Please register.

Seth Philbrook B. Urb. and Reg. Plan. Grad. Cert. Bus. Admin. | Town Planner

Planning and Regulation Division | Development Assessment Unit

p (02) 6670 2755 | **f** (02) 6672 2429 | **e** <u>sphilbrook@tweed.nsw.gov.au</u> | **w** www.tweed.nsw.gov.au

Civic and Cultural Centre Tumbulgum Road Murwillumbah NSW 2484 | PO Box 816 Murwillumbah NSW 2484

Customer Service: (02) 6670 2400 or 1300 292 872 ABN: 90 178 732 496

Our values: transparency | customer focus | fairness | reliability | progressiveness | value for money | collaboration

Please consider the environment before printing this email. One tonne of paper is equivalent to 13 trees and 30 kL of water

From: Clark, Scott [mailto:Scott.Clark@se1.bp.com]
Sent: Friday, 17 January 2014 3:12 PM
To: Seth Philbrook
Subject: DA 10/0737 - BP Chinderah DA/Rezoning Application

Hello Seth,

In response to council's NRM ecological assessment cited a letter received 9th April 2013.

BP commissioned an additional site inspection in respect of the ecological value of the proposed development area. With reference to this expert advice, an internal review of the truck parking development footprint has been completed.

The attached provides a summary of the key findings in response to council's position and affirms BP's position in relation this matter.

<<Response to TSC Final.pdf>>

<<BP Australia TSC Letter DA 10-0737 _ 15th Jan 2014.pdf>>

Regards,

Scott Clark Network Development Manager-QLD/WA

BP Australia Pty Ltd

572 Curtin Avenue Eagle Farm, Queensland Postal: PO Box 718 Hamilton 4007 Tel: +61 (07) 3364 7103 | Fax: +61 (07) 3364 7100 | Mobile: 0434 073636 | scott.clark@bp.com



RESPONSE TO TWEED SHIRE COUNCIL LETTER OF 9 APRIL 2013 BP CHINDERAH TRAVEL CENTRE Lot 1 DP 1127741 Ozone Street, Chinderah

A Report Prepared for BP Australia Pty Ltd

DECEMBER 2013

QUEENSLAND Office 28, 115 Wickham Street Fortitude Valley QLD 4006 p 07 3257 2703 f 07 3257 2708 e brisbane@jwaec.com.au NEW SOUTH WALES

105 Tamar Street PO Box 1465, Ballina NSW 2478 p 02 6686 3858 f 02 6681 1659 e ballina@jwaec.com.au



DOCUMENT CONTROL

Document

Title	Response to Tweed Shire Council Letter of 9 April 2013
Job Number	05023
File Reference	Reports/2013
Version and Date	Final 11.12.13
Client	BP Australia Pty Ltd

Revision History (office use only)

Issue	Version	Draft/Final	Date Sent	Distributed To	No. Copies	Media	Delivery Method
1	Rw1	Draft	18.09.13	Scott Clark	1	PDF	Email
2	Rw2	Draft	23.09.13	S. Clark & S. Williams	1	PDF	Email
3	Rw3	Draft	29.11.13	S. Williams	1	PDF	Email
4	Final	Final	11.12.13	S. Williams	1	PDF	Email
5							

Client Issue

Version	Date	Author		Approved by	
		Name	Initials	Name	Initials
Rw1	18.09.13	James Warren	JW	James Warren	JW
Rw2	23.09.13	James Warren	JW	James Warren	JW
Rw3	29.11.13	James Warren	JW	James Warren	JW
Final	11.12.13	James Warren	JW	James Warren	JW

1 BACKGROUND

JWA Pty Ltd has been engaged by BP Australia Pty Ltd to prepare a response to a Tweed Shire Council letter (dated 9 April 2013) with respect to the Development Application DA10/0737 for land described as Lot 1 DP1127741 and Lot 2 DP1010771, 1 Ozone Street, Chinderah.

