

Flora and Fauna Assessment Report

Muswellbrook Hospital Redevelopment

Report prepared by Narla Environmental

for Health Infrastructure

October 2022



NARLA environmental

| Report: | Flora and Fauna Assessment Report – Muswellbrook Hospital Redevelopment |
|---------------|---|
| Prepared for: | Health Infrastructure |
| Prepared by: | Narla Environmental Pty Ltd |
| Project no: | MOCO1 |
| Date: | October 2022 |
| Version: | Final v1.0 |

© Narla Environmental Pty Ltd

Disclaimer

The document may only be used for the purposes for which it was commissioned and in accordance with the Terms of the Engagement for the commission. This report and all information contained within is rendered void if any information herein is altered or reproduced without the permission of Narla Environmental. Unauthorised use of this document in any form whatsoever is prohibited. This report is invalid for submission to any third party or regulatory authorities while it is in draft stage. Narla Environmental Pty Ltd. The sole purpose of this report and the associated services performed by Narla Environmental Pty Ltd. The sole purpose of this report and the associated this copert by Narla Environmental and the client who commissioned this report. That scope of services, as described in this report. Any survey of flora and fauna will be unavoidably constrained in a number of respects. In an effort to mitigate those constraints, we applied the precautionary principle described in the methodology section of this report to develop our conclusions. Our conclusions are not therefore based solely upon conditions encountered at the site at the time of the survey. The passage of time, manifestation of latent conditions or impacts of future events may require further examination of the project and subsequent data analysis, and re-evaluation of the consulting profession, for the sole purpose described above and by reference to applicable standards, guidelines, procedures and findings expressed in this report. For the reasons outlined above, however, no other warranty or guarantee, whether expressed or implied, is made as to the data, observations and findings expressed in this report. For the reasons outlined above, however, no other warranty or guarantee, whether expressed or implied, is made as to the data, observations and findings expressed in this report. For the reasons outlined above, however, no other warranty or guarantee, whether expressed or implied, is made as to the data, observations and findings expressed i

This report should be read in full and no excerpts are to be taken as representative of the findings. No responsibility is accepted by Narla Environmental for use of any part of this report in any other context. The review of legislation undertaken by Narla Environmental for this project does not constitute an interpretation of the law or provision of legal advice. This report has not been developed by a legal professional and the relevant legislation should be consulted and/or legal advice sought, where appropriate, before applying the information in particular circumstances. This report has been prepared on behalf of, and for the exclusive use of, the client who commissioned this report, and is subject to and issued in accordance with the provisions of the contract between Narla Environmental and the client who commissioned this report. Narla Environmental accepts no liability or responsibility whatsoever for, or in respect of, any use of, or reliance upon, this report by any third party. Narla Environmental Pty Ltd has completed this assessment in accordance with the relevant federal, state and local government legislation and well as current industry best practices including guidelines. Narla Environmental Pty Ltd accepts no liability for any loss or damages sustained as a result of reliance placed upon this report and any of its content or for any purpose other than that for which this report was intended.

Narla Environmental Pty Ltd www.narla.com.au



Report Certification

Works for this report were undertaken by:

| Staff Name | Position |
|----------------|----------------------------|
| Chris Moore | Narla Environmental |
| BBioCon | General Manager/ Ecologist |
| Jonathan Coy | Narla Environmental |
| BEnv | Project Manager/ Ecologist |
| Jayden Maloney | Narla Environmental |
| BSc MBC | Ecologist |

Document Control

| Revision | Document Name | Issue Date | Internal Document Review |
|------------|---|------------|--------------------------|
| Draft v1.0 | Flora and Fauna Assessment Report – Muswellbrook Hospital Redevelopment | 17/10/2022 | Chris Moore |
| Final v1.0 | Flora and Fauna Assessment Report – Muswellbrook Hospital Redevelopment | 24/10/2022 | Chris Moore |



Table of Contents

| 1. | INTR | ODUCTION | 7 |
|----|-------|--|----|
| 1 | .1 | Project Background | 7 |
| 1 | .2 | Site Description and Location | 7 |
| | 1.2.1 | Subject Site | 7 |
| 1 | .3 | Topography, Geology and Soil | 9 |
| 1 | .4 | Hydrology | 9 |
| 1 | .5 | Scope of Assessment | 9 |
| 1 | .6 | Study Limitations | 9 |
| 1 | .7 | Relevant Legislation and Policy | |
| 1 | .8 | Biodiversity Assessment Pathway | |
| 1 | .9 | Muswellbrook Local Environmental Plan 2009 (MLEP) | 13 |
| | 1.9.1 | Zoning | |
| 2. | MET | HODOLOGY | 14 |
| 2 | .1 | Desktop Assessment and Literature Review | 14 |
| 2 | .2 | Ecological Site Assessment | 14 |
| | 2.2.1 | General Survey | 14 |
| | 2.2.2 | Weather Conditions | 15 |
| | 2.2.3 | Mapping and Analysis of Vegetation Communities | 15 |
| 3. | NATI | VE VEGETATION | 16 |
| 3 | .1 | Vegetation Community | 16 |
| | 3.1.1 | Historically Mapped Vegetation Communities | |
| | 3.1.2 | Field-validated Vegetation Communities | |
| 4. | THR | ATENED ENTITIES | 20 |
| 4 | .1 | Threatened Ecological Communities | 20 |
| 4 | .2 | Threatened Flora | 20 |
| 4 | .2 | Threatened Fauna | 23 |
| 4 | .3 | Migratory Fauna Species | 24 |
| 5. | IMPA | CT SUMMARY | 37 |
| 5 | .1 | Vegetation Loss | |
| 6. | RECO | OMMENDATIONS | |
| 6 | .1 | Impact Mitigation and Minimisation Recommendations | |
| 7. | CON | CLUSION | 40 |
| 8. | REFE | RENCES | 41 |
| 9. | APPE | NDICES | 43 |

Tables

| Table 1. Relevant legislation and policy addressed | 12 |
|---|-----------|
| Table 2. Weather conditions recorded at Scone, NSW (station 061363) preceding and during the site ass | sessment |
| (site assessment date in bold). | 15 |
| Table 3. Description of Planted Exotic/Native Vegetation identified within the Subject Site | 19 |
| Table 4. Assessment of likely occurrence of threatened flora species within the Subject Site | |
| Table 5. Fauna habitat values identified within the Subject Site | 23 |
| Table 6. Assessment of likely occurrence of threatened fauna species within the Subject Site | 25 |
| Table 7. Measures to be implemented before, during, and after construction to avoid and minimise the | e impacts |
| of the proposed activity | |

Figures

| Figure 1. Components of the Subject Property and Subject Site | |
|---|----|
| Figure 2. Watercourses and associated riparian within the Subject Site | 10 |
| Figure 3. Soil landscapes mapped within the Subject Site | 11 |
| Figure 4. Historically mapped vegetation communities within the Subject Site. | 17 |
| Figure 5. Narla field-validated vegetation communities within the Subject Site. | 18 |
| Figure 6. Targeted survey effort for threatened species within the Subject Property | 22 |



Glossary

| Acronym/ Term | Definition | |
|--|---|--|
| asl | Above sea level | |
| BAM | Biodiversity Assessment Methodology | |
| BC Act | New South Wales Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016 | |
| BDAR | Biodiversity Development Assessment Report | |
| DAFF | Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry | |
| DAWE | Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment | |
| DEC | Department of Environment and Conservation | |
| DEE | Department of the Environment and Energy | |
| DPE | Department of Planning and Environment (formally DPIE and OEH) | |
| DPI | Department of Primary Industries | |
| DPIE | Department of Planning, Industry and Environment (now known as the DPE) | |
| EEC | Endangered Ecological Community | |
| EP&A Act | Environmental Planning & Assessment Act 1979 | |
| EPBC Act | Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 | |
| FFA | Flora and Fauna Assessment | |
| ha | Hectares | |
| km | Kilometres | |
| LGA | Local Government Area | |
| m | metres | |
| MDCP | Muswellbrook Development Control Plan 2009 | |
| MLEP | Muswellbrook Local Environmental Plan 2009 | |
| mm | millimetres | |
| NSW | New South Wales | |
| OEH | Office of Environment and Heritage (now known as the DPE) | |
| SEPP | State Environmental Planning Policy | |
| SRZ | Structural Root Zone | |
| Subject Site | All areas associated with the proposed activity | |
| Subject Property | Lots 300/-/DP865487, 27/-/DP752484 and 29/-/DP752484 | |
| TEC | Threatened Ecological Community | |
| Threatened species, populations and ecological communities | Species, populations and ecological communities specified in Schedules 1 and 2 of the BC Act 2016 | |
| TPZ | Tree Protection Zone | |



1. Introduction

1.1 Project Background

Narla Environmental Pty Ltd (Narla) was engaged by Health Infrastructure ('the proponent') to undertake a Flora and Fauna Assessment (FFA) for the proposed Muswellbrook Hospital Redevelopment at Lots 300/-/DP865487, 27/-/DP752484 and 29/-/DP752484, hereafter referred to as the 'Subject Property' (**Figure 1**). The proposed activity involves the following elements (dwp Australia 2022; **Appendix A**):

- A new IPU Maternity Ward;
- Renovated Community Health Centre;
- Hardstand and internal roads upgrades; and
- Landscaping.

