



# Terrestrial Biodiversity Report

for  
Alterations and Additions  
at  
12 Montpelier Place, Manly

28<sup>th</sup> January 2020

## Document Information

Prepared for: Christine and John Kelleher

Prepared by: Nicholas Skelton, B. Sc. (Hons), M. App. Sc. (Ecology and Vegetation Management)  
Jane Williamson, B. Env. Sc. (Hons), M. Wld. Mgmt, Grad. Dip. Bfire Prot.  
and  
Sophia Mueller Sewell, B. Sc (Environmental Biology)

Revision No: DRAFT

File Number: 12MPPTBR01

## Required Licences

NSW Department of Primary Industries, Animal Research Authority: 12/4838

Office of Environment and Heritage, Section 132c Scientific Licence: S1101070

Office of Environment and Heritage, Bam Assessor: BAAS 17083

Office of Environment and Heritage, Data Licence Agreement: Con97043

Approved for release by Director:



Nicholas Skelton, B.Sc. (Hons), M. App. Sc.

Approval Date: 28<sup>th</sup> January 2020

GIS Environmental Consultants

ABN: 66011504339  
45 Austin Ave,  
North Curl Curl, NSW 2099  
Phone: (02) 9939 5129  
Mobile: 0419 438 672  
Email: [ecology@ecology.net.au](mailto:ecology@ecology.net.au)  
Web: [www.ecology.net.au](http://www.ecology.net.au)

Copyright GIS Environmental Consultants, All rights Reserved © 2020.

GIS Environmental Consultants (Publisher) is the owner of the copyright subsisting in this publication. The report can be copied and used for planning, DA assessment and research. The intellectual content of the report including the text remains the property of the authors.

This report has been prepared to provide ecological advice to the client and/or their authorised representatives in regard to a particular and specific development proposal as advised by the client. This report can be used by the client for its intended purpose including submission to a Determining Authority for DA assessment. The report and its attachments should be read as a whole and no individual part of the report or its attachments should be interpreted without reference to the entire report. This report may be used for research.

# Table of Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction .....</b>	<b>5</b>
1.1	Background .....	5
1.2	Legislation Addressed by this Report.....	5
1.2.1	<i>NSW Environment Planning and Assessment Act 1979, EP&amp;A Act .....</i>	<i>5</i>
1.2.2	<i>Biodiversity Conservation Act 2017 .....</i>	<i>5</i>
1.2.3	<i>Manly Local Environment Plan, MLEP.....</i>	<i>6</i>
1.2.4	<i>Manly Development Control Plan, DCP.....</i>	<i>6</i>
1.2.5	<i>State Environmental Planning Policies and Sydney Regional Environmental Plans .....</i>	<i>7</i>
1.2.6	<i>Federal Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999, EPBC Act.....</i>	<i>8</i>
1.2.7	<i>Other Potentially Relevant Environmental Legislation .....</i>	<i>9</i>
1.3	General Definitions .....	9
1.4	Assumptions and Limitations .....	10
1.5	Endangered Bandicoot Population at North Head .....	10
1.5.1	<i>Long-nosed Bandicoot (Perameles nasuta) Biology .....</i>	<i>11</i>
1.5.2	<i>Population Viability .....</i>	<i>12</i>
1.5.3	<i>Previous Years Survey Results for the Bushland Area of Habitat .....</i>	<i>12</i>
1.5.4	<i>Threats to the North Head Population .....</i>	<i>13</i>
1.6	The Study Site .....	14
1.7	The Proposed Development.....	14
1.7.1	<i>Plans and Documents Used .....</i>	<i>14</i>
<b>2</b>	<b>Methods .....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Findings .....</b>	<b>15</b>
3.1	Long-nosed Bandicoot Habitat and Use of Adjacent Land .....	15
3.2	Existing Bandicoot Habitat and Access on this Site .....	15
3.2.1	<i>Existing Bandicoot Habitat and Access from Adjacent Land .....</i>	<i>16</i>
3.3	Proposed Bandicoot Habitat and Access .....	16
3.3.1	<i>Proposed Bandicoot Access from/ to Adjacent Land.....</i>	<i>16</i>
3.4	During Construction Impacts.....	17
3.5	Habitat and Presence of Other Flora and Fauna Species.....	17
3.6	Ecological Communities .....	17
	<b>Map 1: Changes to Bandicoot Habitat and Access .....</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>Impact Assessment.....</b>	<b>21</b>
4.1	Test of Significance (5-part test) for the Long-nosed Bandicoot Population.....	21
4.2	Manly LEP 2013 Assessment of Clause 6.5 (3) & (4), Terrestrial Biodiversity .....	23
4.2.1	<i>Clause 6.5 (3) Assessment .....</i>	<i>23</i>
4.2.2	<i>Clause 6.5 (4) Assessment .....</i>	<i>25</i>
4.3	State Environmental Planning Policies and Sydney Regional Environmental Plan....	25
4.3.1	<i>SEPP 19 Bushland in Urban Areas Assessment .....</i>	<i>25</i>
4.3.2	<i>SREP Sydney Harbour Catchment 2005 Assessment .....</i>	<i>25</i>
4.3.3	<i>SEPP Coastal Management 2018 Assessment .....</i>	<i>25</i>
4.4	Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016, Threshold Test .....	26
<b>5</b>	<b>Conclusions.....</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>Ameliorative Conditions .....</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>Management Recommendations.....</b>	<b>28</b>

<b>8</b>	<b>References and Relevant Literature .....</b>	<b>30</b>
	<b>Appendix 1. Plate of Photographs .....</b>	<b>31</b>
	Figure 1: Habitat in front yard at 12 Montpelier Pl, Manly.....	19
	Figure 2: Habitat in front yard at 12 Montpelier Pl, Manly.....	19
	Figure 3: Habitat in front yard at 12 Montpelier Pl, Manly.....	19
	Figure 4: Habitat in rear yard at 12 Montpelier Pl, Manly.....	19
	Figure 5: Access to St Patricks Estate to the south of 12 Montpelier Pl, Manly.....	19
	Figure 6: Access to neighbouring property to the west at 12 Montpelier Pl, Manly .....	19
	Figure 7. Example of gap under boundary fence for bandicoot access .....	31
	Figure 8. Example of gap under boundary fence for bandicoot access .....	31
	Figure 9. Example of gap under boundary fence for bandicoot access .....	31

# 1 Introduction

---

## 1.1 Background

This report identifies the ecological values and constraints at the property, 12 Montpellier Place, Manly, then assesses the likely impact of a proposed development on the terrestrial flora, fauna and ecological communities, in particular the Endangered Long-nosed Bandicoot population on North Head. Potential impacts and Key Threatening Processes for the Endangered Long-nosed Bandicoot population that have been identified include loss of habitat and change to habitat access. This report also makes recommendations on ways to avoid or reduce impacts caused by the development.

## 1.2 Legislation Addressed by this Report

This section describes the Local, State and Federal legislation that provide the legal framework for approval of development and the protection and conservation of native flora and fauna that are relevant to this site.

### 1.2.1 NSW Environment Planning and Assessment Act 1979, EP&A Act

The NSW Environment Planning and Assessment Act 1979 is the framework for approval of development in NSW. This proposal will be assessed under Part 4 of the EP&A Act which requires the determining authority (normally Council) to not approve local development (Development Applications, DA's) without considering the heads of consideration in section 4.15 which requires the assessment of relevant legislation (Biodiversity Conservation Act, LEP, DCP, SEPPs etc.)(4.15a), the environmental impact of the proposal (4.15b) and the suitability of the site for development (4.15c). The assessment of the ecological impact of this Development Application including the relevant heads of consideration are addressed in section 4 of this report.

### 1.2.2 Biodiversity Conservation Act 2017

Section 7.2 of the Biodiversity Conservation Act requires that all local developments (Development Applications DAs, Part 4 EP&A Act):

- Implement the core purpose of the Act is hierarchy to “Avoid” and “Minimise” impacts, only then can “Offsets” be used for any residual impacts,
- be assessed to determine whether they trigger the BOS Threshold Test specified in the Biodiversity Conservation Regulation 2017, which has 2 parts; the area of native vegetation to be impacted and a check of whether the impact is within an area of mapped “biodiversity” on the Biodiversity values map and
- be assessed by a qualified ecologist to determine if there may be a positive a 5-Part Test of Significance as outlined in part 7.3 of the BC Act for each Threatened species or ecological community (listed in the schedules of the BC Act) or their habitats (listed in the schedules of the BC Act) that may occur on the site.
- be assessed to determine if the proposal may impact on an Area of Outstanding Biodiversity Value (AOBV).