JWA completed an Ecological Assessment to accompany DA10/0737 in June 2012. The DA involved the development of two new diesel refuelling points, expansion of the existing refuelling canopy, a new truck parking area (36 new bays) and a new bus drop-off area.

Council issued a letter (dated 9 April 2013) to the applicant setting out their position with respect to the application. In essence, the suggestion was that re-consideration of the development footprint would be beneficial to the favourable assessment of the development. Additionally, JWA have reviewed an internal Tweed Shire Council memorandum (dated 21 December 2012) from Council's Natural Resource Management Unit (NRMU).

The following report addresses the concerns raised by the Council in the aforementioned letter of April 2013:

- Council Officers consider the areas consisting of Coastal Brushbox/Pink Bloodwood Open Forest on the site to be of high ecological status and hence a high ecological constraint to development;
- Council Officers also consider the mature Pink Bloodwood within the Pink Bloodwood woodland to open woodland community on the site contribute to the overall high ecological status of the site, and need to be considered in any development proposal for this site; and
- The Endangered Ecological Community (EEC) and the population of Scented Acronychia must have a continuous vegetated buffer of minimum 20 metres. This buffer must have the sole purpose of minimising the impact of the development on this EEC and threatened species. A 10m Asset Protection Zone (APZ) within this 20m buffer is not acceptable. Furthermore, the vegetated buffer must be accurately measured and mapped.
- The internal memorandum (December 2012) contains a more detailed analysis of the Council's concerns, in particular it notes:
 - (i) significant corridor issues i.e. connectivity between the Tweed River, predominantly along the Kingscliff drain and Cudgen Creek;
 - (ii) the significant value of mature Pink bloodwoods as a nectar resource for Grey-headed flying foxes and hollows and fissures in these trees providing roost habitat for microchiropteran bats;
 - (iii) that the JWA assessment is considered inadequate with respect to Koala activity in the area and the potential impact of further development on the Tweed Coast local population; and

(iv) that the ecological constraints analysis undertaken in the JWA (June 2012) report is not in accordance with statements made during the Habitat Assessment documented in the same report.

2 **RESPONSE TO COUNCIL**

2.1 Vegetation Mapping and Zoning

Community 1:

Both the Council and the JWA (June 2012) agree that the vegetation (denoted as Community 1 on attached **FIGURE 1**) is consistent with the Endangered Ecological Community (EEC) Lowland Rainforest on Floodplain and/or Swamp Sclerophyll Floodplain Forest. This EEC comprises 1.32 hectares (or approximately 33%) of the total 4.041 hectare study site.

Part of this EEC area (north-eastern corner) is currently included in an Environmental Protection Zone (Wetland and Littoral Rainforests) denoted 7(a) in the Tweed Local Environmental Plan (LEP 2000). FIGURE 2 depicts this zoning with respect to the subject site.

The Council notes that "this area of the development site is to be protected within <u>proposed</u> Environmental Protection zoning." This refers to the Draft Tweed LEP 2010 Environmental Conservation zoning (E2) - also depicted on **FIGURE 2**. However, it is noted that the NSW Department of Planning and Infrastructure states the following:

"Draft Standard Instrument LEPs for the local government areas will be progressed while the environmental zones are reviewed. However, all land <u>to be</u> zoned E2, E3 or E4 in draft plans will be deferred when the LEP is finalised. This means the present zoning under the existing LEP for those deferred areas will remain until such time as the review is completed."

As at the date of this letter, this review had not been completed. Regardless of this zoning distinction, the proposed development does not encroach on the candidate EEC and makes allowance for the requisite 20m ecological buffer zone, as depicted on **FIGURE 3**.

Communities 2, 3 and 5:

JWA do not agree with the vegetation descriptions and mapping provided for the remaining 2.72ha (approximately 67%) of the study site. This area falls within a rural zoning (1(a)) of the Tweed LEP (2000). The footprint of the proposed development is contained entirely within this rural zoning.