All areas associated with the proposed activity will hereafter be collectively referred to as the 'Subject Site' (Figure 1).

Narla have produced this report in order to assess any potential impacts associated with the proposed activity on terrestrial ecology (biodiversity), particularly threatened species, populations and ecological communities listed under the Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016 (BC Act). The report will also recommend appropriate measures to mitigate any potential impacts in line with all relevant State Environmental Planning Policies (SEPPs) and local government plans, namely the Muswellbrook Local Environmental Plan 2009 (MLEP) and Muswellbrook Development Control Plan 2009 (MDCP).

1.2 Site Description and Location

1.2.1 Subject Site

The Subject Site is located within the locality of Muswellbrook in the Muswellbrook Shire Council Local Government Area (LGA). The Subject Site occurs within the existing Muswellbrook Hospital grounds, surrounded by a mix of health infrastructure, residential properties and a cemetery, covering an area of approximately 0.5ha. Currently, the Subject Site comprises of, grassed open space, existing buildings, hardstand and a car park (**Figure 1**).





Figure 1. Components of the Subject Property and Subject Site.



1.3 Topography, Geology and Soil

The Subject Site occurs on a gentle slope with an elevation ranging from approximately 187m above sea level (asl) to 192m asl. The Subject Site is situated on the 'Roxburgh' soil landscape, as described in Soil Landscapes of the Singleton 1:250,000 Sheet (Kovac and Lawrie 1991), which is characterised by undulating low hills and undulating hills on Singleton Coal Measures which is derived from Permian sediments including sandstone, shale, mudstone, conglomerate and coal.

1.4 Hydrology

The Subject Site contains one (1) mapped 1st order watercourse and associated riparian buffer. The location has been verified by the site survey (adw Johnson 2022)

1.5 Scope of Assessment

The objectives of this FFA were to:

- Establish the likelihood of occurrence of migratory species, threatened species, endangered populations and threatened ecological communities as listed under the BC Act and/or the EPBC Act;
- Assess any potential impacts to species and/or communities listed under the BC Act and EPBC Act;
- Identify and map the distribution of vegetation communities within the Subject Site;
- Record presence and the extent of any known or potential fauna habitat features such as nests, dreys, caves, crevices, culverts, pools, soaks, flowering trees, fruiting trees or hollow-bearing trees and provide recommendations for on-going management of these habitat features and any fauna present;
- Record presence and the extent of any Priority Weeds or weed infestations and provide recommendations for on-going management; and
- Recommend any controls or additional actions to be taken to protect or improve environmental outcomes of the proposed activity.

1.6 Study Limitations

This study was not intended to provide a complete inventory of all flora and fauna species with potential to occur within the Subject Site. The species list provided for the Subject Site within this report was restricted to what was observed during the site assessment by the Narla Ecologist.

The timing of the survey may not have coincided with emergence times of some species of flora and fauna, such as seasonally flowering herbs, seasonal migratory fauna or nocturnal fauna. To account for those species that could not be identified during the site assessment, detailed habitat assessments were combined with desktop research and local ecological knowledge to establish an accurate prediction of the potential for such species to occur on or adjacent the Subject Site.





Figure 2. Watercourses and associated riparian within the Subject Site.





Figure 3. Soil landscapes mapped within the Subject Site.



1.7 Relevant Legislation and Policy

The legislation and policy that are addressed in this report are listed in Table 1.

Table 1. Relevant legislation and policy addressed

| Legislation/Policy | | Relevant Ecological Feature on Site | Triggered | Action Required |
|--|--|--|-----------|---|
| Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 (EP&A Act) | | All threatened species, populations and ecological communities and their habitat that occur or are likely to occur within the Subject Site during a part of their lifecycle. | Yes | This FFA and all subsequent recommendations relevant to the planning process under Part 5 'Infrastructure and environmental impact assessment'. |
| Biodiversity Conservation Act (BC Act) (New South Wales) | | BC Act threatened species have the potential to occur within the Subject Site. No BC Act listed species were identified within the Subject Site during the site assessment. The BC Act listed Endangered Ecological Community (EEC) Central Hunter Grey Box— Ironbark Woodland in the New South Wales North Coast and Sydney Basin Bioregions was present within the Subject Site. | Yes | This FFA, particularly the likelihood tables for threatened fauna and flora species occurring or potentially occurring within the Subject Site, as well as severity of potential impacts. A Test of Significance (5-part Test) was undertaken in accordance with the BC Act to assess potential impacts from the proposed activity on BC Act listed threatened ecological communities. |
| Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 (EPBC Act) (Commonwealth) | | EPBC Act threatened species have the potential to occur within the Subject Site. No EPBC Act listed species or communities were observed within the Subject Site during the site assessment. | Yes | This FFA, particularly the likelihood tables for threatened fauna and flora species occurring or potentially occurring within the Subject Site, as well as severity of potential impacts. |
| Biosecurity Act 2015 (Bio Act) | | Two (2) priority weed for the Hunter area was observed within the Subject Site: Olea europaea subsp. cuspidata (Alligator Weed); Asparagus aethiopicus (Ground Asparagus). | Yes | Listed priority weeds must be managed in accordance with the Biosecurity Act 2015. |
| StateStateEnvironmentalPlanningChapter 2-PolicyCoastal(ResilienceManagementand Hazards)2021 | | The Subject Site does not contain areas mapped as 'Coastal Wetlands', 'Littoral Rainforest' or any other areas on the Coastal Management mapping. As such Chapter 2 – Coastal Management of this | No | None. |



| Legislation/Policy | | Relevant Ecological Feature on Site | Triggered | Action Required |
|--|--|--|-----------|-----------------|
| | | SEPP does not apply to the Subject Site. | | |
| State Environmental Planning Policy | Chapter 4 – Koala habitat protection 2021 | Part 5 developments are not subject to this chapter. | No | None. |
| (Biodiversity and Conservation SEPP) 2021 | Chapter 6— Bushland in Urban Areas | The Subject Site does not occur within a LGA listed in schedule 5. | No | None |

1.8 Biodiversity Assessment Pathway

Activities requiring an environmental assessment under Part 5 of the EP&A Act 1979 are to consider biodiversity as part of the environmental assessment process. The test of significance (under s.7.3 of the BC Act) determines whether the proposed activity is likely to significantly affect threatened species, ecological communities or their habitats. If the activity is likely to have a significant impact, or will be carried out in a declared Area of Outstanding Biodiversity Value (AOBV), the proponent can opt in to the Biodiversity Offsets Scheme (BOS) or instead prepare a species impact statement (SIS).

The environmental impact of activities that will not have a significant impact on threatened species will continue to be assessed under Section 5.5 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979. The proposed activity is considered unlikely to result in a significant impact to threatened species, ecological communities or their habitats.

1.9 Muswellbrook Local Environmental Plan 2009 (MLEP)

1.9.1 Zoning

The Subject Site is zoned 'SP2: Infrastructure'. The MLEP requires that the proposed activity satisfies the zone objectives which are:

- To provide for infrastructure and related uses.
- To prevent development that is not compatible with or that may detract from the provision of infrastructure.
- To recognise existing railway land and to enable future development for railway and associated purposes.
- To prohibit advertising hoardings on railway land.
- To recognise major roads and to enable future development and expansion of major road networks and associated purposes.
- To recognise existing land and to enable future development for utility undertakings and associated purposes.

The aims of the proposed activity are to improve the facilities of the hospital, improving the local health infrastructure for the Muswellbrook community.