Developments that trigger the Threshold Test or have a positive 5-Part Test of Significance or impact on a AOBV, need to enter the Biodiversity Offset Scheme (BOS) and require the Biodiversity Assessment Method (BAM) to be applied and include a Biodiversity Development Assessment Report (BDAR) with the DA application. The proposal also needs to be assessed to determine if it may result in a Serious and Irreversible Impact (SAIL).

If a development application does not meet the threshold or any other triggers then a smaller report is still required to address the “heads of consideration” (section 4.15 of the EP&A Act), the 5-part Test of Significance as required by the Manly DCP, SEPPs and Local Council’s LEP/DCP requirements.



The Threshold Test, 5-Part Test, assessment of AOBV, heads of consideration, SEPP LEP/DCP requirements are all assessed in section 4 of this report.

### **1.2.3 Manly Local Environment Plan, MLEP**

The Manly (Northern Beaches Council) Local Environment Plan's (2013) 'Terrestrial Biodiversity Map' identifies this property as having high terrestrial biodiversity value. Development applications in the mapped area requires consideration of Clause 6.5 (3) and (4) 'Terrestrial Biodiversity' (Manly LEP 2013). Development proposals need to be consistent with the objectives of this Clause and include appropriate measures to avoid, minimise or mitigate possible impacts of the development on biodiversity.

#### **Extract from MLEP 2013**

##### **6.5 Terrestrial biodiversity**

- (1) The objective of this clause is to maintain terrestrial biodiversity by:*
  - (a) protecting native fauna and flora, and*
  - (b) protecting the ecological processes necessary for their continued existence, and*
  - (c) encouraging the conservation and recovery of native fauna and flora and their habitats.*
- (2) This clause applies to land identified as "Biodiversity" on the Terrestrial Biodiversity Map.*
- (3) Before determining a development application for development on land to which this clause applies, the consent authority must consider:*
  - (a) whether the development is likely to have:*
    - (i) any adverse impact on the condition, ecological value and significance of the fauna and flora on the land, and*
    - (ii) any adverse impact on the importance of the vegetation on the land to the habitat and survival of native fauna, and*
    - (iii) any potential to fragment, disturb or diminish the biodiversity structure, function and composition of the land, and*
    - (iv) any adverse impact on the habitat elements providing connectivity on the land, and*
  - (b) any appropriate measures proposed to avoid, minimise or mitigate the impacts of the development.*
- (4) Development consent must not be granted to development on land to which this clause applies unless the consent authority is satisfied that:*
  - (a) the development is designed, sited and will be managed to avoid any significant adverse environmental impact, or*
  - (b) if that impact cannot be reasonably avoided by adopting feasible alternatives—the development is designed, sited and will be managed to minimise that impact, or*
  - (c) if that impact cannot be minimised - the development will be managed to mitigate that impact.*

These sections of the Manly LEP are addressed within this report.

### **1.2.4 Manly Development Control Plan, DCP**

Manly Development Control Plan 2013 Section 2.1.15 'Threatened Flora and Fauna Assessment of Significance Report, including the Long-nosed Bandicoot, and Little Penguins' requires the assessment of the significance of impact on threatened species, populations or ecological communities or their habitats.

#### **Manly DCP 2013**

*DCP extract 2.1.15 'Threatened Flora and Fauna Assessment of Significance Report'*

*Objective 1) To ensure the assessment of any significant effect on threatened species, populations or ecological communities or their habitats (as listed in the Threatened Species Conservation Act 1995) in accordance with Section 5A of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 (now superseded by section 7.3 of the Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016).*

*DCP extract 5.4.2 'Threatened Species and Critical Habitat'*

*Any development of land with known habitat for threatened species must consider the likely impacts of the development and whether further assessment needs to be undertaken by a Species Impact Statement.*

DCP Extract - Schedule 1 - Map D - Areas where Assessment of Significance is required (for Little Penguins and/or Long Nosed Bandicoots)



This report includes a Test of Significance (5-part test) for the Endangered Long-nosed Bandicoot population at North Head and other Threatened Species, Populations or Endangered Ecological Communities that may be impacted by the proposal. These clauses are addressed in the Impact Assessment section of this report.

### **1.2.5 State Environmental Planning Policies and Sydney Regional Environmental Plans**

The SEPPs and SREPs which are relevant to Northern Beaches LGA and which may be relevant to this proposal are SEPP 19 Bushland in Urban Areas and Sydney Regional Environmental Plan (Sydney Harbour Catchment) (SREP SHC) 2005 (which amends SEPP No 56 Sydney Harbour Foreshores and Tributaries).

#### **State Environmental Planning Policy No 19—Bushland in Urban Areas**

State Environmental Planning Policy 19 - Bushland in Urban Areas (SEPP 19) is a NSW government policy that aims to protect and preserve bushland within urban areas. The policy applies to naturally vegetated land adjacent to Council reserves.

#### **Sydney Regional Environmental Plan (Sydney Harbour Catchment) 2005**

The plan aims to establish a balance between promoting a prosperous working harbour, maintaining a healthy and sustainable waterway environment and promoting recreational access to the foreshore and waterways. It establishes planning principles and controls and consolidates and replaces the following instruments: - Sydney Regional Environmental Plan No. 22 - Parramatta River (SREP 22); - Sydney Regional Environmental Plan No. 23 - Sydney and Middle Harbour (SREP 23); and amends State Environmental Planning Policy No. 56 Sydney Harbour Foreshores and Tributaries (SEPP 56).

The area to the **below** of the heavy black boundary line including the whole of North Head, St Patrick's Estate, Manly Boatshed and Manly Wharf. See image below. The whole of Manly Cove is zoned as **W2 Environment Protection Zone**. Wetlands are mapped along the majority of Manly Coves' foreshore.



Image: Strategic Foreshores and Waterways Area - Part of Sheet 4 SREP SHC

The ecological Aim of the SREP is to ensure the protection, maintenance and rehabilitation of watercourses, wetlands, riparian lands, remnant vegetation and ecological connectivity.

The specific ecological matters to be taken into consideration are assessed in the Impact Assessment section of this report. The Objectives of the W2 zoning is also assessed in Impact Assessment section of this report.

### **Coastal Management SEPP 2018**

The new SEPP *Coastal Management 2018* combines SEPP 14 (Coastal Wetlands), SEPP 26 (Littoral Rainforests) and SEPP 71 (Coastal Protection) and clause 5.5 of the Standard Instrument into one integrated policy. These policies have been repealed. This SEPP defines four coastal management areas and specifies the assessment of development within these management areas.

The Coastal Management SEPP also maps Coastal Wetlands and Littoral Rainforest (EEC) and areas with close proximity of Coastal Wetland and Littoral Rainforest and includes controls for development within those areas.

### **1.2.6 Federal Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999, EPBC Act**

There is currently no memorandum of understanding agreement between the State and Federal government regarding the need to apply the EPBC Act 1999.

Assessment of a Development Application with respect to the EPBC Act 1999 is not a Council issue but the responsibility of the proponent. Proponents should be advised by their ecological consultant whether a referral is necessary. The Commonwealth Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 (EPBC Act) would need detailed assessment if the proposal is considered likely to have an impact on a 'Matter of National Environmental Significance' (MNES), thus providing a



trigger for referral of the proposal to the Department of the Environment and Water Resources. Matters of national environmental significance identified in the Act are: world heritage properties; national heritage places; RAMSAR wetlands; nationally threatened species and communities; migratory species protected under international agreements; the Commonwealth marine environment; and nuclear actions.

Section 4 of this report addresses this requirement.

### **1.2.7 Other Potentially Relevant Environmental Legislation**

If the proposal involves impact to riparian land or aquatic habitat than assessment under the Fisheries Management Act 1994 and the Water Management Act 2000 may also be required.