The Tweed Council NRM Unit (in their December 2012 memorandum) believes that the vegetation communities in the south-western portion of the site should be classified as:

- Coastal Brushbox/Pink Bloodwood Open Forest (an approximate 20m strip along the western most site boundary and approximate 30m strip along the southern most boundary); and
- Pink Bloodwood woodland to open woodland with dense mid-stratum of *Acacia disparrima*, in the central and central northern portions of the study area.







The NRM Unit classification is based on the TVMS (2004). It is noted that the methodology for determining this classification has not been detailed. It is mentioned (in the memorandum) that a "survey" was undertaken but whether this was a desktop review or included ground truthing/mapping is not stated.

JWA (2012) classified the vegetation in the western and southern portion of the site into three different structural units (refer to **FIGURE 1**). Further clarification of classification with respect to that used in the TVMS (2004) has been undertaken to show that the JWA (2012) vegetation mapping, whilst more detailed, is not dissimilar to that proposed by the NRM Unit:

- **Community 2** Tall closed sclerophyll forest (*Lophostemon confertus, Corymbia intermedia*). In terms of the TVMS (2004) this would be included in the Sclerophyll Forests/Woodlands on Sand substrates and Alluvium category. Being dominated by *Lophostemon confertus* with a secondary occurrence of *Lophostemon suaveolens*; and *Banksia integrifolia*; as well as mid storey species of *Cupaniopsis anacardioides*; *Alphitonia excelsa*; *Bridelia exaltala*; and ground storey species of *Lomandra longifolia*; *Austromyrtus dulcis* and *Pteridium* sp., it would most likely fall into the Coastal Pink Bloodwood/Brush Box Open Forest to Woodland classification (Veg Code 302);
- **Community 3** Low closed shrubland (*Acacia disparrima* +/- scattered trees). Due to the highly modified/disturbed nature of this community (as evidenced by aerial photography indicating clearing occurring in 2001 and 2007 and the presence of windrows) it could also be contended that this community could be classified as the highly modified/disturbed "Acacia/ Other Sclerophyll Regrowth Open Woodland" (Veg Code 1003); and
- **Community 5** Mid-high regrowth (*Acacia disparrima* +/- Lophostemon confertus/Lantana camara/vine species). This area has also been disturbed (through repeated clearing); however, disturbance was of a lower intensity. The regrowth, whilst exhibiting edge effects and weed invasion could be classified as regenerating Coastal Brushbox Open Forest to Woodland (Veg Code 303).

To further clarify conclusions regarding the structural classification made in JWA (2012), a plot of all mature trees occurring within the proposed development footprint has been completed. The data collected included the location (mapped via GPS), species and the Diameter at Breast Height (DBH) of each tree. The tree plots (overlaid on a current high resolution aerial photograph) are shown on the attached **FIGURE 4**.

A mature tree density of fifty-one (51) in the mature tree survey area (2.1 hectares) equates to one (1) mature tree every 411m². The mature tree survey area covered mostly Communities 3 and 5. A mature Pink bloodwood or Brushbox tree, on average, could have a canopy spread of ten (10) metres i.e. one tree will cover approximately 75 square metres. In a normal Closed forest (70-100% canopy cover) it would be expected to find 280 mature trees (100%) and 196 for 70% cover. It would be expected to find 84 trees in this survey area where there was 30% cover. The survey area actually has 51 mature trees which equates to a Projected Foliage Cover (PFC) of 18%.