2. Methodology

2.1 Desktop Assessment and Literature Review

A thorough literature review of local information relevant to the Muswellbrook LGA was undertaken. Searches using NSW Wildlife Atlas (BioNet; DPE 2022b) and the Commonwealth Protected Matters Search Tool (DAFF 2022) were conducted to identify all current threatened flora and fauna, as well as migratory fauna records within a 10km x 10km cell search area centred on the Subject Site. These data were used to assist in establishing the presence or likelihood of any ecological values as occurring on or adjacent the Subject Site and helped inform our Ecologist on what to look for during the site assessment.

Soil landscape and geological mapping was examined to gain an understanding of the environment on the Subject Site and assist in determining whether any threatened flora or ecological communities may occur there (Kovac and Lawrie 1991).

2.2 Ecological Site Assessment

2.2.1 General Survey

A site assessment was undertaken by experienced Narla Ecologist, Jonathan Coy and Jayden Maloney, on Tuesday the 20th of September 2022. During the site assessment, the following activities were undertaken:

- Identifying and recording the vegetation communities present within the Subject Site, with focus on identifying any threatened ecological communities;
- Recording a detailed list of flora species encountered within the Subject Site, with a focus on threatened species, species diagnostic of threatened ecological communities and Priority Weeds;
- Recording opportunistic sightings of any fauna species seen or heard on or within the immediate surrounds of the Subject Site;
- Targeted surveys for threatened flora;
- Identifying and recording the locations of notable fauna habitat such as important nesting, roosting or foraging microhabitats;
- Assessing the connectivity and quality of the vegetation within the Subject Site and surrounding area; and
- Targeting the habitat of any threatened and regionally significant fauna including:
 - Tree hollows (habitat for threatened large forest owls, parrots and arboreal mammals);
 - Caves and crevices (habitat for threatened reptiles, small mammals and microbats);
 - Termite mounds (habitat for threatened reptiles);
 - Soaks (habitat for threatened frogs);
 - Wetlands (habitat for threatened fish, frogs and water birds);
 - Drainage lines (habitat for threatened fish and frogs);
 - Fruiting trees (food for threatened frugivorous birds and mammals);
 - Flowering trees (food for threatened nectarivorous birds and mammals);
 - Trees and shrubs supporting nest structures (habitat for threatened birds and arboreal mammals); and
 - Any other habitat features that may support fauna (particularly threatened) species.



2.2.2 Weather Conditions

Weather conditions recorded at the nearest weather station (Scone, NSW) prior to and during the site assessment are provided in **Table 2** (BOM 2022). The data revealed moderate-high rainfall and mild temperatures leading up to the survey. These weather conditions were conducive to the emergence of annual herbs.

| Survey date | Day | Minimum Temp. (°C) | Maximum Temp. (°C) | Rainfall (mm) |
|-------------|-----------|--------------------|--------------------|---------------|
| 13/09/2022 | Tuesday | 4.4 | 18.7 | 0 |
| 14/09/2022 | Wednesday | 2.3 | 19.3 | 0 |
| 15/09/2022 | Thursday | 9 | 17.2 | 2.2 |
| 16/09/2022 | Friday | 11.1 | 22.3 | 28 |
| 17/09/2022 | Saturday | 12 | 21.5 | 0 |
| 18/09/2022 | Sunday | 12.1 | 21.5 | 0 |
| 19/09/2022 | Monday | 8.6 | 21.3 | 0 |
| 20/09/2022 | Tuesday | 2.4 | 21.5 | 0 |

| Table 2. Weather conditions recorded at Scone, NSW (station 061363) preceding and during the site assessment |
|--|
| (site assessment date in bold). |

2.2.3 Mapping and Analysis of Vegetation Communities

Narla examined local satellite imagery, geological mapping, soil landscape mapping and topographic mapping, in addition to existing vegetation mapping (Sivertsen et al 2013) in order to stratify the Subject Site and guide the site assessment survey efforts. The following resources were consulted during the site assessment to assist with the identification of vegetation communities present within the Subject Site:

- eSPADE v2.2 (DPE 2022e);
- Soil Landscapes of the Singleton 1:250,000 Sheet (Kovac and Lawrie 1991); and
- Hunter Native Vegetation Mapping. Geodatabase Guide (Version 4.0) (Sivertsen 2011);



3. Native Vegetation

3.1 Vegetation Community

3.1.1 Historically Mapped Vegetation Communities

One (1) vegetation community has been historically mapped within the Subject Site (Sivertsen et al 2011; **Figure 4**):

• Non-native Vegetation.

The nearest native vegetation community mapped in the locality is MU173: Narrow-leaved Ironbark/ Grey Box grassy woodland of the central and upper Hunter.

3.1.2 Field-validated Vegetation Communities

The field survey conducted by the Narla Ecologist identified the vegetation within the Subject Site best conforms to the following vegetation communities (**Figure 5**):

Planted Exotic/Native Vegetation.

.

The vegetation communities identified within the Subject Site are detailed in Table 3 and displayed in Figure 5.









Figure 5. Narla field-validated vegetation communities within the Subject Site.



Table 3. Description of Planted Exotic/Native Vegetation identified within the Subject Site.



Extent within Subject Site (approximate)

0.16ha

Description of the Vegetation within the Subject Site

This vegetation was characterised by planted native and exotic species typical of an urban environment. The canopy comprised of a mixture of exotic and planted native species including *Grevillea robusta, Phoenix canariensis, Populus spp., Araucaria bidwillii* and *Lophostemon confertus*.

Shrubs within this community were a mix of exotic and planted native species including *Senna artemisioides*, *Callistemon viminalis*, *Schefflera arboricola*, *Grevillea spp. (cultivar)*, *Agonis flexulosa*, *Pelargonium hortorum*, *Atriplex halimus* and the priority weed *Olea europaea* subsp. *cuspidata*.

The ground layer was a mix of common parkland native and exotic species. Native groundcover species included *Cynodon dactylon* and *Dichondra repens*. Exotic species included *Poa annua, Lotus uliginosus, Hypochaeris radicata, Arctotheca calendula* and *Bidens pilosa*.

| Justification of Vegetation Assignment | The vegetation within this area consisted of planted native and exotic vegetation. As the vegetation could not be assigned to a locally occurring native community it has been classified as Planted Exotic/Native Vegetation | |
|--|---|--|
| TEC Status | N/A | |
| References | N/A | |



4. Threatened Entities

4.1 Threatened Ecological Communities

No Threatened Ecological Communities (TECs) are anticipated to be impacted by the proposal activity.

4.2 Threatened Flora

Desktop analysis revealed a range of threatened flora as occurring or having the potential to occur on or within a 10km x 10km cell centred on the Subject Site. Thorough targeted surveys were undertaken throughout the Subject Site for potentially occurring threatened flora (**Figure 6**). No threatened flora were identified at the time of the site assessment.

Owing to the degraded nature of the Subject Site it was deemed unlikely that the proposed activity will have a significant impact on these species. Therefore, no further assessment of impacts pursuant to the BC Act (e.g. Biodiversity Development Assessment Report (BDAR)) and/or EPBC Act Referral to Commonwealth will be required. A comprehensive list of flora species identified within the Subject Site during the site assessment is presented in **Appendix B**.