## **1.3 General Definitions**

**5-Part Test of Significance (5-Part Test)** - Assessment under Section 7.3 of the BC Act to determine whether a proposed development or activity is likely to significantly affect threatened species or ecological communities, or their habitats. The minister has provided a guide under 7.3(2) titled Threatened Species Assessment Guidelines.

**BC Act** - NSW Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016 contains the lists of threatened species, the definitions of the threatened ecological communities, the 5-part Test of Significance and the Biodiversity Offset Scheme (BOS). There are associated Biodiversity Conservation regulations which refers to the BAM.

**Clearing** - clearing of native vegetation including; cutting down, felling, uprooting, thinning or otherwise removing native vegetation, killing destroying, poisoning, ringbarking or burning native vegetation and includes and includes establishment and maintenance of bushfire protection Asset Protection Zones (APZ) inner and outer zones.

**Direct Impacts** - are impacts that directly affect habitat, ecosystems and individuals. They include, but are not limited to, death, trampling, poisoning of the animal/plant itself and the removal of vegetation and suitable habitat. When applying each factor, consideration must be given to all of the likely direct impacts of the proposed activity or development during construction. As defined by the 2018 Threatened Species Assessment Guidelines.

**DPI** - NSW government of Department of Primary Industries

**EPA Act (EP&A Act)** - NSW Environment Planning and Assessment Act 1979, controls development in NSW, includes the requirement to consider SEPPs, LEPs, DCPs, BC Act 2016.

**EPBC Act** - Federal Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999.

**Indirect Impacts** - occur when project-related activities affect species, populations or ecological communities in a manner other than direct loss. Indirect impacts can include loss of individuals through starvation, exposure, predation by domestic and/or feral animals, loss of breeding opportunities, loss of shade/shelter, deleterious hydrological changes, increased soil salinity, erosion, inhibition of nitrogen fixation, weed invasion, fertiliser drift, or increased human activity within or directly adjacent to sensitive habitat areas. Indirect impacts may occur after construction during the life of the development, e.g. escape of garden plants, excess nutrients and changes in fire frequency and grazing. As with direct impacts, consideration must be given, to all of the likely indirect impacts of the proposed activity or development (2006 DECC Assessment of Significance Guidelines)

**LEP** - Local Environment Plan, a local planning instrument for each Council area.

**Native Vegetation** - is defined in the LLS Act as any plants native to NSW including trees, understory plants or groundcover plants including wetland. Marine vegetation is protected by the Fisheries Act.

**OEH** - NSW Office of Environment and Heritage, formerly NPWS, DEC, DECC and DECCW. Government organisation responsible for the conservation of native flora and fauna.

**Property** - The lot(s) that are the subject of the proposal. In this report, this is the same as the Study Area, the Subject Site and “site”.

**Proposal** - The works/actions that are proposed on the property that is the subject of the development application.

**Protected Fauna** - refers to any native bird, mammal, reptile or frog in NSW.

**Site** - In this report this is the same as the Study Area and the Subject Site and the property.

**Study Area** - means the subject site and any additional areas which are likely to be affected by the proposal, either directly or indirectly. The study area should extend as far as is necessary to take all potential impacts into account. In this report, this is the same as the Subject Site, the property and “site”.

**Subject Site** - means the area directly affected by the proposal. In this report, this is the same as the Study Area, the property and “site”.

**Threatened Species** - refers to those species listed in the schedules of the Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016 as “Critically Endangered”, “Endangered” or “Vulnerable”.

For definitions that are relevant to the Assessment of Significant test see the Appendices.

#### 1.4 Assumptions and Limitations

- This document only assesses the impacts of the proposal described in this report and shown on Map 1 and the cited plans.
- This report does not consider the cumulative impact of other developments on this property or on adjacent land.
- This report does not include assessment of soil suitability or European/Aboriginal heritage.
- It can never be proven that other Threatened Species have not, do not or will not use the site as habitat. The conclusions drawn in this report are a result of testing, observation and experience.
- This report describes the habitat and species of the site at the time of the field survey. Vegetation, habitat and legislation will change over time and therefore the findings of this report are only relevant for 6 months.
- This report should be read in its entirety and no part should be taken out of context.
- No responsibility is accepted for use of any part of this report in any other context or for any other purpose or by third parties.

#### 1.5 Endangered Bandicoot Population at North Head

The main species of interest on this site is the Long-nosed Bandicoot, *Perameles nasuta*, (Geoffrey 1804) and in particular, the Endangered population at North Head, Manly, which is known to occur in the vicinity of the Subject Site.

The Final Determination (TSC Act Scientific Committee 1997) for the listing of this population in the schedules of the Threatened Species Conservation Act described the population as:

*“P. nasuta was once widespread in the Sydney region but many formerly recorded populations have become extinct. The North Head population is now isolated and disjunct.”*



“...the North Head population of *P. nasuta* is in immediate danger of extinction.”

“...the North Head *P. nasuta* population is of significant conservation value on the grounds that it is:

- A disjunct population
- One of the few surviving populations within the Sydney region
- A population which has been the subject of a number of scientific studies, and is thus an important reference population
- Accorded considerable value by the local community, and thus serves to promote conservation more generally”

The Office of Environment and Heritage has identified 25 priority actions to help recover the Long-nosed Bandicoot population on North Head in New South Wales (as of July 2013). These priority actions relate to OEH, Northern Beaches Council and other determining authorities developing, implementing and continuing the fox, feral cat and rabbit control program, weed control program, monitoring program, community awareness program, collecting mortality data, finalising and reviewing Long-nosed Bandicoot Recovery Plan, and Sydney Harbour National Park Fire Management Strategy and Plan of Management.

#### **1.5.1 Long-nosed Bandicoot (*Perameles nasuta*) Biology**

**Description:** The Long-nosed Bandicoot (*Perameles nasuta*) is a solitary nocturnal marsupial that grows to a size of between 850 and 1100 g, 310 to 425 mm in head and body length, and with a tail length of 120 to 155 mm (Stoddart 1995). The males are larger than females. These bandicoots characteristically dark, greyish-brown above and creamy white below. The forefeet and upper surfaces of the hind feet are also creamy white (NPWS 2000b). The muzzle is long and pointed and the ears are markedly larger and more pointed than short-nosed bandicoots of the genus *Isoodon*, such as the other bandicoot that lives in Sydney, the Southern Brown Bandicoot (Stoddart 1995).

**Distribution:** Long-nosed Bandicoots are locally common along the east coast of Australia and adjacent mountains from north-eastern Queensland to south-western Victoria. This Endangered population is restricted to the relatively isolated area of habitat on North Head in the Manly Local Government Area, south of Addison Road (NSW Scientific Committee 2003). See above the DCP extract, Schedule 1 - Map D - Areas where Assessment (test) of Significance is required. There is another Threatened population in the inner western part of Sydney.

**Habitat:** At North Head, Long-nosed Bandicoots inhabit, to varying extents, all of the habitat types available including woodlands, scrub, heath open areas and the urban landscape. Recent research indicates that urban areas are important for the population and that there are individuals who live their entire lives within the urban area. Long-nosed Bandicoots prefer sites with sandy soils, as well as with low undergrowth and leaf litter cover and does not have a particular preference for proportion of canopy cover (Chambers & Dickman 2002). This species depends on a mosaic of vegetation types at a landscape level, including feeding grounds in patches of moist, soft soil located close to shelter with an abundance of invertebrates (Scott et al. 1999). These types of habitat can be found in both bushland and urban environments including native vegetation and residential gardens. Resting and nesting habitat is low, dense vegetation or litter where a bandicoot can take shelter in during the day. Bandicoot diggings are more abundant in areas of moist, soft soils close to cover (Hughes and Banks 2010).

Individuals build diurnal nests that are typically made in a shallow hole or depression on ground surface and are lined with leaf litter and dry grasses. The entrance to each nest is closed when occupied making them generally difficult to locate. Nests on North Head have been found in a variety of habitat types, such as at the base of large trees and within tall grasses including residential backyards (Scott 1995; Scott et al. 1999). Long-nosed Bandicoots typically have more than 1 nest that

is in regular use within their territory (Chambers & Dickman 2002). It is expected that bandicoots in the wild may live up to 2 to 2.5 years.