0	25m
1:1	250

SOURCE: JWA Site Investigations; NSW Dept. of LPI 2012 Aerial Photograph SCALE: 1:1250@A3 JWA PTY LTD Ecological Consultants

CLIENT BP Australia Limited PROJECT Lot 1 DP 1127741 1 Ozone Street, Chinderah, NSW Shire of Tweed

LEGEND

Acacia disparrima
 Lophostemon confertus
 Corymbia intermedia
 Lophostemon sauveolens
 Extent of Tree Survey (16.09.13)
 Site Outline

Tree No.	DBH (mm)
1	300
2	300
3	400
4	450
5	350
6	350
7	400 500
8	
-	300
10	700
11	500
12	850
13	550
14	600
15	400
16	500
17	450
18	600
19	400
20	500
21	550
22	450
23	500
23	550
24	500
25	450
27	600
28	600
29	500
30	500
31	500
32	700
33	400
34	700
35	400
36	550
37	550
38	500
39	450
40	350
41	650
42	600
43	550
44	650
45	800
45	
-	400
47	500
48	500
49	500
50	300
51	400

FIGURE 4

PREPARED: BW DATE: 10 December 2013 FILE: N05023_Mature Trees.cdr TITLE

MATURE TREES

The TVMS lists the Coastal Brushbox/Pink bloodwood community as an Open Forest. Specht (1970)¹ notes that this type of structure will have a 30-70% foliage cover. The Specht (1970) structural classification notes the PFC's of less than 30% can either be termed Woodland or Tall Shrubland. The low density of these trees and the prevalence of shrubby weeds and *Acacia disparrima* regrowth are consistent with the structural description of "Low closed shrubland (*Acacia disparrima* +/- scattered trees)" provided in the June 2012 Ecological Assessment. Furthermore, regardless of whether these are termed Woodland or Tall Shrubland, it is clear that they do not fit the structural criteria for description as the Coastal Brushbox/Pink bloodwood Open Forest to Open Woodland described in the TVMS (2004) and are more indicative of a modified/disturbed community.

The overlay of the tree plots on the proposed development shows that there will be a loss of forty-four (44) mature trees (mostly Pink bloodwoods) from the development footprint. The majority of the vegetation along the southern boundary, considered to have high ecological value (by the NRM Unit) would be retained based on the current development footprint (refer to **FIGURE 3**). The loss of these trees is not seen as a loss of Coastal Brushbox/Pink bloodwood community and therefore is not seen as significant in a local or regional sense.

2.2 Koala Activity and Assessment

The Tweed Coast Koala Habitat Study (January 2011) lists the eastern portion, the southern fringe and the south-western corner of the site as being Secondary (A) habitat (FIGURE 5). That is:

Areas of forest and/or woodland wherein primary food tree species are present but not dominant or co-dominant and usually (but not always) growing in association with one or more secondary food tree species.

In comparing Appendix II of the Koala Habitat categories against actual site conditions, it indicates that:

Vegetation Code 104 (Community 1) - is categorised as "O" for other; Vegetation Code 302 (Community 2) - is categorised as "O" for other; Vegetation Code 303 (Community 5) - is categorised as "2A" for Secondary (A); and Vegetation Code 1003 (Community 3) - is categorised as "O" for other.

Given the lack of Primary Koala Food Trees (PKFTs) at the site (Swamp mahogany; Forest red gum; Tallowwood and Grey gum); the already fragmented nature of Secondary (A) habitat; and lack of visual evidence for recent Koala activity it is unlikely that vegetation at the site would form a suitable home range for a viable population.

In any event, approximately 95% of the area indicated as Secondary (A) habitat in the study would be retained within the buffered EEC. **FIGURE 6** shows an overlay of the mapped Koala habitat on the proposed development.

¹ Specht R.L. (1970) Vegetation. In: The Australian Environment. 4th edition, ed. G.W. Leeper, pp. 44-67, CSIRO-Melbourne Univ. Press, Melbourne.