The following locally occurring species were assessed for their potential to occur within the Subject Site (Table 4).

| Species | BC Act | EPBC Act | Likelihood of occurrence within the Subject Site | Further Impact Assessment Required? |
|--|--|----------|--|--|
| <i>Acacia pendula</i> (Weeping Myall) | Endangered Population in the Hunter Catchment | - | Absent. Within the Hunter catchment the species typically occurs on heavy soils, sometimes on the margins of small floodplains, but also in more undulating locations. Due to the degraded nature of the Subject Site it is unlikely to be present and the species was not observed within the Subject Site during the DPE approved survey period (DPE 2022d) in September 2022. | No |
| Cymbidium canaliculatum (Tiger Orchid) | Endangered Population in the Hunter Valley | _ | Absent. Typically grows in the hollows, fissures, trunks and forks of trees in dry sclerophyll forest or woodland, where its host trees typically occur on Permian Sediments of the Hunter Valley floor. Within the Hunter Catchment, this species is most commonly found in <i>Eucalyptus albens</i> (White Box) dominated woodlands (including those dominated by the intergrade <i>E. albens- moluccana</i>), much of which may constitute the endangered ecological community (EEC) 'White Box Yellow Box Blakely's Red Gum Woodland'. It has been found, less commonly, to grow on E. <i>dawsonii</i> (Slaty Box), <i>E. crebra</i> (Narrow-leaved Ironbark), <i>E.</i> <i>moluccana</i> (Grey Box), <i>Angophora floribunda</i> (Rough-barked Apple), <i>Acacia salicina</i> | No |

Table 4. Assessment of likely occurrence of threatened flora species within the Subject Site



| Species | BC Act | EPBC Act | Likelihood of occurrence within the Subject Site | Further Impact Assessment Required? |
|---|--|----------|--|--|
| | | | (Cooba) and on some other species, including dead stags. It is also known to use man-made structures, such as fence posts and wooden bridges as its host. While potential host species are present, due to the degraded nature of the Subject Site it is unlikely to utilise the site. The species was not observed within the Subject Site during the DPE approved survey period (DPE 2022d) in September 2022. | |
| <i>Diuris tricolor</i> (Pine Donkey Orchid) | V Endangered Population in the Muswellbrook LGA | _ | Absent. Found in sclerophyll woodland and derived grassland on flats or small rises, on a range of substrates including sandy or loamy soils. Due to the degraded nature of the Subject Site it is unlikely to be present and the species was not observed within the Subject Site during the DPE approved survey period (DPE 2022d) in September 2022. | No |
| Eucalyptus camaldulensis (River Red Gum) | Eucalyptus camaldulensis | | Absent. Found in grassy woodland or forest on deep rich alluvial soils adjacent to large permanent water bodies. May occur with <i>Eucalyptus tereticornis, Eucalyptus</i> <i>melliodora, Casuarina cunninghamiana</i> <i>subsp. cunninghamiana</i> and <i>Angophora</i> <i>floribunda</i> . No such habitat is present within the Subject Site. The species was not observed within the Subject Site during the DPE approved survey period (DPE 2022d) in September 2022. | No |
| <i>Eucalyptus glaucina</i> (Slaty Red Gum) | V | V | Absent. This species grows in grassy woodland and dry eucalypt forest on deep, moderately fertile and well-watered soils. Due to the degraded nature of the Subject Site it is unlikely to be present and the species was not observed within the Subject Site during the DPE approved survey period (DPE 2022d) in September 2022. | No |

V = Vulnerable; E = Endangered; CE = Critically Endangered





Figure 6. Targeted survey effort for threatened species within the Subject Property



4.2 Threatened Fauna

Details of the threatened fauna habitat recorded within the Subject Site are included in **Table 5**. The likelihood of occurrence of threatened fauna species within the Subject Site is presented in **Table 6**.

A small suite of avian native fauna species were identified within and surrounding the Subject Site during the site assessment. All native fauna species encountered are listed as 'protected' under the BC Act. The list of fauna recorded during the site visit was produced opportunistically (**Appendix C**).

Based on unsuitable habitat, geographic distribution and/or the small scale of the proposed activity, it was determined that the proposed works are unlikely to significantly impact upon any potentially occurring BC Act or EPBC Act listed threatened species.

| Habitat component | Subject Site |
|---|--|
| Coarse woody debris | Absent. |
| Rock outcrops and bush rock | Absent. |
| Caves, crevices and overhangs | Absent. |
| Culverts, bridges, mine shafts, or abandoned structures | Absent. |
| Nectar/lerp-bearing Trees | Various native and exotic trees present within the Subject Site produce nectar and lerps. These trees may provide intermittent nectar sources for nectivores such as the Grey-headed Flying-fox. |
| Nectar-bearing shrubs | Various nectar-bearing shrubs identified within the Subject Site may provide intermittent nectar sources for similar nectivores. |
| Koala Use Trees | Numerous koala use trees (Eucalypts) were present throughout the Subject Site. |
| Large stick nests | Absent. |
| Sap and gum sources | Native sap and gum source trees were recorded within the Subject Site such as <i>Eucalyptus</i> spp. These trees may provide intermittent sap and/or lerp sources for various fauna species. |
| She-oak fruit (Glossy Black Cockatoo feed) | Absent. |
| Seed-bearing trees and shrubs | Seed-bearing trees such as <i>Eucalyptus</i> spp. and <i>Lophostemon confertus</i> identified within the Subject Site may provide foraging habitat for Gang-gang Cockatoos. |
| Soft-fruit-bearing trees/shrubs | Exotic soft-fruit-bearing trees occur throughout the Subject Site. These trees may provide intermittent fruit sources for fructivores such as the Grey-headed Flying-fox. |
| Dense shrubbery and leaf litter | Absent. |
| Tree hollows | Small and Medium hollows are present within the Subject Site. |
| Decorticating bark | Absent. |
| Wetlands, soaks, and streams | Absent. |

Table 5. Fauna habitat values identified within the Subject Site



| Habitat component | Subject Site |
|--|--------------|
| Open water bodies | Absent. |
| Estuarine, beach, mudflats, and rocky foreshores | Absent. |

4.3 Migratory Fauna Species

The following EPBC Act listed migratory fauna species were considered to occasionally use habitat within or around the Subject Site for foraging or passage:

- Apus pacificus (Fork-tailed Swift);
- *Hirundapus caudacutus* (White-throated Needletail);
- Monarcha melanopsis (Black-faced Monarch);
- Motacilla flava (Yellow Wagtail);
- Myiagra cyanoleuca (Satin Flycatcher); and
- Rhipidura rufifrons (Rufous Fantail).

The proposed activity will have low impacts to potential foraging habitat and negligible impacts to potential breeding habitat for these species given their migratory nature. In the unlikely event that these species forage within the Subject Site, the proposed removal of vegetation will have low impacts to foraging habitat given the large areas of suitable foraging habitat in the surrounding area and in their migratory range. No anticipated net loss of breeding habitat is expected as these species do not breed within or in close proximity of the Subject Site. As such, the proposed activity is unlikely to a significant impact on these species; therefore, a Referral to Commonwealth pursuant to the EPBC Act should not be required.



Table 6. Assessment of likely occurrence of threatened fauna species within the Subject Site

| Species | BC Act | EPBC Act | Likelihood of Occurrence | Foraging Habitat Present Within the Subject Site | Breeding Habitat Present Within the Subject Site | Anticipated Impact | Further Impact Assessment Required? |
|---|-----------|-------------|-----------------------------|---|---|---|--|
| Anseranas semipalmata (Magpie Goose) | V | - | Low | Mainly found in shallow wetlands (less than 1 m deep) with dense growth of rushes or sedges. No such foraging habitat is present within the Subject Site. | Nests are formed in trees over deep water. No such habitat is present within the Subject Site. | Negligible. No anticipated impact to foraging or breeding habitat. | No |
| Anthochaera phrygia (Regent Honeyeater) | CE | CE | Low | The species inhabits dry open forest and woodland, particularly Box-Ironbark woodland, and riparian forests of River Sheoak. The Regent Honeyeater is a generalist forager, although it feeds mainly on the nectar from a relatively small number of eucalypts that produce high volumes of nectar. Sub-optimal foraging habitat due to the disturbed nature of the Subject Site. | There are three known key breeding areas, two of them in NSW - Capertee Valley and Bundarra-Barraba regions. The Subject Site is not within these regions. | Low anticipated impact to potential foraging habitat given the mobility of this species. No anticipated impact to breeding habitat. Furthermore, the Subject Site is not mapped on the important areas map for the species (DPE 2022f). The site assessment in September 2022 did not detect this species. | No |
| Artamus cyanopterus cyanopterus (Dusky Woodswallow) | V | - | Low | This species often inhabits dry, open eucalypt forests and woodlands with an open or sparse understorey of eucalypt saplings, acacias and other shrubs, and ground-cover of grasses or sedges and fallen woody debris. Sub-optimal foraging habitat due to the disturbed nature of the Subject Site. | This species nests in dry open Eucalypt Forest. No nests were identified within the Subject Site. | Low anticipated impact to suboptimal foraging habitat given the mobility of this species. No anticipated impact to breeding habitat. The site assessment in September 2022 did not detect this species. | No |