**Diet:** Long-nosed Bandicoots feed on invertebrates, plants, tubers, fungi and vertebrates (Menkhorst & Knight 2004, Scott et al. 1999, Claridge 1993). Invertebrates mostly include insects from the orders Coleoptera and Hymenoptera (> 80%). Plants preferred are mainly the leaves and stems of monocotyledons (>76%). Fungi are consumed in a high proportion (> 63%), mostly those hypogaeal from the family Zygomycetes, in particular the species *Glomus fuegianum*. Vertebrates, even though contribute little to bandicoots' diet include skinks, birds and sometimes eggs of the Eastern Water Dragon (Scott et al. 1999).

**Breeding:** At North Head, Long-nosed Bandicoots were recorded breeding from June to March (Scott 1995), however mating can occur throughout the year. The average recorded litter size for the North Head population is 2.3 babies (Stoddart 1995). In productive years, females may have up to 4 litters.

Litters are typically 2-3 (>76%), with the young weaned at about 7 weeks and reaching maturity at 20 weeks. Females tend to overlap their home ranges (i.e., 1.7 ha) throughout the year, as well as to reduce their size during the breeding season. By contrast, home ranges of males (i.e., 4.4 ha) only overlap during the breeding season, as they also enlarge their home ranges (Scott et al. 1999, Menkhorst & Knight 2004).

### 1.5.2 Population Viability

There have been many studies on this population over the last 20 years including; micro-chipping, radio tracking, extensive trapping, diet analysis, population viability estimation (Banks, 2000; Banks, 2004; Chambers and Dickman, 2002; Hughes and Banks, 2006; Hughes and Banks, 2010; Lenehan and Banks, 2004; Scott, Hume, and Dickman, 1999). There is ongoing biannual monitoring program by the Office of Environment and Heritage (OEH; formerly DECCW, DECC and NPWS) in collaboration with Manly Council and Sydney University.

Every two years there is a more extensive Long-nosed Bandicoot trapping survey conducted in the bushland part of North Head. This survey does not include the urban environment part of North Head, which is now known to have permanent bandicoot residence. These areas are likely to be the same population. Population viability estimates within the urban environment most recently occurring in November 2012 and March 2013. This urban study utilised 14 transects across Eastern Hill and used the same methods as the current study by NPWS within the bushland habitat on North Head (Hughes and Banks, 2010).

In May 2015, a total of 152 individual Long-nosed Bandicoots were trapped at North Head, compared to 99 in 2014, and 71 in 2010. The sex ratio of the bushland population is relatively even. Under current conditions, the North Head Long-nosed Bandicoot population has a 62% chance of persisting after 50 years. This figure has dropped from 80% in since the previous PVA, due to the slightly higher sex specific adult mortality rates used in the current PVA's (Price & Banks, 2015). The latest PVA analysis determined that the population is stable and has been for the last few years. It has been calculated that only a small loss to the population could cause the local population to become extinct.

### 1.5.3 Previous Years Survey Results for the Bushland Area of Habitat

See below text results from the Long-Nosed Bandicoot Urban Monitoring Program (Cumberland Ecology) 2016.

- A total of 34 (14 males and 19 females, adults 72%) individual Long-nosed Bandicoots were trapped in the urban area of Manly, in May 2016, compared with 31 (19 males and 12 females, 75% adult) in March 2013.
- Four of the females captured had 1-2 young in their pouch.

- 25% of the total population on North Head are living within the urban environment with 28 - 45 individuals in the **urban** environment compared with 120 - 140 individuals in the **bushland** environment (NPWS).
- There are individuals with their home range within the urban environment
- Individuals were trapped across Eastern Hill and all the way down to Ashburner Street.

#### **1.5.4 Threats to the North Head Population**

The major threats to this population are thought to be vehicle traffic, loss of habitat through development and, to a lesser degree, predation by dogs, cats and foxes. Other threats include inbreeding depression, loss of genetic variation, risk of catastrophic events (such as bushfires or disease), inappropriate fire regimes, clearing of native vegetation and invasion of native plant communities by Bitou Bush. Bandicoots are also susceptible to infection by cats carrying the disease toxoplasmosis. If urban developments keep reducing the area of accessible habitat available it is likely to result in population decrease and the likelihood of the population becoming extinct in the near future (i.e., 20 years) range between 31% and 46%.

The removal of habitat or prevention of access to habitat on a site may constitute a significant impact to the conservation of the threatened population and may require modifications to the development so there is no significant impact or a more extensive assessment in the form of a Biodiversity Development Assessment Report or modification of the proposal.



## 1.6 The Study Site

The site is the whole of Lot 12 in DP 1105469 known as 12 Montpelier Place in the Northern Beaches LGA. The property is rectangular in shape with an area of 752.8m<sup>2</sup>. The property currently contains a three-storey rendered dwelling and lawn and garden beds in the front and rear yards.

The property is a corner block with Montpelier Place bordering to the north and east and is accessed via the driveway to the north. The adjacent lot to the west is a residential lot with a single dwelling. Further to the north and east are residential lots. The property backs on to the bushland of St Patricks Estate to the south.

Map 1 shows the existing site and the proposed changes along with the changes to bandicoot habitat and access.

There are areas of urban habitat surrounding the site, and an extensive area of bushland reserve on North Head to the south-east, which is mostly Sydney Harbour National Park and Sydney Harbour Federation Trust land. Little Manly Beach and Sydney Harbour are approximately 250 m south east of the site.

The aerial photograph on the cover of this report shows the context of this site.

The geographic co-ordinates of the site are -33.802152 °S and 151.295632° E.

## 1.7 The Proposed Development

This report addresses a DA for:

- Relocation of a swimming pool and spa, including drain and perforate the base of and infill existing lap pool for planting Construction of a new pool and spa in the rear yard.
- Earthworks, including changes to levels and replacement of retaining walls
- Re-landscaping the rear yard and along western side of the house including hard and soft landscaping in the rear yard

For further information on the locations of parts of the proposal, the extent of the development and details of the proposal, see Map 1.

The plans and documents used for this report are:

### 1.7.1 Plans and Documents Used

Title	Author	Rev	DWG./Doc. No./Ref. No.	Date Modified or Accessed
Showing selected levels and details over Lot 12 in DP 1105469 being 12 Montpelier Place, Manly	Hill & Blume Consulting Surveyors		60440001A	17/05/2018
Existing and Demolition Plans	Ilario G. Cortese Architects Pty Ltd	-	DA EX01	24/01/2020
Existing and Demolitions Elevations	Ilario G. Cortese Architects Pty Ltd	-	DA EX02	24/01/2020
Proposed Plans First and Roof/Site	Ilario G. Cortese Architects Pty Ltd	-	DA003	24/01/2020
Proposed Plans Lower Ground and Ground	Ilario G. Cortese Architects Pty Ltd	-	DA002	24/01/2020
Landscape Plan	Potager-The Whole Garden Pty Ltd & Vale Green Life	B	-	04/12/2019

## 2 Methods

---

The site was inspected on the 19<sup>th</sup> October 2018 by the experienced and qualified ecologists Nick Skelton and Jane Williams for a total of 1-person hour and again on the 20<sup>th</sup> December 2019 by the experienced and qualified ecologist Nicholas Skelton. This locality has been visited on many previous occasions by the authors for various other ecological survey projects. Nicholas Skelton has 20 years of experience in Flora and Fauna surveys in the Sydney Metropolitan area and has completed over 200 bandicoot surveys and assessments in Manly for NPWS, Council, SHFT and private landowners. The field survey searched for evidence of all Threatened Species, Populations and Endangered Ecological Communities that are known to, or that may have potential habitat within the site, especially the Endangered population of Long-nosed Bandicoot.

Existing and potential foraging, resting, and nesting Long-nosed Bandicoot habitat was determined and quantified and is shown on Map 1. Existing bandicoot access to, from and within the site was also determined and mapped also on Map 1.

The plans referenced within this report were assessed to determine the amount and type of habitat and the access that would be altered as a result of the proposal. The change in amount of habitat and access is also shown in Map 1.