0 300m	Second	/ Habitat lary (A) Habitat lary (B) Habitat vn	z
SOURCE: Biolink (Jan 2011) Tweed Coast Koala Habitat Study - Figure 4.5 Potential Koala Habitat Map SCALE: 1:10 000 @ A4 JWA PTY LTD Ecological Consultants	CLIENT BP Australia Limited PROJECT Lot 1 DP 1127741 1 Ozone Street, Chinderah, NSW Shire of Tweed	FIGURE 5 PREPARED: BW DATE: 10 December 2013 FILE: 05023_Koala.cdr	TITLE POTENTIAL KOALA HABITAT MAP



2.3 Basis for Analysis of constraints contained in the JWA (2012) Ecological Assessment

The Council's memo concedes that "vegetation within the development footprint is not considered an EEC" but contends that it does have high ecological value, challenging the JWA (2012) ecological constraints analysis.

The Tweed NRM unit report quotes from the JWA (2012) Ecological Assessment. It should be noted that all of the comments attributed to the JWA (2012) report relate to the eastern portion of the site i.e. the portion of the site containing the Endangered Ecological Community "Lowland Rainforest on Floodplain/Swamp Sclerophyll Floodplain Forest". JWA comments such as, "The site provides a high diversity and abundance of fruiting species", obviously relate to the areas of the site containing rainforest (fruit producing) plants. The middle and western portions of the site are characterised by eucalypt (and allied species) species that do not produce fruit.

A number of inconsistencies between government agency constraints mapping and existing site conditions have been identified during the recent review. The following plans: FIGURES 1, 7, 8, 9 and 10 depict mapping and assessment results for the study site that were subject to this review.

FIGURE 5 of the JWA report shows the distribution of vegetation communities on the site. The distribution of the EEC Lowland Rainforest on Floodplain/Swamp Sclerophyll Floodplain Forest (Community 1) and Pink bloodwood/Brushbox forest (Community 2) is consistent with the landuse zones as both communities exist within the area of the site outside of the development footprint.

FIGURE 7 of the JWA report shows the TVMS Maps (2004) for Ecological Status and Ecological Sensitivity. The development footprint is denoted as having high status and moderate sensitivity. **FIGURE 8** of the JWA report shows the site as Bushland on the Tweed LEP (2000) Amendment No.21 Catchment Management Map. These maps are not accurate. Reference to the JWA vegetation mapping and the proposed zoning maps shows that the extent of significant value vegetation is significantly underestimated in the TVMS Ecological Status and Sensitivity plans and over-estimated in the Catchment Management Map. Additionally, the TVMS plans were produced prior to subsequent clearing in the middle and western portions of the site. The clearing that occurred in the central and western portion of the site occurred in 2001, three years prior to the 2004 TVMS mapping. The TVMS mapping failed to recognise the clearing.

Furthermore, a review of historical aerial photography indicate that the western twothirds of the site had been cleared at some time prior to 1947 with the 1947 aerial photograph showing some shrubby regrowth in this area. The 1962 photograph showed that further clearing or maintenance of the cleared area had continued. In 1972 the western one-third of the site had been entirely cleared with the remainder of the site allowed to sucker. The 1987 photograph showed that the canopy of the western twothirds of the site had been thinned. Records indicate that the western twothirds of the site had been thinned. Records indicate that the western twothirds of the site were cleared again in 2001 with the 2004 aerial photograph verifying that some mature trees remained but the majority of the site remained cleared. The site was again maintained in 2007 with undergrowth cleared, the 2010 aerial photography plainly showing the extent of clearing. Repeated clearing over a 60 year period has led to the









highly modified/disturbed habitat that currently exists in the western portion of the site. Aerial photographs have been attached as **APPENDIX 1**.

FIGURE 9 shows the site as occurring within a mapped NPWS regional corridor. This corridor of regional significance is based on mapping completed prior to the clearing in 2001. This mapping was based on "The Key Habitats and Corridors Project" (DEC; Scotts *et al.* 2000).

FIGURE 8 shows the site as Bushland in a Catchment Management Map. This map was produced in 2000 i.e. one (1) year prior to the removal of most of the vegetation from the middle and western portion of the site.