| Species | BC Act | EPBC Act | Likelihood of Occurrence | Foraging Habitat Present Within the Subject Site | Breeding Habitat Present Within the Subject Site | Anticipated Impact | Further Impact Assessment Required? |
|---|-----------|-------------|-----------------------------|---|--|--|--|
| Calyptorhynchus lathami (Glossy Black Cockatoo) | V | _ | Low | Inhabits open forest and woodlands of the coast and the Great Dividing Range where stands of sheoak occur. Black Sheoak (<i>Allocasuarina littoralis</i>) and Forest Sheoak (<i>A. torulosa</i>) are important foods. No such foraging habitat was present within the Subject Site. | Dependent on large hollow- bearing eucalypts for nest sites. No large hollows were identified within the Subject Site. | Negligible. No anticipated impact to foraging or breeding habitat. The site assessment in September 2022 did not detect this species. | No |
| <i>Chalinolobus dwyeri</i> (Large- eared Pied Bat) | V | V | Low | This species probably forages for small, flying insects below the forest canopy. Prey items may occur within the Subject Site. | Roosts in caves (near their entrances), crevices in cliffs, old mine workings and in the disused, bottle-shaped mud nests of the Fairy Martin. No such habitat occurs within the Subject Site. | Low anticipated impact to suboptimal foraging habitat given the mobility of this species. No anticipated impact to breeding habitat. | No |
| Chthonicola sagittata (Speckled Warbler) | V | _ | Low | Lives in a wide range of Eucalyptus dominated communities that have a grassy understorey, often on rocky ridges or in gullies. The diet consists of seeds and insects, with most foraging taking place on the ground around tussocks and under bushes and trees. Sub-optimal foraging habitat due to the disturbed nature of the Subject Site. | The rounded, domed, roughly built nest of dry grass and strips of bark is located in a slight hollow in the ground or the base of a low dense plant, often among fallen branches and other litter. No nests were identified within the Subject Site. | Low anticipated impact to suboptimal foraging habitat given the mobility of this species. No anticipated impact to breeding habitat. The site assessment in September 2022 did not detect this species. | No |



| Species | BC Act | EPBC Act | Likelihood of Occurrence | Foraging Habitat Present Within the Subject Site | Breeding Habitat Present Within the Subject Site | Anticipated Impact | Further Impact Assessment Required? |
|--|-----------|-------------|-----------------------------|---|---|---|--|
| <i>Circus assimilis</i> (Spotted Harrier) | V | _ | Low | Occurs in grassy open woodland including Acacia and mallee remnants, inland riparian woodland, grassland and shrub steppe. Preys on terrestrial mammals (e.g bandicoots, bettongs, and rodents), birds and reptile, occasionally insects and rarely carrion. Such prey may occur within the Subject Site. | Builds a stick nest in a tree and lays eggs in spring (or sometimes autumn), with young remaining in the nest for several months. No large stick nests were identified within the Subject Site at the time of the site assessment. | Low anticipated impact to suboptimal foraging habitat given the mobility of this species. No anticipated impact to breeding habitat. The site assessment in September 2022 did not detect this species. | No |
| Climacteris picumnus victoriae (Brown Treecreeper) – eastern subspecies | V | - | Low | Found in eucalypt woodlands (including Box-Gum Woodland) and dry open forest of the inland slopes and plains inland of the Great Dividing Range. Up to 80% of the diet is comprised of ants; other invertebrates (including spiders, insects larvae, moths, beetles, flies, hemipteran bugs, cockroaches, termites and lacewings) make up the remaining percentage. Such prey may occur within the Subject Site. | Hollows in standing dead or live trees and tree stumps are essential for nesting. Such hollows are present within the Subject Site, however sub- optimal due to the disturbed nature of the Subject Site. | Low anticipated impact to suboptimal foraging habitat given the mobility of this species. One (1) hollow- bearing trees will be impacted that may be used by the species. Due to better quality habitat in the greater locality, it is not expected that the removal of one hollow-bearing tree to be significant to this species. | No |
| Daphoenositta chrysoptera (Varied Sittella) | V | - | Low | Inhabits eucalypt forests and woodlands, especially those containing rough-barked species and mature smooth-barked gums with dead branches, mallee and Acacia woodland. Feeds on arthropods gleaned | Builds a cup-shaped nest of plant fibres and cobwebs in an upright tree fork high in the living tree canopy, and often re-uses the same fork or tree in successive years. No nests | Low anticipated impact to suboptimal foraging habitat given the mobility of this species. No anticipated impact to breeding habitat. The site assessment in September | No |



| Species | BC Act | EPBC Act | Likelihood of Occurrence | Foraging Habitat Present Within the Subject Site | Breeding Habitat Present Within the Subject Site | Anticipated Impact | Further Impact Assessment Required? |
|--|-----------|-------------|-----------------------------|--|---|--|--|
| | | | | from crevices in rough or decorticating bark, dead branches, standing dead trees and small branches and twigs in the tree canopy. Sub-optimal foraging habitat due to the disturbed nature of the Subject Site. | were identified within the Subject Site. | 2022 did not detect this species. | |
| Dasyurus maculatus (Spotted-tailed Quoll) | V | E | Low | A generalist predator with a preference for medium-sized (500g-5kg) mammals. Consumes a variety of prey, including gliders, possums, small wallabies, rats, birds, bandicoots, rabbits, reptiles and insects. Also eats carrion and takes domestic fowl. Potential foraging habitat is present within the Subject Site, however it is suboptimal due to its modified nature. | This species uses hollow- bearing trees, fallen logs, small caves, rock outcrops and rocky-cliff faces as den sites. Hollows were observed within the Subject Site. | Low anticipated impact to suboptimal potential foraging habitat as it is located in a highly disturbed area. One (1) hollow-bearing trees will be impacted that may be used by the species. Due to better quality habitat in the greater locality, it is not expected that the removal of one hollow- bearing tree to be significant to this species. | No |
| <i>Delma impar</i> (Striped Legless Lizards) | V | V | Low | Found mainly in Natural Temperate Grassland but has also been captured in grasslands that have a high exotic component. Actively hunts for spiders, crickets, moth larvae and cockroaches. No such habitat is present within the Subject Site. | Found mainly in Natural Temperate Grassland but has also been captured in grasslands that have a high exotic component. No such habitat is present within the Subject Site. | Negligible. No anticipated impact to foraging or breeding habitat. | No |



| Species | BC Act | EPBC Act | Likelihood of Occurrence | Foraging Habitat Present Within the Subject Site | Breeding Habitat Present Within the Subject Site | Anticipated Impact | Further Impact Assessment Required? |
|---|-----------|-------------|-----------------------------|---|---|---|--|
| Ephippiorhynchus asiaticus (Black-necked Stork) | E | _ | Low | Floodplain wetlands (swamps, billabongs, watercourses and dams) of the major coastal rivers are the key habitat in NSW for the Black-necked Stork. Secondary habitat includes minor floodplains, coastal sandplain wetlands and estuaries. No such habitat is present within the Subject Site. | Black-necked Storks build large nests high in tall trees close to water. No such habitat is present within the Subject Site. | Negligible. No anticipated impact to foraging or breeding habitat. | No |
| <i>Falco subniger</i> (Black Falcon) | V | _ | Low | The Black Falcon inhabits woodland, shrubland and grassland in the arid and semi- arid zones, especially wooded (eucalypt- dominated) watercourses; it also uses agricultural land with scattered remnant trees. The Falcon is often associated with streams or wetlands, visiting them in search of prey. Sub-optimal foraging habitat due to the disturbed nature of the Subject Site. | Nest along tree-lined creeks and rivers of inland drainage systems. Eggs are laid in the abandoned stick nests of other birds, usually high in a tree. No stick nests were identified within the Subject Site at the time of the site assessment. | Low anticipated impact to suboptimal foraging habitat given the mobility of this species. No anticipated impact to breeding habitat. The site assessment in September 2022 did not detect this species. | No |
| Falsistrellus tasmaniensis (Eastern False Pipistrelle) | V | - | Low | This species prefers moist habitats with trees taller than 20m. Feeds on insects. Potential prey items may occur within the Subject Site, however foraging habitat is suboptimal given the Subject Site is highly modified. | Generally, roosts in Eucalypt hollows, but has also been found under loose bark on trees or in buildings nearby foraging habitat. Hollows were observed within the Subject Site. | Low anticipated impact to suboptimal foraging habitat given the mobility of this species. One (1) hollow- bearing trees will be impacted that may be used by the species. Due to better quality habitat in the greater locality, | No |