Mega-chiropteran bat species, such as the Threatened Grey-headed Flying-fox, are surveyed by searching for flower/fruit trees during spotlighting activities and by listening to distinctive vocalisations. Suitable roosting habitat is searched for presence of small or large established camps during diurnal survey periods. The habitat potential of the site for bandicoots was determined by detailed onsite assessment of the access, shelter and food sources. The recent use of the property by bandicoots was determined by an ecologist with extensive experience in bandicoot survey in urban environments, by searching for diggings, scats, frequently used trails and boundaries were thoroughly searched for accessibility by bandicoots. The road reserve and accessible parts of nearby properties were searched for evidence of bandicoot activity and habitat value. Photographs were taken of the site. The findings from other reports from nearby surveys and studies were also used to provide additional habitat use information. Habitat for other Threatened species was searched for. Field notes are available for scrutiny.

## 3 Findings

---

### 3.1 Long-nosed Bandicoot Habitat and Use of Adjacent Land

During the field survey evidence was found of bandicoots using the gardens at the front and rear of the property and along the road reserve of Montpelier Place. Bandicoots have been recorded regularly in the locality. These animals are all from the Endangered Long-nosed Bandicoot population at North Head.

### 3.2 Existing Bandicoot Habitat and Access on this Site

The site currently contains 180m<sup>2</sup> of good quality bandicoot foraging habitat in the form of garden beds and lawn in the front yard and the gardens at the rear of the property (see Figures 1-4). The green shaded areas on Map 1 show bandicoot foraging habitat on the site. During the survey bandicoot diggings were observed in the lawn and garden beds in the front and rear yards.

Current access to the habitat on the site is from the north, south and western sides of the property and is represented by the Dark Blue double ended arrows on Map 1. Access into the property from the south is via the open wire rear boundary fence (see Figure 5) and access from the west is via a rock escarpment in the south western corner of the property along the boundary with the property next-door (see Figure 6). There is no restriction to access to the habitat at the front of the property from the north, east and west (see Dark Blue arrows on Map 1).

There is no access from the front of the property to the rear from within the property.

See Map 1 for a diagram showing the existing bandicoot access to, from and within the site and a comparison with the proposed and recommended access.

### 3.2.1 Existing Bandicoot Habitat and Access from Adjacent Land

Adjacent Land	Existing Bandicoot Access and Habitat
North - Montpelier Place	Good quality habitat at the front of the property and along the nature strip of Montpelier Place, open access. See Map 1.
East - Montpelier Place	Good quality habitat on road reserve at southern end of the eastern boundary. No access through boundary fence. See Map 1.
South - St Patricks Estate	Good quality habitat, access through rear fence. See Map 1.
West - Neighbouring property	Good quality habitat. Access from rock escarpment in south west corner. See Map 1.

### 3.3 Proposed Bandicoot Habitat and Access

Map 1 summarises the existing and proposed bandicoot habitat and access to, from and within the site. There is currently **180m<sup>2</sup>** (24%) of accessible bandicoot foraging habitat in the 752m<sup>2</sup> Site.

The proposal will provide **146m<sup>2</sup>** (19.4% of the site) of potential foraging habitat (see **green** areas on Map 1) in the form of lawn and gardens in the front and rear yards

This is a permanent loss of 34m<sup>2</sup> of foraging habitat from the property, which is 18.8% of the current habitat.

The temporary (during construction) loss of habitat caused by demolition, storage of materials, stockpiling and cut and fill will be small and contained within the site.

Access to the front yard will not be changed by the proposal. The following recommendations are made to maintain or provide access (see **blue** arrows on Map 1).

- Access to and from the rear yard of the property through the south and eastern boundaries is to be maintained. The replacement boundary fences are to have 150mm-300mm gaps every two metres along the fence. Access point should be provided where there is a difference in soil height of no more than 250mm.
- Access to the planters in the rear yard is to be provided through a 150mm gap provided under the gate along the eastern boundary.

If the recommendations of this report are followed there will be a decrease in the amount of habitat but access to habitat at the property will remain unchanged.

#### 3.3.1 Proposed Bandicoot Access from/to Adjacent Land

Adjacent Land	Bandicoot Access and Habitat
North - Montpelier Place	Open access, no proposed changes.
East - Montpelier Place	No access through boundary fence, recommended access under new boundary gate.
South - St Patricks Estate	Recommendations made to keep existing access through new rear boundary fence.

West - Neighbouring property	Recommendations made to keep existing access through new boundary fence.
------------------------------	--

### 3.4 During Construction Impacts

Likely impacts during construction are:

- Temporary restriction of access to habitat for bandicoots and other fauna due to skips, site fences and storage of materials. **Low impact**;
- Temporary potential hazards to bandicoots and other fauna including falling into open pits and drowning hazards. **Medium risk**, recommend a wooden plank be placed in holes to enable bandicoots to climb out. ;
- Temporary additional traffic movement around the street. **Low risk**.

The temporary (during construction) loss of habitat caused by demolition, storage of materials, stockpiling and cut and fill will be very small as the builder will use a truck to store rubbish.

Measures to ameliorate these potential impacts are discussed in the Recommendations and Ameliorative Conditions sections of this report.

### 3.5 Habitat and Presence of Other Flora and Fauna Species

There are likely to be Blue-tongue Lizards (*Tiliqua scincoides sincooides*), Rainbow Lorikeets (*Trichoglossus moluccanus*), Garden Skink (*Lampropholis guichenoti*), and Noisy Miners (*Manorina melanocephala*) visiting the site. There are also many Eastern Water Dragons (*Physignathus lesueurii*) living in the surrounding locality.

Threatened Grey-headed Flying-foxes (*Pteropus poliocephalus*) and micro-bats would regularly fly over this property. There are local populations of the endangered Magenta Lillypilly, *Syzygium paniculatum* and Sunshine Wattle (*Acacia terminalis* subsp. *terminalis*) on North Head and the Magenta Lillypilly has been recorded nearby in the St Pats estate but it does not occur on this site.

None of the other six (6) endangered and twenty-eight (28) vulnerable fauna species that occur in the Manly area where found on the site or have important habitat on the site. No evidence was found of any other Threatened Species, Population or Endangered Ecological Community on this property at the time of the survey.

### 3.6 Ecological Communities

The NSW Threatened Species Conservation Act (TSC), 1995 and the Federal Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation (EPBC) Act 1999, both list Threatened ecological communities. Threatened ecological communities can be either Vulnerable (VEC) or Endangered (EEC) or Critically Endangered (CEEC) Ecological Communities under the TSC Act. The Federal Act lists only Endangered or Critically Endangered Ecological Communities. These communities are likely to become extinct in nature unless the circumstances and factors threatening their survival cease to operate. The listing is most commonly referred to as a determination, which is a several page definition of the community written by a scientific committee and listed in the schedules of the Act.

During the site survey the likelihood of Endangered Ecological Communities occurring on the site was determined using a three-step approach: 1. Has the community been recorded in the locality? 2. Is there a sufficient density of characteristic species on the site? and 3. Does the environmental description in the Determination fit the site?

#### Littoral Rainforest Endangered Ecological Community

Littoral rainforest in the NSW North Coast, Sydney Basin and South East Corner Bioregions endangered Ecological Community (EEC) is generally a closed forest, the structure and composition of which is

strongly influenced by proximity to the ocean. The plant species in this ecological community are predominantly rainforest species with evergreen mesic or coriaceous leaves.

There are not enough native species on the site or the correct structure for the vegetation on the site to represent any native vegetation community. No Endangered Ecological Community occurs on the site.






**Figure 1: Habitat in front yard at 12 Montpelier Pl, Manly**



**Figure 2: Habitat in front yard at 12 Montpelier Pl, Manly**



**Figure 3: Habitat in front yard at 12 Montpelier Pl, Manly**



**Figure 4: Habitat in rear yard at 12 Montpelier Pl, Manly**





**Figure 5: Access to St Patricks Estate to the south of 12 Montpelier Pl, Manly**



**Figure 6: Access to neighbouring property to the west at 12 Montpelier Pl, Manly**



# Map 1: Changes to Bandicoot Habitat and Access



Map to be viewed in colour

12 Montpelier Place, Manly

16 January 2020

- Bandicoot Access
- Barrier to Bandicoot Movement
- Bandicoot Habitat



## 4 Impact Assessment

This Test of Significance is in accordance with the Threatened Species Assessment Guidelines recommended for use by Manly Development Control Plan 2013 (MDCP 2013) in section 2.1.15.2 (a).