FIGURE 10 shows the site as dominated by a wetland (No. 372). The vegetation assessment shows potential wetland (Lowland Rainforest on Floodplain/Swamp Sclerophyll Floodplain Forest) as occurring only in the far eastern portion of the site, which has also been agreed by Council.

As can be seen, a desktop study of the ecological sensitivity and status of the site gives conflicting information in itself and is not reflective of actual site conditions, in some cases underestimating ecological significance of the eastern portion of the site and over estimating the significance of the western portion of the site. The constraints analysis and mapping completed by JWA (2012) has been amended to show the area containing a small portion of the *Acronychia littoralis* population in the far north of the site as being of high constraint. A small area of native vegetation along the southern boundary has been elevated to moderate constraint. **FIGURE 11** shows the amended constraints plan. This plan has been based on actual site conditions rather than relying on desktop information.

2.4 Analysis of site ecological elements based on existing site conditions

Council have indicated that they disagree with the constraints mapping (FIGURE 10) contained in the JWA ecological assessment. It should be noted that comments in the 2012 Ecological Assessment relating to:

"The variety of habitats present in the Study area is likely to result in a high diversity of resident and nomadic birds occurring in the site over the year. The site provides a high diversity and abundance of fruiting species. The Subject site and adjacent areas of vegetation represent high quality habitat for frugivorous birds."

"However, the Study area may represent important forage habitat for hollow-dependent avifauna breeding in forests in the locality."

"The Study area is likely to provide forage habitat for a relatively high diversity and abundance of insectivorous bats, due to the combination of open, forested and denser areas of vegetation. The site provides a relatively high diversity and abundance of fruiting species and represents moderate quality foraging habitat for frugivorous bats."



A review of the species comprising each of the plant communities confirms that fruiting species predominantly occur in the eastern portion of the site.

These comments were directed to the eastern portion of the subject site. Obviously, the previously cleared areas on the site cannot possibly have the same high values as the eastern (EEC) portion of the site.

The following analysis has been completed based on the actual site conditions rather than the constraints mapping provided by government agencies. JWA have utilised a detailed set of criteria to assess the level of ecological constraint for each discrete habitat (vegetation unit) occurring on the site.

Environmental attributes assigned to each category are shown in TABLE 1.

Category	Environmental attributes			
	World Heritage Areas			
High	RAMSAR Wetlands			
	- Endangered species or endangered species habitat (Commonwealth $\&$			
	State)			
	Land zoned Environmental Protection (LEPs)			
	Endangered populations (Commonwealth & State)			
	Critical habitat (State)			
	Endangered Ecological Communities (State)			
	SEPP No. 14 Coastal Wetlands*			
	SEPP No. 26 Littoral Rainforests*			
Moderate-High	• Areas containing habitat for a Vulnerable species (Commonwealth & State)			
	Endangered Vegetation communities (CRA/RVMP)**/***			
Primary Koala habitat identified in any Koala Plan of Management				
	Vulnerable and Rare vegetation communities (CRA/RVMP)			
Madamata	 Flora/fauna species or populations of regional significance (ROTAP****and NRAC*****) 			
Moderate	• Significant areas of habitat for Rare species (Commonwealth and State).			
	Secondary Koala habitat identified in any Koala Plan of Management			
	Wildlife corridors of regional importance			
Low-Moderate	Common native vegetation communities.			
	Wildlife corridors of local significance			
	Exotic vegetation			
Low	Cleared areas			
	Highly disturbed native vegetation			
*SEPP	State Environmental Planning Policy			
**CRA	 Comprehensive Regional Assessment as part of the Regional Forestry Agreement process (1999) 			
***RVMP	Regional Vegetation Management Plan			
****ROTAP	Rare or Threatened Australian Plants (Briggs and Leigh 1999)			
*****NRAC	Northern Region Audit Council (1995)			

