocols are developed to prevent the introduction and spread of pest species.

Please refer to Attachment 3_211006 MNES Report v1.0 Attachment 4_211006 MNES Report Appendices and for full details.

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

Specific outcomes include:

- a) Avoid and minimise construction impacts on individual Koalas and local Koala populations.
- b) Prevent the spread of communicable disease or infection.
- c) Avoid impacts to Koalas in areas of retained vegetation adjacent to the site once proposed use has commenced.
- d) No net loss of Koala habitat in the Ipswich City Council local government area through the provision of on-site rehabilitation and a financial offset settlement.



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

An assessment of the likely significance of impacts on the above MNES was completed in accordance with the Significant Impact Guidelines (Department of the Environment 2013) and/or species specific guidelines where relevant. Results of the impact assessment indicated that:

- The development avoids direct impacts on the Moreton Bay Ramsar wetland.
 - With respect to indirect impacts on downstream water quality, the local development permits associated with the proposed action contain relevant conditions relating to the environment and water quality.
 - With the exception of the Koala, the development avoids direct impacts on threatened and migratory fauna; however, does result in impacts on potential habitat for threatened and migratory species.
 - Despite the impacts on potential habitat for threatened and migratory fauna, the impacts are not considered to be significant for a range of reasons, including:
 - o There was no direct or indirect evidence of these species;
 - o The site does not support an important population of these species or an ecologically significant proportion of the population;
 - o The site does not contain an area of important habitat for these species, nor areas essential for reproduction and breeding;
 - o The proposed action is unlikely to adversely affect habitat critical to the survival of this species; and,
 - o The development retains 4.59 ha of existing native vegetation, with the final proposed development including 12.45 ha of open space (35% of the development).
 - The subject site contains habitat critical to the survival of the koala.
 - The development is expected to impact on the observed Koala habitat.
 - The impact on Koala habitat is proposed to be mitigated via the implementation of compulsory permit conditions, including:
 - o Rehabilitation of proposed Lots 1001-1004 to a natural bushland setting consistent with the sites regional ecosystems; and,
 - o Provision of a monetary contribution to Ipswich City Council to ensure a nil net loss of mature native vegetation.
- Measures to avoid and reduce impacts have been outlined, which assist in avoiding, reducing or otherwise managing the action to the greatest extent practicable.

Please refer to MNES Report for full details.



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, Century Estate Contracting Pty Ltd understands and recognises it has a duty of care to the environment. The company's (or related companies) environmental management record does not include any instances of contraventions or non-compliances with development approval conditions.

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

The proponent has not had any past or present proceedings.

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

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

Site specific management plans to mitigate the potential for adverse impacts on environmental matters will be developed for the project as required under existing approvals.

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 Department of Agriculture Water and the Environment. (2021). "Species Profile and Threats Database." from http://www.environment.gov.au/cgi-bin/sprat/public/sprat.pl .
Reliability High
Uncertainties None known
Reference source Department of Environment and Heritage Protection (2014). Copy of the certified Koala Conservation in South East Queensland State Planning Regulatory Provisions map. Brisbane, Department of Environment and Heritage Protection.
Reliability Hgh
Uncertainties None known
Reference source Department of Environment and Science (2020). Koala Hospital Data. Queensland Government.
Reliability High
Uncertainties None known
Reference source Department of Resources (2021). Vegetation management - regulated vegetation management map v4.13 (GIS dataset). State of Queensland. Brisbane.
Reliability High
Uncertainties None known
Reference source Department of Science Information Technology Innovation and the Arts (2021). Queensland Government Wildlife Online Extract. Brisbane, The State of Queensland, Queensland Government.
Reliability High
Uncertainties None known



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

Reference source

Department of the Environment (2013). Matters of National Environmental Significance: Significant Impact Guidelines 1.1. Canberra, Commonwealth of Australia.

Reliability

Hgih

Uncertainties

None known

Reference source

Department of the Environment (2014). EPBC Act referral guidelines for the vulnerable koala. Canberra, Department of the Environment.

Reliability

High

Uncertainties

None known

Reference source

Department of the Environment (2014). *Geophaps scripta scripta* in Species Profile and Threats Database. Canberra, Department of the Environment.

Reliability

High

Uncertainties

None known

Reference source

Department of the Environment (2014). *Phascolarctos cinereus* (combined populations of Qld, NSW and the ACT) in Species Profile and Threats Database. Canberra, Department of the Environment.

Reliability

High

Uncertainties

None known

Reference source

Department of the Environment. (2019). "*Hirundapus caudacutus* in Species Profile and Threats Database." from <http://www.environment.gov.au/sprat>.

Reliability

High

Uncertainties

None known

Reference source

Department of the Environment. (2019). "*Petauroides volans* in Species Profile and Threats Database." from <http://www.environment.gov.au/sprat>.

Reliability



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

High

Uncertainties

None known

Reference source

Department of the Environment and Energy. "Register of Critical Habitat." from <https://www.environment.gov.au/cgi-bin/sprat/public/publicregisterofcriticalhabitat.pl>.

Reliability

High

Uncertainties

None known

Reference source

Department of the Environment and Energy. (2021). "EPBC Protected Matters Search Tool." from <http://www.environment.gov.au/epbc/pmst/index.html>.