### 4.1 Test of Significance (5-part test) for the Long-nosed Bandicoot Population

Part 7.3 of the BC Act, Test of Significance (5-part test) for impact of the proposed development on the Long-nosed Bandicoot Population at North Head

*(a) in the case of a threatened species, whether the proposed development or activity is likely to have an adverse effect on the life cycle of the species such that a viable local population of the species is likely to be placed at risk of extinction,*

#### Response:

The Long-nosed Bandicoot population on North Head is listed in Schedule 1, Part 2, Division 4 of the BC Act 2016 as an Endangered Species Population.

The local population is viable at least in the short term. In May 2015, a total of 152 individual Long-nosed Bandicoots were trapped at North Head, compared to 99 in 2014, and 71 in 2010. The sex ratio of the bushland population is relatively even. Under current conditions, the North Head Long-nosed Bandicoot population has a 62% chance of persisting after 50 years. This figure has dropped from 80% in since the previous PVA, due to the slightly higher sex specific adult mortality rates used in the current PVA's (Price & Banks, 2015). The latest PVA analysis determined that the population is stable and has been for the last few years.

Evidence of recent bandicoot use (diggings) was observed in the front yard of the site during the survey.

The site currently contains 180m<sup>2</sup> of good quality bandicoot foraging habitat provided by garden beds and lawn in the front yard and the gardens at the rear of the property (see photos 1-4). The green shaded areas on Map 1 show bandicoot foraging habitat on the site.

The proposal will provide 146m<sup>2</sup> (19.4% of the site) of potential foraging habitat (see green areas on Map 1) in the form of lawn and gardens in the front yard. This is a permanent loss of 34m<sup>2</sup> of foraging habitat from the property.

Access to habitat to some parts of the rear of the property (See dark blue arrows on Map 1) will be changed by the proposal. Recommendations have been made to maintain existing access and improve access. See Map 1 for proposed bandicoot habitat and access to, from and within the site.

This population is restricted to North Head, which has an area of 385 ha, of which only a negligible amount will be lost due to the proposed development. The change in bandicoot habitat is of a scale that is not likely to lead to the reduction in the population size or reproduction success of individuals, the population or their habitat. The proposal is not likely to have a significant negative effect on the life cycle of this population such that the viability of the population is compromised and placed at risk of extinction.

*(b) in the case of an endangered ecological community or critically endangered ecological community, whether the proposed development or activity:*

*(i) is likely to have an adverse effect on the extent of the ecological community such that its local occurrence is likely to be placed at risk of extinction, or*

*(ii) is likely to substantially and adversely modify the composition of the ecological community such that its local occurrence is likely to be placed at risk of extinction,*

**Response:**

The Long-nosed Bandicoot Population at North Head is listed as a threatened population and not an Endangered or Critically Endangered Ecological Community; therefore, this question is not applicable.

*(c) in relation to the habitat of a threatened species, population, or ecological community:*

*i) the **extent** to which habitat is likely to be removed or modified as a result of the action proposed, and*

**Response:**

The site currently contains 180m<sup>2</sup> of good quality bandicoot foraging habitat provided by garden beds and lawn in the front yard and the gardens at the rear of the property (see photos 1-4). The **green** shaded areas on Map 1 show bandicoot foraging habitat on the site.

The proposal will provide 146m<sup>2</sup> (19.4% of the site) of potential foraging habitat (see **green** areas on Map 1) in the form of lawn and gardens in the front yard. This is a permanent loss of 34m<sup>2</sup> of foraging habitat from the property.

This population is restricted to North Head, which has an area of 385ha, of which only a negligible amount will be lost due to the proposed development.

This population and a large part of the suitable habitat on North Head is situated within Sydney Harbour National Park and land managed by the Sydney Harbour Federation Trust as a conservation area. A significant proportion of this population also occurs on St Patrick's Estate and other private urban land on North Head.

The change in the **extent** of bandicoot habitat is of a scale that is not likely to lead to the reduction in the population size or reproduction success of individuals, the population or their habitat. If the recommendations of this report are followed, the proposed development will not change the access to this habitat.

*ii) whether an area of habitat is likely to become **fragmented or isolated** from other areas of habitat as a result of the action proposed, and*

**Response:**

Access to habitat to some parts of the rear of the property (See **dark blue** arrows on Map 1) will be changed by the proposal. Recommendations have been made to maintain existing access and improve access. See Map 1 for proposed bandicoot habitat and access to, from and within the site.

If the recommendations are not followed, then the proposal will restrict access to the habitat on the property.

*iii) the **importance** of the habitat to be removed, modified, fragmented or isolated to the **long-term survival** of the species, population or ecological community in the locality*

**Response:**

This population is restricted to North Head, which has an area of 385 ha, of which only a negligible amount will be lost due to the proposed development.

The change in bandicoot habitat is of a scale that is not likely to lead to the reduction in the population size or reproduction success of individuals, the population or their habitat. The proposal is not likely to have a significant negative effect on the life cycle of this population such that the viability of the population is compromised and placed at risk of extinction.

*(d) whether the proposed development or activity is likely to have an adverse effect on any declared area of outstanding biodiversity value (either directly or indirectly),*

**Response:**

There is no Area of Outstanding Biodiversity on the site. The proposal will not directly or indirectly effect any Area of Outstanding Biodiversity Value.

*(e) whether the proposed development or activity is or is part of a key threatening process or is likely to increase the impact of a key threatening process.*

**Response:**

The following Key Threatening Processes are relevant to the Site and/or the proposal

**Clearing of native vegetation:** The proposal will not remove any native vegetation. Therefore, the proposal will not to the increase of this or any other listed Key Threatening Process.

**Conclusion to the 5-Part Test of Significance on the impact of the proposal of the Endangered population of Long-nosed Bandicoots on North Head**

It is not likely that the proposal will have a significant impact on the Endangered Long-nosed Bandicoot population at North Head. Entry into the Biodiversity Offset Scheme (BOS) and further assessment in the form of a Biodiversity Development Assessment Report (BDAR) is not considered necessary for this population.

**4.2 Manly LEP 2013 Assessment of Clause 6.5 (3) & (4), Terrestrial Biodiversity**

Manly LEP 2013 'Terrestrial Biodiversity Map' shows the subject property is located within an area identified as of 'Terrestrial Biodiversity'.

Therefore Clause 6.5 of MLEP 2013 applies to this Development Application and the objectives of the clause and in particular points (3) and (4) must be considered in regard to this proposal.

**4.2.1 Clause 6.5 (3) Assessment**

a) *Whether the development is likely to have:*

- i. *Any adverse impact on the condition, ecological value and significance of the fauna and flora on the land?*

**Response:** The site survey found evidence of the Long-nosed Bandicoot utilising the site and adjacent land. It is likely that bandicoots use the adjacent properties and nearby bushland areas for foraging and probably resting and breeding, and they have been recorded regularly in the locality.

Other fauna that are likely to use site include possums, Rainbow Lorikeets, Noisy Minors, Sulphur Crested Cockatoo, Garden Skinks, Eastern Water Dragon and Brush turkeys.



The site currently contains 180m<sup>2</sup> of good quality bandicoot foraging habitat provided by garden beds and lawn in the front yard and the gardens at the rear of the property (see photos 1-4). The green shaded areas on Map 1 show bandicoot foraging habitat on the site.

The proposal will provide 146m<sup>2</sup> (19.4% of the site) of potential foraging habitat (see green areas on Map 1) in the form of lawn and gardens in the front yard. This is a permanent loss of 34m<sup>2</sup> of foraging habitat from the property.

It is recommended that local native species are used in landscaping to improve habitat value for all native species.

Access to the habitat will not change for birds or arboreal mammals such as possums that are using the site.

No evidence was found of any other Threatened Species, Populations or Endangered Ecological Communities utilising this property.

Based on the information gathered and the assessments of potential impacts of the proposal on flora and fauna in section 3 of this report, it is considered that the proposal will not have any adverse impact on the condition, ecological value and significance of the fauna and flora on the land.

*ii. Any adverse impact on the importance of the vegetation on the land to the habitat and survival of native fauna?*

**Response:** The vegetation on the site is medium-low quality habitat for a wide range of fauna including reptiles, birds and mammals. Brush-tailed and Ring-tailed Possums Rainbow Lorikeets, Noisy Minors, Sulphur Crested Cockatoo, Garden Skinks, Eastern Water Dragon and Brush turkeys are likely to occur. Evidence of Long-nosed Bandicoot foraging was observed in the rear yard of the site. There is no native vegetation community on the property.

