



Ecological Assessment
Proposed Alterations & Additions
7 Montpelier Place, Manly.

1. Introduction

AES was invited by Mr Steve & Mrs Karen Perks to assess the likely impact of the above-proposed development¹ on the Long-nosed Bandicoot (*Perameles nasuta*). The North Head population of this species is listed as endangered on Part 2 Schedule 1 of the NSW *Biodiversity Conservation Act* (BC Act). Northern Beaches Council has requested that a 5-part Test (Section 7.3 of the BC Act) assessing the likely impacts on the population accompany the development application. No other threatened species listed on the BC Act or the Commonwealth *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act* are considered likely to occur.

The site is also covered by the Biodiversity layer of Clause 6.5 of the Manly Local Environmental Plan 2013. An assessment is made as to the likely impacts the proposed development would have in relation to heads of consideration in that clause.

The site and environs were inspected by Paul Burcher (B.App.Sc) on 9/11/2020. Searches were made for evidence of the species (conical diggings, scats) and notes made of the site's habitat characteristics.

¹ The extent and nature of the proposed development is detailed on the Development Application Drawings prepared by Action Plans dated Thursday, 1 October 2020.

2. Section 7.3 of the BC Act.

Each of the five factors required to be taken into account when deciding whether the proposed development " is likely to significantly affect threatened species, ecological communities or their habitats" are addressed below.

(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,

The proposed development is entirely within the footprint of the existing house and only affects extant hard surfaces. Whilst evidence of the species (conical diggings) was found in the garden bed at the rear of the property, this area would not be affected by the proposed development. An area of lawn at the front of the property would be used for a storage of a waste disposal skip. No bandicoot diggings were found in this area. Nevertheless, should the species occasionally use this area for foraging, the amount of potential habitat affected is minimal and impacts would be temporary and reversible. The local population would not be 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,*

Not relevant to a threatened species.

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

- (i) the extent to which habitat is likely to be removed or modified as a result of the proposed development or activity, and*
- (ii) whether an area of habitat is likely to become fragmented or isolated from other areas of habitat as a result of the proposed development or activity, and*
- (iii) the importance of the habitat to be removed, modified, fragmented or isolated to the long-term survival of the species or ecological community in the locality*

As represented by the use of the skip on the lawn, a very small area of potential foraging habitat covering a few square metres would be temporarily made uninhabitable to the species. This would have no impact upon the long-term survival of the species in the locality.

(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),

The subject site is not mapped as an 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.

Currently 35 KTP for mainland NSW are listed under Schedule 4 of the BC Act, none of which are applicable to the proposed development.

3. Manly Local Environmental Plan 2013 (MLEP 2013)

As the site is within the Biodiversity overlay of the MLEP 2013, Clause 7.6 of the LEP must be addressed.

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.

Sub-clause 7.6(3) states *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*

The proposed footprint is restricted to already affected areas of the site. There would be no impact upon 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, and

No vegetation would be affected.

(iii) any potential to fragment, disturb or diminish the biodiversity structure, function and composition of the land, and

The proposal would not contribute to fragmentation, disturbance or diminishment of ecological values.

(iv) any adverse impact on the habitat elements providing connectivity on the land, and

There would be no adverse impacts on connectivity.

(b) any appropriate measures proposed to avoid, minimise or mitigate the impacts of the development.

As the footprint is confined to existing hard surfaces no further measures to avoid, minimise or mitigate impacts are required.

Sub-clause 6.5 (4) states *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

It is considered that there would not be any significant adverse environmental impact. The design of the proposed development is such that it avoids any adverse environmental impact.

(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

It is considered that impacts have been reasonably avoided.

(c) if that impact cannot be minimised—the development will be managed to mitigate that impact.

Impacts have been avoided.

Given the consideration of Clauses 6.5(3) and 6.5(4) of MLEP 2013, it is considered that the proposed development is in accordance with the objectives of Clause 6.5.

4. Conclusion

The proposed development is unlikely to significantly affect the North Head population of the Long-nosed Bandicoot, or its habitat. A Biodiversity Development Assessment Report need not accompany the development application.

The proposed development is in accordance with the objectives of Clause 6.5 Biodiversity of MLEP 2014.

There are no ecological constraints to the proposal.

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Paul Burcher". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Paul Burcher 11/10/2020