| Species | BC Act | EPBC Act | Likelihood of Occurrence | Foraging Habitat Present Within the Subject Site | Breeding Habitat Present Within the Subject Site | Anticipated Impact | Further Impact Assessment Required? |
|---|-----------|-------------|-----------------------------|--|--|---|--|
| | | | | | | it is not expected that the removal of one hollow-bearing tree to be significant to this species. | |
| <i>Glossopsitta pusilla</i> (Little Lorikeet) | V | - | Low | The Subject Site contains potential feed trees for this species. Isolated flowering trees (e.g. in urban areas) can help sustain viable populations of this species. Sub-optimal foraging habitat due to the disturbed nature of the Subject Site. | This species favours small hollows in Eucalypts. Small hollows were observed within the Subject Site. | Low anticipated impact to suboptimal foraging habitat given the mobility of this species. One (1) hollow- bearing trees will be impacted that may be used by the species. Due to better quality habitat in the greater locality, it is not expected that the removal of one hollow-bearing tree to be significant to this species. | No |
| Haliaeetus leucogaster (White-bellied Sea-Eagle) | V | - | Low | Foraging habitats are characterised by the presence of large areas of open water including larger rivers, swamps, lakes, and the sea. No such is present within the Subject Site. | Breeding habitat is live large old trees within 1km of a rivers, lakes, large dams or creeks, wetlands and coastlines. No nests were identified within the Subject Site at the time of the site assessment. | Negligible, no anticipated net loss of foraging or breeding habitat. The site assessment in September 2022 did not detect this species. | No |



| Species | BC Act | EPBC Act | Likelihood of Occurrence | Foraging Habitat Present Within the Subject Site | Breeding Habitat Present Within the Subject Site | Anticipated Impact | Further Impact Assessment Required? |
|--|-----------|-------------|-----------------------------|--|--|---|--|
| Hieraaetus morphnoides (Little Eagle) | V | - | Low | Occupies open eucalypt forest, woodland or open woodland. Preys on birds, reptiles and mammals, occasionally adding large insects and carrion. Potential prey items may occur within the Subject Site however foraging habitat is suboptimal given the Subject Site is disturbed. | This species nests in tall living trees within a remnant patch, where pairs build a large stick nest in winter. No stick nests were identified within the Subject Site at the time of the site assessment. | Low anticipated impact to suboptimal foraging habitat given the mobility of this species. No anticipated impact to breeding habitat. The site assessment in September 2022 did not detect this species. | No |
| Hirundapus caudacutus (White-throated Needletail) | - | V | Low | This species has been recorded eating a wide variety of insects, including beetles, cicadas, flying ants, bees, wasps, flies, termites, moths, locusts and grasshoppers. Prey items may be present within the Subject Site. | N/A. This species does not breed in Australia. | Low anticipated impact to potential foraging habitat given the mobility of this species. No anticipated impact to breeding habitat. The site assessment in September 2022 did not detect this species. | No |
| <i>Micronomus norfolkensis</i> (Eastern Coastal Free-tailed Bat) | V | - | Low | Occur in dry sclerophyll forest, swamp forests and mangrove forests east of the Great Dividing Range, feeding on insects. Potential prey items may occur within the Subject Site. | Roost mainly in tree hollows but will also roost under bark or in man-made structures. Hollows were observed within the Subject Site. | Low anticipated impact to suboptimal foraging habitat given the mobility of this species. One (1) hollow- bearing trees will be impacted that may be used by the species. Due to better quality habitat in the greater locality, it is not expected that the removal of one hollow-bearing tree to be significant to this species. | No |
| Miniopterus australis | V | - | Low | This species forage for small insects beneath the canopy of | Only five nursery sites/maternity colonies are | Low anticipated impact to potential foraging habitat | No |



| Species | BC Act | EPBC Act | Likelihood of Occurrence | Foraging Habitat Present Within the Subject Site | Breeding Habitat Present Within the Subject Site | Anticipated Impact | Further Impact Assessment Required? |
|---|-----------|-------------|-----------------------------|---|--|---|--|
| (Little Bent- winged Bat) | | | | densely vegetated habitats. Potential prey items may occur within the Subject Site. | known in Australia. The Subject Site is not located near a known maternity colony; therefore, it is not expected breeding habitat will be impacted. | given the mobility of this species. No anticipated impact to breeding habitat. | |
| Miniopterus orianae oceanensis (Large Bent- winged Bat) | V | - | Low | Hunt in forested areas, catching moths and other flying insects above the tree tops. Potential prey items may occur within the Subject Site. | This species only breeds in caves. No such habitat was identified within, or in close proximity to, the Subject Site. | Low anticipated impact to potential foraging habitat given the mobility of this species. No anticipated impact to breeding habitat. | No |
| <i>Myotis macropus</i> (Southern Myotis) | V | - | Low | This species forages over streams and pools catching insects and small fish by raking their feet across the water surface. No such habitat was present within the Subject Site. | Generally, roost in groups of 10 - 15 close to water in caves, mine shafts, hollow-bearing trees, storm water channels, buildings, under bridges and in dense foliage. No water bodies that would be used by the species are present. | Negligible, no anticipated net loss of foraging or breeding habitat. | No |
| <i>Nyctophilus corbeni</i> (Corben's Long-eared Bat) | V | V | Low | Inhabits a variety of vegetation types, including mallee, bulloke and box eucalypt dominated communities, but it is distinctly more common in box/ironbark/cypress-pine vegetation. Hunts non-flying prey - especially caterpillars and beetles. Potential prey items | Roosts in tree hollows, crevices, and under loose bark. Hollows were observed within the Subject Site. | Low anticipated impact to suboptimal foraging habitat given the mobility of this species. One (1) hollow- bearing trees will be impacted that may be used by the species. Due to better quality habitat in the greater locality, it is not expected that the removal of one hollow-bearing | No |



| Species | BC Act | EPBC Act | Likelihood of Occurrence | Foraging Habitat Present Within the Subject Site | Breeding Habitat Present Within the Subject Site | Anticipated Impact | Further Impact Assessment Required? |
|---|-----------|-------------|-----------------------------|---|--|---|--|
| | | | | may occur within the Subject Site. | | tree to be significant to this species. | |
| <i>Petaurus norfolcensis</i> (Squirrel Glider) | V | _ | Very Low | Inhabits mature or old growth Box, Box-Ironbark woodlands and River Red Gum forest west of the Great Dividing Range and Blackbutt-Bloodwood forest with heath understorey in coastal areas. Diet varies seasonally and consists of Acacia gum, eucalypt sap, nectar, honeydew and manna, with invertebrates and pollen providing protein. Sub-optimal foraging habitat due to the disturbed nature of the Subject Site. | Require abundant tree hollows for refuge and nest sites. While a hollow bearing tree was present within the Subject Site, the area does not contain abundant tree hollows, making it sub-optimal habitat. | Low anticipated impact to suboptimal foraging habitat given the mobility of this species. One (1) hollow- bearing trees will be impacted that may be used by the species. Due to better quality habitat in the greater locality, it is not expected that the removal of one hollow-bearing tree to be significant to this species. | No |
| Phascolarctos cinereus (Koala) | V | V | Low | Inhabit eucalypt woodlands and forests. Feed on the foliage of more than 70 eucalypt species and 30 non-eucalypt species, but in any one area will select preferred browse species. Potential foraging habitat was identified within the Subject Site, however this is considered suboptimal given the highly disturbed and urbanised nature of the site. | Potential breeding habitat was identified within the Subject Site, however this is considered suboptimal given the disturbed and urbanised nature of the site. | Low anticipated impact to suboptimal foraging and breeding habitat. The Subject Site is highly urbanised and disturbed, making it unlikely for a koala to utilise the site. | No |
| Pomatostomus temporalis temporalis | V | - | Low | The species inhabits open Box- Gum Woodlands on the slopes, and Box-Cypress-pine and open | Build and maintain several conspicuous, dome-shaped stick nests about the size of a | Low anticipated impact to suboptimal foraging habitat given the mobility of this | No |