Reliability

High

Uncertainties

None known

Reference source

Department of the Environment and Heritage (2003). EPBC Administrative Guidelines on Significance: Supplement for the Grey-headed Flying-fox. Department of the Environment and Heritage. Canberra, ACT.

Reliability

High

Uncertainties

None known

Reference source

Gold Coast City Council. (-). "About koalas." Retrieved 21st November, 2019, from <https://www.goldcoast.qld.gov.au/environment/about-koalas-4047.html>.

Reliability

High

Uncertainties

None known

Reference source

National Research Infrastructure for Australia. (2021). "Atlas of Living Australia online database."

Reliability

High

Uncertainties

None known



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

Reference source

Nearmap. (2021). "Nearmap PhotoMaps." from <https://www.nearmap.com/au/en>.

Reliability

High

Uncertainties

None known

Reference source

Queensland Parks and Wildlife Service (2011). Planting trees for koalas: Coastal South East Queensland. Brisbane, Queensland, State of Queensland.

Reliability

High

Uncertainties

None known

Reference source

Smith, G. C., M. Mathieson and L. Hogan (2006). "Home range and habitat use of a low-density population of greater gliders, *Petauroides volans* (Pseudocheiridae: Marsupialia), in a hollow-limiting environment." *Wildlife Research* 34(6): 472-483.

Reliability

Hgih

Uncertainties

None known

Reference source

The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species. (2018). "Species Profiles." from www.iucnredlist.org.

Reliability

High

Uncertainties

None known

Reference source

Threatened Species Scientific Committee (2016). Conservation Advice *Petauroides volans* greater glider. Department of the Environment. Canberra, Department of the Environment,.

Reliability

High

Uncertainties

None known

Reference source

Threatened Species Scientific Committee (2016). *Petauroides volans* (greater glider) Conservation Advice.

Reliability

High



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

Uncertainties
None known
Reference source
Threatened Species Scientific Committee (2019). Conservation Advice <i>Hirundapus caudacutus</i> (White-throated Needletail) Department of Environment and Energy. Canberra.
Reliability
High
Uncertainties
None known



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

8.0 Provide a description of the feasible alternative

Not taking the action

8.1 Select the relevant alternatives related to your proposed action

- ☐ Timeframes
- ☐ Locations
- ☐ Activities

8.25 Do you have another alternative?

☐ Yes ☒ No



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) CENTURY ESTATE CONTRACTING PTY LTD
Business name
ABN 81651994704
ACN
Business address Suite 1, 598 St Kilda Rd, Melbourne, 3004, Victoria, Australia
Postal address

Main Phone number 03 9291 0700

Fax

Primary email address brad@charleslloyd.com.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 Brad
Last name Dring
Job title CFO / Director
Phone 03 9291 0700
Mobile 0447 340 953
Fax
Email brad@charleslloyd.com.au
Primary address Suite 1, 598 St Kilda Rd, Melbourne, 3004, Victoria, Australia
Address

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

I, Brad Dring, 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: 7.10.21

I, Brad Dring, the person proposing the action, consent to the designation of on behalf of Century Estate Contracting Pty Ltd as the proponent for the purposes of the action described in this EPBC Act Referral.

Signature:  Date: 7.10.21



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)	CENTURY ESTATE CONTRACTING PTY LTD
Business name	
ABN	81651994704
ACN	
Business address	Suite 1, 598 St Kilda Rd, Melbourne, 3004, Victoria, Australia
Postal address	
Main Phone number	03 9291 0700
Fax	
Primary email address	brad@charleslloyd.com.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	Brad
Last name	Dring
Job title	CFO / Director
Phone	03 9291 0700
Mobile	0447 340 953
Fax	
Email	brad@charleslloyd.com.au
Primary address	Suite 1, 598 St Kilda Rd, Melbourne, 3004, Victoria, Australia
Address	

Declaration: Proposed Designated Proponent

I, Brad Dring, 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: 7.10.21



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)**

The Trustee for Litoria Trust

Business name**ABN**

75100511689

ACN**Business address**Level 3, 22 Wandoo St, Fortitude Valley, 4006, QLD,
Australia**Postal address****Main Phone number**

07 3852 4855

Fax**Primary email address**

info@litoria.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**

Kaleena

Last name

Fry

Job title

Practice Director

Phone

07 3852 4855

Mobile**Fax****Email**

kaleena.fry@litoria.com.au

Primary addressLevel 3, 22 Wandoo St, Fortitude Valley, 4006, QLD,
Australia**Address****Declaration: Referring party (person preparing the information)**

I, Kaleena Fry, 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: 15/10/21



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
localgov_approval_consent	Attachment 1_ICC Development Permit_part 1.pdf
localgov_approval_consent	Attachment 2_ICC Development Permit_part 2.pdf
supporting_tech_reports	Attachment 3_211006 MNES Report v1.0.pdf
supporting_tech_reports	Attachment 4_211006 MNES Report Appendices v1.0.pdf

Appendix B
Coordinates
Area 1
-27.63985383487,152.83925446348
-27.638466172991,152.83650788145
-27.634588230051,152.83738764601
-27.635614757733,152.84371765928
-27.63945464627,152.84506949263
-27.63945464627,152.84506949263
-27.63985383487,152.83925446348