Based on the findings and assessment of the impact of this proposal on flora and fauna in sections 3 and 4 of this report, fauna habitat is not likely to be adversely impacted by the proposal and the habitat is not likely to be important habitat for these species due to the higher quality bushland habitat to the east in Sydney Harbour National Park. The proposed development will not have any adverse impact on the importance of the vegetation on the land to the habitat and survival of native fauna.

It is recommended that local native species be used in landscaping on the property to improve that habitat value of the vegetation to native fauna.

*iii. Any potential to fragment, disturb or diminish the biodiversity structure, function and composition of the land?*

**Response:** Based on the findings and assessment of the impact of this proposal on flora and fauna in sections 3 and 4 of this report, the proposed development will not significantly fragment, disturb or diminish the current biodiversity structure, function and composition of the subject site. See section 4 for details.

*iv. Any adverse impact on the habitat elements providing connectivity on the land?*

**Response:** The site is located in a residential area surrounded by other private properties with a discontinuous canopy of trees. The site is not part of an important wildlife corridor. Access to the habitat will not change for birds or arboreal mammals such as possums that are using the site. Access to the habitat for bandicoots (See dark blue arrows on Map 1) will be changed by the proposal. Recommendations have been made to maintain access.

Based on the findings and assessment of the impact of this proposal on flora and fauna in sections 3 and 4 of this report, this proposal will not adversely impact on the habitat elements providing connectivity to other areas of suitable habitat.

- b) *Are there appropriate measures proposed to avoid, minimise or mitigate the impacts of the development?*

**Response:** This report makes recommendations for appropriate measures to avoid, minimise or mitigate the impacts of the development. See the Ameliorative Conditions and Management Recommendations sections of this report for further information.

#### **4.2.2 Clause 6.5 (4) Assessment**

- a) *Is the development designed, sited and will be managed to avoid any significant adverse environmental impact? OR*

**Response:** Due to the constraint of the small lot size, the small amount of habitat on the site and the dense urbanization in the area, the proposal is designed and sited to reduce significant adverse impacts by having minimal changes to the existing development footprint. The recommendations and ameliorative conditions in this report provide measures to manage and mitigate impacts.

- b) *If the impact cannot be reasonably avoided by adopting feasible alternatives—is the development designed, sited and will be managed to minimise that impact? OR*

**Response:** Due to the constraint of the small lot size, the small amount of habitat on the site and the dense urbanisation in the area, the proposal is designed and sited to reduce significant adverse impacts by having minimal changes to the existing development footprint. The recommendations and ameliorative conditions in this report provide measures to manage and mitigate impacts.

- c) *If that impact cannot be minimised—will the development will be managed to mitigate that impact?*

**Response:** N/A

#### **Conclusion to the Assessment of Clause 6.5 of the MLEP**

The proposal is consistent with the requirements of Clause 6.5 of the MLEP 2013 and is not considered to have a significant adverse impact on terrestrial biodiversity

### **4.3 State Environmental Planning Policies and Sydney Regional Environmental Plan**

#### **4.3.1 SEPP 19 Bushland in Urban Areas Assessment**

The site does not contain natural vegetation with intact structure and floristics and therefore does not fit the definition of Bushland as described in SEPP 19 (Bushland in Urban Areas 1986).

The proposed works, with the amelioration recommendations described in this report, will have a very low impact on the environment, they will not disrupt any fauna corridor, they will not endanger and plant or animal species, they will not cause significant erosion and they will not change the accessibility or recreational value of bushland. The proposed works therefore are considered generally to meet the objectives of SEPP 19.

#### **4.3.2 SREP Sydney Harbour Catchment 2005 Assessment**

The site is not included within the Sydney Harbour Catchment Map and therefore assessment with respect to SREP Sydney Harbour Catchment is not required. However, this proposal is consistent with the matters to consider in respect to the biodiversity, ecology and environment protection of the site.

#### **4.3.3 SEPP Coastal Management 2018 Assessment**

The site is not within the “Land Application Map” for the Coastal Management SEPP 2018. The site is not mapped as containing Littoral Rainforest, Coastal Wetland, Proximity to Littoral Rainforest or

Proximity to Coastal Wetland. Therefore, the SEPP Coastal Management 2018 does not apply to this proposal.

#### 4.4 Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016, Threshold Test

This proposal is **not** considered to meet the BC Act threshold as;

1. The lot size is less than 1ha and there is less than 0.25ha of native vegetation being removed. **and**
2. The proposal will not directly or indirectly an area mapped as having high biodiversity value on the “Biodiversity Values Map” or area declared Area or Outstanding Biodiversity Significance (AOBV). **and**
3. There is not likely to be a significant affect (5-part test of significance test in Section 7.3, BC Act) on any Threatened species or ecological community or their habitat as has determined by this report.

Therefore, the proposal does not need a Biodiversity Development Assessment Report (BDAR).

## 5 Conclusions

The site surveys found evidence of the Long-nosed Bandicoot using the front and rear garden beds at the site. Bandicoots also use the adjacent properties and nearby bushland areas for foraging and probably resting and breeding, and they have been recorded regularly in the locality.

The site currently contains 180m<sup>2</sup> of good quality bandicoot foraging habitat provided by garden beds and lawn in the front yard and the gardens at the rear of the property (see photos 1-4). The **green** shaded areas on Map 1 show bandicoot foraging habitat on the site.

The proposal will provide 146m<sup>2</sup> (19.4% of the site) of potential foraging habitat (see **green** areas on Map 1) in the form of lawn and gardens in the front yard. This is a permanent loss of 34m<sup>2</sup> of foraging habitat from the property, which is 18.8% of the current habitat.

Access to habitat to some parts of the rear of the property (See **dark blue** arrows on Map 1) will be changed by the proposal. Recommendations have been made to maintain existing access and improve access. See Map 1 for proposed bandicoot habitat and access to, from and within the site.

The development is unlikely to have a significant impact on the conservation of any Endangered Population, Threatened Species or Endangered Ecological Community. The proposal does not meet the BC Act Threshold Test. Further assessment of the impact of this proposal in the form of a Biodiversity Development Assessment Report (BDAR) not recommended in relation to this development application at this site.

The ecological impact is not considered an unacceptable impact under section 4.15 (79C(b)) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 or a significant impact under Section 7.3 of the Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016.

The proposal is not considered to be a 'matter of National Environmental Significance (NES)' EPBC Act referral of the proposal to the Department of the Environment and Water Resources is not considered necessary.

The proposal will not have a significant impact to terrestrial biodiversity and meets the requirement of clause 6.5 of the MLEP.

We recommend that the ameliorative conditions and management recommendations in this report be followed to limit disturbance during construction and to further reduce the impact of the proposal on potential bandicoot habitat and access.