| Species | BC Act | EPBC Act | Likelihood of Occurrence | Foraging Habitat Present Within the Subject Site | Breeding Habitat Present Within the Subject Site | Anticipated Impact | Further Impact Assessment Required? |
|---|-----------|-------------|-----------------------------|--|--|---|--|
| (Grey-crowned Babbler (eastern subspecies) | | | | Box Woodlands on alluvial plains. Woodlands on fertile soils in coastal regions. Feed on invertebrates, either by foraging on the trunks and branches of eucalypts and other woodland trees or on the ground, digging and probing amongst litter and tussock grasses. Potential foraging habitat was identified within the Subject Site, however this is considered suboptimal given the highly disturbed and urbanised nature of the site. | football. A nest is used as a dormitory for roosting each night. Nests are usually located in shrubs or sapling eucalypts, although they may be built in the outermost leaves of low branches of large eucalypts. Nests are maintained year round, and old nests are often dismantled to build new ones. No nests were observed within the Subject Site. | species. No anticipated impact to breeding habitat. The site assessment in September 2022 did not detect this species. | |
| Pteropus poliocephalus (Grey-headed Flying-fox) | V | V | Low | Occur in subtropical and temperate rainforests, tall sclerophyll forests and woodlands, heaths and swamps as well as urban gardens and cultivated fruit crops. Feed on the nectar and pollen of native trees, in particular Eucalyptus, Melaleuca and Banksia, and fruits of rainforest trees and vines. Potential foraging habitat was identified with the Subject Site. | No breeding camps were identified within or surrounding the Subject Site. | Low anticipated impact to potential foraging habitat given the mobility of this species. No anticipated impact to breeding habitat. The site assessment in September 2022 did not detect this species. | No |
| Saccolaimus flaviventris (Yellow-bellied Sheathtail-bat) | V | - | Low | This species feeds on insects, flying high and fast over the forest canopy. Prey items may be present within the Subject Site. | Roosts singly or in groups of up to six, in tree hollows and buildings. One (1) hollow- bearing tree was present within the Subject Site. | Low anticipated impact to suboptimal foraging habitat given the mobility of this species. One (1) hollow- bearing trees will be impacted | No |



| Species | BC Act | EPBC Act | Likelihood of Occurrence | Foraging Habitat Present Within the Subject Site | Breeding Habitat Present Within the Subject Site | Anticipated Impact | Further Impact Assessment Required? |
|--|-----------|-------------|-----------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | that may be used by the species. Due to better quality habitat in the greater locality, it is not expected that the removal of one hollow-bearing tree to be significant to this species. | |
| <i>Scoteanax rueppellii</i> (Greater Broad- nosed Bat) | V | _ | Low | Forages after sunset, flying slowly and directly along creek and river corridors. No such habitat was present within the Subject Site. | This species usually roosts in tree hollows and females congregate at maternity sites located in suitable trees. One (1) hollow-bearing tree was present within the Subject Site. | Negligible anticipated impact to foraging habitat. One (1) hollow-bearing trees will be impacted that may be used by the species. Due to better quality habitat in the greater locality, it is not expected that the removal of one hollow- bearing tree to be significant to this species. | No |
| <i>Stagonopleura guttata</i> (Diamon Firetail) | V | - | Low | Found in grassy eucalypt woodlands, including Box-Gum Woodlands and Snow Gum Woodlands. Feeds exclusively on the ground, on ripe and partly-ripe grass and herb seeds and green leaves, and on insects (especially in the breeding season). Potential foraging habitat was identified within the Subject Site, however this is considered suboptimal given the highly disturbed and urbanised nature of the site. | Nests are globular structures built either in the shrubby understorey, or higher up, especially under hawk's or raven's nests. No nests were identified within the Subject Site at the time of the site assessment. | Low anticipated impact to potential foraging habitat given the mobility of this species. No anticipated impact to breeding habitat. The site assessment in September 2022 did not detect this species. The site assessment in September 2022 did not detect this species. | No |



| Species | BC Act | EPBC Act | Likelihood of Occurrence | Foraging Habitat Present Within the Subject Site | Breeding Habitat Present Within the Subject Site | Anticipated Impact | Further Impact Assessment Required? |
|--|-----------|-------------|-----------------------------|--|---|--|--|
| <i>Stictonetta naevosa</i> (Freckled Duck) | V | _ | Very Low | Prefer permanent freshwater swamps and creeks with heavy growth of Cumbungi, Lignum or Tea-tree. During drier times they move from ephemeral breeding swamps to more permanent waters such as lakes, reservoirs, farm dams and sewage ponds. No such habitat is present within the Subject Site. | Nests are usually located in dense vegetation at or near water level. No such habitat is present within the Subject Site. | Negligible. No anticipated impact to foraging or breeding habitat. The site assessment in September 2022 did not detect this species. | No |
| <i>Vespadelus troughtoni</i> (Eastern Cave Bat) | V | _ | Low | Little is understood of its feeding or breeding requirements or behaviour. Therefore, potential breeding habitat could be present within the Subject Site. | A cave-roosting species that is usually found in dry open forest and woodland, near cliffs or rocky overhangs; has been recorded roosting in disused mine workings, occasionally in colonies of up to 500 individuals. No such habitat is present within the Subject Site. | Low anticipated impact to potential foraging habitat given the mobility of this species. No anticipated impact to breeding habitat. The site assessment in September 2022 did not detect this species | No |

V – Vulnerable; E – Endangered; EP – Endangered Population; CE – Critically Endangered


5. Impact Summary

5.1 Vegetation Loss

The proposed activity will result in the following impacts to the vegetation within the Subject Site:

• The removal of approximately 0.16ha of vegetation identified as Planted Exotic/Native Vegetation.



6. Recommendations

6.1 Impact Mitigation and Minimisation Recommendations

This section of the report details recommended efforts to avoid and minimise impacts on biodiversity values associated with the proposed activity. Measures to be implemented before, during, and post construction are detailed in **Table 7**.

| Action | Outcome | Timing | Responsibility |
|--|--|-------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Project Location, Design and Planning | The project has been designed to avoid impacts to native vegetation where possible, however there will be some minor impacts to native vegetation within the Subject Site. The following mitigation measures will also ensure impacts to native vegetation are minimal. | Pre- construction phase | Proponent |
| Tree Protections | Australian Standard 4970 (2009) Protection of Trees on Development Sites (AS-4970) outlines that a Tree Protection Zone (TPZ) is the principal means of protecting trees on construction sites. It is an area isolated from construction disturbance so that the tree remains viable. Ideally, works should be avoided within the TPZ. | | |
| | A Minor Encroachment is less than 10% of the TPZ and is outside the structural root zone (SRZ). A Minor Encroachment is considered acceptable by AS-4970 when it is compensated for elsewhere and contiguous within the TPZ. | Pre- construction phase | Proponent Arborist |
| | A Major Encroachment is greater than 10% of the TPZ or inside the SRZ. Major Encroachments generally require root investigations undertaken by non-destructive methods or the use of tree sensitive construction methods. | pilase | |
| | Tree Protection Zones should be erected around all retained trees that occur within close proximity to the proposed works. | | |
| Assigning a Project Ecologist | Prior to the implementation of the activity, the proponent should commission the services of a qualified and experienced Ecologist with a minimum tertiary degree in Science, Conservation, Biology, Ecology, | Pre- construction | Proponent |
| Ecologist | Natural Resource Management, Environmental Science or Environmental Management. The Ecologist | phase | Project Ecologist |



| Action | Outcome | Timing | Responsibility |
|---|--|---|---|
| | must be licensed with a current Department of Primary Industries Animal Research Authority permit and New South Wales Scientific License issued under the BC Act. The Ecologist will be commissioned to: Undertake an extensive pre-clearing survey which includes targeted searches for threatened fauna threatened flora and Priority Weeds, and delineating habitat-bearing trees and shrubs; and Supervise the clearance of any habitat trees or shrubs identified during the pre-clearing survey (native and exotic) in order to capture, treat and/or relocate any displaced fauna. | | |
| Landscaping | Landscaping should be undertaken in accordance with the proposed landscaping plan (Moir Landscape Architects). Where possible, consideration should be given to the planting of native species that conform to the nearby community "Narrow-leaved Ironbark/ Grey Box grassy woodland of the central and upper Hunter" (Sivertsen et al 2011). | Pre- construction phase | Proponent Project Ecologist |
| Erosion and Sedimentation | Appropriate erosion and sediment control should be erected and maintained at all times during construction in order to avoid the potential of incurring indirect impacts on biodiversity values. As a minimum, such measures should comply with the relevant industry guidelines such as 'the Blue Book' (Landcom 2004). | Construction phase | Proponent Construction Contractor |
| Storage and Stockpiling (Soil and Materials) | Allocate all storage, stockpile, and laydown sites away from any vegetation that is planned to be retained. Avoid importing any soil from outside the site in order to avoid the potential of incurring indirect impacts on biodiversity values as this can introduce weeds and pathogens to the site. If materials are required to be imported for landscaping works, they are to be sterilised according to industry standards prior to importation to site. | Construction phase | Construction Contractors |
| Weed Eradication and Continued Suppression | Weeding should be undertaken around areas of planted native vegetation to improve the condition of the Subject Site. Priority weeds should be eradicated across the Subject Site. Two (2) priority weed for the Hunter area was observed within the Subject Site: Olea europaea subsp. europaea; Asparagus aethiopicus (Ground Asparagus). | Construction phase Post- construction phase | Proponent |



7. Conclusion

This assessment indicates that the relevant provisions of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979, Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016, the Muswellbrook Local Environmental Plan 2009, and the Muswellbrook Development Control Plan 2009 have been satisfied.

In summary, the proposed activity will require the clearing of:

• The removal of approximately 0.16ha of vegetation identified as Planted Exotic/Native Vegetation.

If the appropriate recommendations in this report are followed, the proposed activity is considered to have a minimal ecological impact.



8. References

Australian Standard 4970 (2009) Protection of Trees on Development Sites (AS-4970)

Bureau of Meteorology (BOM) (2022) Scone, NSW (station 061363)) September 2022 Daily Weather Observations http://www.bom.gov.au/climate/dwo/IDCJDW2061.latest.shtml

Kovac M. and Lawrie J.M. (1991) *Soil Landscapes of the Singleton 1:250,000 Sheet map and report,* Soil Conservation Service of NSW, Sydney.

Department of the Agriculture, Water and the Environment (DAWE) (2022) Protected Matters Search Tool, http://www.environment.gov.au/epbc/pmst/

Department of the Environment (2015). *Approved Conservation Advice (including listing advice) for the Central Hunter Valley eucalypt forest and woodland ecological community*. Canberra: Department of the Environment.

Department of Planning and Environment (DPE) (2022a) Biodiversity Values Map and Threshold Tool

Department of Planning and Environment (DPE) (2022b) BioNet. The website of the Atlas of NSW Wildlife http://www.bionet.nsw.gov.au/

Department of Planning and Environment (DPE) (2022c) BioNet Vegetation Classification. https://www.environment.nsw.gov.au/research/Visclassification.htm

Department of Planning and Environment (DPE) (2022d) NSW BioNet. Threatened Biodiversity Data Collection

Department of Planning and Environment (DPE) (2022e) eSPADE v2.2 https://www.environment.nsw.gov.au/eSpade2Webapp#

Department of Planning and Environment (DPE) (2022f) BAM Important Areas Viewer

Department of Planning and Environment (DPE) (2022g) Central Hunter Grey Box—Ironbark Woodland in the New South Wales North Coast and Sydney Basin Bioregions – profile.

Department of Planning, Industry and Environment (DPIE) (2020a) Surveying Threatened Plants and Their Habitats

Department of Primary Industries (DPI) (2022) NSW WeedWise: Priority weeds for the Greater Sydney https://weeds.dpi.nsw.gov.au/WeedBiosecurities?AreaId=42

dwp Australia (2022) Site Plans: Muswellbrook Hospital Redevelopment

Landcom (2004) Managing Urban Stormwater: Soils and Construction 'The Blue Book', Volume 1, Fourth Edition, New South Wales Government, ISBN 0-9752030-3-7

NSW Government (2017) NSW Legislation: Biodiversity Conservation act 2016 No 63, Schedule 4: Key Threatening Processes https://www.legislation.nsw.gov.au/acts/2016-63.pdf

NSW Government Spatial Services (NSW SixMaps) (2022) NSW Government Land & Property Information Spatial Information Exchange map viewer, https://six.nsw.gov.au/

NSW Legislation (2021) State Environmental Planning Policy (Biodiversity and Conservation) 2021



NSW Scientific Committee (2010) Central Hunter Grey Box-Ironbark Woodland in the NSW North Coast and Sydney Basin Bioregions - endangered ecological community listing

PlantNET (2022) The NSW Plant Information Network System, Royal Botanic Gardens and Domain Trust, Sydney. http://plantnet.rbgsyd.nsw.gov.au

Sivertsen, D., Roff, A., Somerville, M., Thonell, J., and Denholm, B. (2011) Hunter Native Vegetation Mapping. Geodatabase Guide (Version 4.0), Office of Environment and Heritage, Department of Premier and Cabinet, Sydney, Australia.



9. Appendices

Appendix A. Site Plan (dwp Australia 2022)

Appendix B. Flora species identified within the Subject Site.

Appendix C. Fauna species identified within and surrounding the Subject Site.



Appendix A. Site Plan (dwp Australia 2022)





Flora and Fauna Assessment Report – Muswellbrook Hospital Redevelopment | 44 Appendix B. Flora species identified within the Subject Site.

| Scientific Name | Canopy | Mid-Story | Ground |
|----------------------------------|--------|-----------|--------|
| Agapanthus spp.* | | | X |
| Agonis flexulosa* | | X | |
| Araucaria bidwillii* | X | | |
| Arctotheca calendula* | | | X |
| Asparagus aethiopicus** | | | X |
| Atriplex halimus* | | X | |
| Bidens pilosa* | | | X |
| Bromus catharticus* | | | X |
| Callistemon viminalis | | X | |
| Carpobrotus glaucescens | | | X |
| Cedrela odorata* | X | | |
| Cenchrus clandestinus* | | | X |
| Chlorophytum comosum* | | | X |
| Cynodon dactylon | | | X |
| Cyperus involucratus* | | | X |
| Dichondra repens | | | X |
| Dodonaea viscosa | | x | |
| Eucalyptus moluccana | X | | |
| Fraxinus spp.* | | X | |
| Galium aparine* | | | X |
| Geranium molle* | | | X |
| Grevillea robusta* | X | | |
| Grevillea spp. cultivar | | X | |
| Hakea sericea | | X | |
| Hypochaeris radicata* | | | X |
| Jacaranda mimosifolia | X | | |
| Jacksonia scoparia | | x | |
| Lomandra longifolia | | | X |
| Lophostemon brushbox | X | | |
| Lotus uliginosus* | | | X |
| Melaleuca quinquenervia | | X | |
| Melaleuca spp. | | X | |
| Modiola caroliniana* | | | X |
| Nandina domestica* | | | X |
| Nephrolepis exaltata* | | | X |
| Olea europaea subsp. cuspidata** | | X | |
| Pelargonium hortorum* | | x | |
| Phoenix canariensis* | | X | |
| Pittosporum undulatum | | X | |
| Plantago lanceolata* | | | X |
| Poa annua* | | | X |
| Poplar alba* | | X | |
| Rumex crispus* | | | X |
| Schefflera arboricola* | | X | |



| Scientific Name | Canopy | Mid-Story | Ground |
|----------------------|--------|-----------|--------|
| Schinus spp.* | | х | |
| Senna artemisioides | | х | |
| Soliva sessilis* | | | х |
| Sonchus oleraceus* | | | х |
| Trisetum flavescens* | | | х |

* Denotes exotic species

** Denotes Priority Weed



| Class | Scientific Name | Common Name | Status | |
|-------|--------------------------|---------------------------|-----------|--|
| Aves | Anthochaera carunculata | Red Wattlebird | Protected | |
| | Columba livia domestica | Feral Pigeon | Pest | |
| | Coracina novaehollandiae | Black-faced Cuckoo Shrike | | |
| | Entomyzon cyanotis | Blue-faced Honeyeater | | |
| | Eolophus roseicapilla | Galah | | |
| | Gymnorhina tibicen | Magpie | | |
| | Manorina melanocephala | Noisy Minor | Protected | |
| | Ocyphaps lophotes | Crested Pigeon | | |
| | Platycercus eximius | Eastern Rosella | | |
| | Trichoglossus moluccanus | Rainbow Lorikeet | | |
| | Zosterops lateralis | Silver Eye | | |

Appendix C. Fauna species identified within and surrounding the Subject Site.







environmental

Eastern Sydney Office 2/8 Apollo Street Warriewood NSW 2102 Ph: 02 9986 1295

Western Sydney Office 7 Twentyfifth Avenue West Hoxton NSW 2171

Hunter Valley Office 10/103 Glenwood Drive Thornton NSW 2322

www.narla.com.au