## 6 Ameliorative Conditions

---

- Access to and from the rear yard of the property through the south and eastern boundaries is to be maintained. The replacement boundary fences are to have 150mm-300mm gaps every two metres along the fence. Access point should be provided where there is a difference in soil height of no more than 250mm.
- Access to the planters in the rear yard is to be provided through a 150mm gap provided under the gate along the eastern boundary.
- Any new external and internal gates (excluding those that provide access to the pool area) are to have gaps of a minimum of 150mm under the full length of the gate to allow for bandicoot access.
- If the plans change from what is described in this report or what is shown on Map 1 then the impacts will change, and this report may need reviewing.
- In areas of habitat for the long-nosed bandicoot, landscape design should include native plant species to provide new and/or improved low dense clumping habitat to provide for potential foraging and nesting. The planting schedule should comprise species such as Lomandra sp., Dianella sp., Banksia spinulosa, Caustis sp., Xanthorrhoea sp., Isolepis sp., Juncus sp., Calochlaena sp., Callistemon sp., Gleichenia sp. and Grevillea 'Robyn Gordon' (Manly DCP 2013 Section 3.3.1 [a][iv]).
- To the untrained eye an Endangered Long-nosed Bandicoot may be mistaken for a rat. To avoid direct physical harm to Long-nosed Bandicoots, it is important that workers on the site are aware of their presence and their conservation significance and the steps to take to protect them.
- While temporary fencing around the construction area is usually a standard requirement, even purpose-built fencing has been known to be ineffective in excluding bandicoots from construction sites. It is therefore essential that daily checks be undertaken to ensure the construction/works areas are free of bandicoot occupation including sheltering sites. All excavations and stockpiles of construction material are to be inspected daily prior to commencing operation to ensure that no bandicoots are sheltering in these areas. In the case that a Long-nosed Bandicoot is encountered within one of these work areas, no work shall proceed until the bandicoot has safely vacated the works area.
- **Noise and vibration** discourages bandicoot occupation of this and adjacent sites. Normal construction hours are to be adhered to, with no machinery to be used outside the hours of 7:30am and 4:30pm.
- **Bright lighting** discourages bandicoot occupation. No bright lighting or motion detectors are to be installed to illuminate the lawn or garden areas. A modest amount of low lighting is acceptable for safety purposes only.
- While bandicoots can swim short distances, they are not strong swimmers and as such pools and ponds, which present a fairly unnatural water body edge, can become a drowning hazard for bandicoots. Bandicoots are to be excluded from man-made water body areas (e.g.: pools, ponds, spas or water features), while maintaining access to the surrounding soft landscaping. For example, pool fencing could be constructed with a surrounding barrier 300mm in height or greater, or a base gap of less than 120mm, so as to exclude bandicoots from entering the pool areas but not the garden or grassed areas. Alternatively, pools or ponds could contain ramped edges or a ramp at one end to enable escape should a bandicoot enter the water.

## 7 Management Recommendations

---

- The Companion Animals Act 1998 requires that dog and cat owners ensure that their cat or dog does not threaten or harm a person or animals.
- Domestic cats and dogs should be kept indoors from dusk to dawn. Cats should only be allowed outside if in a sealed cat run. Example solutions can be seen at these internet addresses:  
<https://catnip.com.au/design-ideas/>  
<http://www.catnets.com.au/>  
<http://www.catcagesaustralia.com.au/gallery/index.html>  
<http://www.cat-world.com.au/cat-worldenclosures.htm>  
<http://www.catmax.com.au/photo-gallery.php>
- Dog owners must take all reasonable precautions to prevent your dog from escaping from the property on which it is being kept. If you fail to comply with this requirement, you may be liable for a penalty of \$880.
- **Cats should be kept indoors at night**, as there are benefits to both the cat and the community. Yowling and fighting is more of a problem at night. The noise is likely to be intrusive and may keep your neighbours awake. Keeping your cat indoors at night is recommended in the interests of both your cat's safety and community harmony. Many kinds of native wildlife are more active or more vulnerable to hunting at night. There is also evidence that cats hunt more during the night. By keeping your cat indoors, you can help reduce the number of native birds and animals that are killed in your area. Kittens can quickly become accustomed to staying indoors at night. Consider also containing your cat in a cat enclosure on your premises both during the day and during the night. Council Rangers can issue nuisance orders to cat owners.
- Injured bandicoots should be given expert care in order that they can be rehabilitated and returned to the population where possible. It is also important that any deceased bandicoots are reported, so that appropriate investigations can be undertaken to understand the cause of death to inform the future management and recovery of the endangered Long-nosed bandicoot population. Any **injured or dead Long-nosed Bandicoots** should be reported by phoning Council on 9976 1500 or Office of the Environment and Heritage (OEH) on 131 555
- Modest, low external lighting in the garden should be used at the minimum level required for safety.
- Landscaping watering and additional cover in the form of planting low, dense vegetation will increase the value of the foraging habitat and facilitate bandicoot persistence in the urban mosaic.
- Bandicoots and other native animals should **not be fed artificial foods** as it may cause them nutritional problems and may increase predation.
- Feral animals including cats and/or foxes should never be fed, nor should food be left out where they can access it, such as rubbish bins without lids, or in pet food bowls, as these animals present a significant threat to Long-nosed Bandicoots and other wildlife.
- Rat baiting is to only occur within buildings. No Rat baiting should occur under or around houses.
- The use of insecticides, fertilisers, or snail baits should be avoided on the property. Garden insects will be kept in low numbers if Long-nosed Bandicoots are present.
- When the final North Head Long-nosed Bandicoot Recovery Plan is released it should be implemented where relevant.

- Care should be taken when driving in the area, especially at night as bandicoots have little road sense and cars are a major threat to bandicoots.
- Dead bandicoots should be reported by phoning Council on 9976 1500 as they will assist in monitoring the program.
- Please report all sightings of feral rabbits, feral or stray cats and/or foxes to Council on 9976 1500 or NPWS (OEH) on 9997 6102.



## 8 References and Relevant Literature

---

- Banks, P. B. (2000). Population viability analysis for the Long-nosed Bandicoot population at North Head, NSW: modelling the effects of increased traffic flow on adult mortality. School of Biological Sciences, University of Sydney.
- Banks, P. B. (2004). Population viability analysis in urban wildlife management: modelling management options for Sydney's quarantined bandicoots. School of Biological, Earth and Environmental Sciences, University of New South Wales.
- Chambers, L. K. and Dickman, C. R. (2002) Habitat selection of the long-nosed Bandicoot *Perameles nasuta* (Mammalia, Peramelidae), in a patchy urban environment. *Austral Ecology* 27: 334-342.
- Claridge, A. W. (1993). Fungal diet of the Long-nosed Bandicoot (*Perameles nasuta*) in south-eastern Australia. *Victorian Naturalist* 110: 86-91.
- Cumberland Ecology (2016) Long-nosed Bandicoot Urban Monitoring Program 2016 - Interim Report  
Department of Environment, Climate Change and Water (DECCW), Threatened Species Assessment Guidelines for the Assessment of Significance, dated August 2007
- Office of Environment and Heritage (OEH), Threatened Species database,  
<http://www.threatenedspecies.environment.nsw.gov.au/tsprofile/index.aspx>
- Hughes, N. K. and Banks, P. B. (2006) An analysis of the May 2006 Census of the North Head Long-nosed Bandicoot Population: A report for DEC Central Directorate threatened Species Unit. School of Biological, Earth and Environmental Sciences, University of New South Wales.
- Hughes, N. K. and Banks, P. B. (2010) Heading for greener pastures? Defining the foraging preferences of urban long-nosed bandicoots. School of Biological, Earth and Environmental Sciences, University of New South Wales.
- Hughes, N. K. and Banks, P. B. (2013) An analysis of the 2012/2013 Census of the North Head Long-nosed Bandicoot Population: A report for OEH Central Directorate threatened Species Unit. School of Biological, Earth and Environmental Sciences, University of New South Wales.
- Population Census: A report for the NPWS Central Directorate Threatened Species Unit. School of Biological, Earth and Environmental Sciences, University of Sydney.
- Menkhorst, P. W. & Knight, F. A. (2004). Field guide to the mammals of Australia. Oxford University Press, Melbourne.
- NPWS. (2002). Endangered Population of Long-nosed Bandicoots (*Perameles nasuta*) at North Head, Draft Recovery Plan. NSW NPWS Hurstville.
- NSW Scientific Committee (last amended June 2003). Final determination for the North Head population of the Long-nosed Bandicoot, *Perameles nasuta*.
- Scott, L. K. (1995). Nutritional ecology and population biology of the Long-nosed Bandicoot (*Perameles nasuta*): Implications for conservation. School of Biological Sciences, University of Sydney.
- Scott, L. K., Hume, I. D. & Dickman, C. R. (1999). Ecology and population biology of long-nosed bandicoots (*Perameles nasuta*) at North Head, Sydney National Park. *Wildlife Research* 26: 805-821.
- Skelton, N., O. Richmond, A. Gilson and P. Wong, 2003, Fauna of North Head, GIS Environmental Consultants, North Curl Curl.
- Skelton, N., P. Wong and E. Donner, 2004, Fauna and Fauna of Manly Councils Bushland Reserves, GIS Environmental Consultants, North Curl Curl.
- Stoddart, E. (1995) "Long-nosed Bandicoot", pp. 184-185 in Mammals of Australia (Ed. R. Strahan). Reed Books, Chatswood.

## Appendix 1. Plate of Photographs

---



Figure 7. Example of gap under boundary fence for bandicoot access



Figure 8. Example of gap under boundary fence for bandicoot access



Figure 9. Example of gap under boundary fence for bandicoot access