TABLE 1KEY TO CONSTRAINTS ANALYSIS

Utilising the criteria in **TABLE 1** the development site (excluding the eastern portion of the site and the clumps of Scented acronychia along the northern boundary of the site) contains the following elements and their true relevant ranking:

- 1. A regionally uncommon vegetation community (Coastal pink bloodwood/Brushbox) - Moderate;
- 2. Common native vegetation (Acacia disparrima) Low to Moderate;
- 3. High density of exotic vegetation (Lantana, Winter senna and Passiflora spp. Low;
- 4. A mapped corridor of regional significance based on mapping completed prior to the clearing in 2001. This mapping was based on "The Key Habitats and Corridors Project" (DEC; Scotts *et al.* 2000). Low Moderate;
- 5. No endangered or otherwise significant plant species to be lost- Low;
- 6. No Endangered Ecological Communities (EEC) Low;
- 7. No wetlands Low;
- 8. Contains Secondary Koala habitat (Pink bloodwood). Koalas known from the area Moderate;
- 9. Habitat for other threatened fauna e.g. Grey-headed flying fox Low Moderate;
- 10. Small areas of more intact vegetation along the western and southern boundaries (Community 5) Moderate.

Overall, it is considered that the ranking provided in **FIGURE 11** (Ecological Constraints) of the JWA report for the proposed development envelope (Communities 3 and 5) i.e. Low - Moderate is correct. It is considered that the areas of more intact vegetation, particularly along the southern boundary, have elevated conservation value i.e. moderate if viewed in isolation. However, the majority of this area (southern boundary) is also outside of the development footprint (occurring in the ecological buffer zone). A revised representation of **FIGURE 11** is provided to illustrate this.

3 CONCLUSIONS

JWA Pty Ltd has assessed the concerns raised by Tweed Shire Council in their letter (dated 9 April 2013). It has been recognised that inconsistencies between government agency constraints mapping and existing site conditions have led to a misrepresentation of the ecological values of the site.

The Proposed development has been designed to utilise areas of the subject site that have a long history (at least 60 years) of modification and disturbance and is unlikely to contribute significantly to an increase in the fragmentation of native vegetation communities. All areas of high ecological constraint on, and adjacent to the site, including the Endangered Ecological Community (EEC) and the population of Endangered Scented acronychia, will be retained and adequately buffered (at least 20m) by dense plantings of appropriate native species. This represents approximately 45% of the site that will remain undisturbed or be replanted.

Approximately 95% of the area indicated as Secondary (A) habitat in the January 2011 Tweed Coast Koala Habitat Mapping, would be retained within the buffered EEC.

Furthermore, the ability of the eastern portion of the site, which contains the dense old growth habitat most likely to contain hollows and fissures, to continue to operate as an effective corridor will not be compromised. It is considered that the loss of forty-four (44) mature trees as a result of the proposed development does not represent a significant impact in a local or regional context.

APPENDIX 1 - AERIAL PHOTOGRAPHS





Environmental Site Assessment

Location Greenfield Site Ozone Street CHINDERAH NSW 2487 (Lot 1 on DP 1027224, Lots 4 & 5 on DP 830660)

Prepared for BP Australia Pty Ltd 701 Kingsford Smith Drive WHINSTANES QLD 4007

Date Prepared 26 April 2007



Photograph 01

A view facing north, taken on the south-western corner of Lot 5. The Lot 1 easement can be seen on the left side of the photograph. The location of TP-1 has been indicated.



Photograph 02

A view facing south of the western portion of the investigation area. The location of the two stockpiles of cleared vegetation has been indicated.

Google

To see all the details that are visible on the screen, use the "Print" link next to the map.



Acrizl Photography 2010















BP Australia Pty Ltd ABN 53 004 085 616 572 Curtin Avenue (East) Eagle Farm OLD 4009

Postal: PO Box 718 Hamilton 4007

17th January 2014

Tweed Shire Council <u>Attention</u>: Seth Philbrook TSC Development Assessment Planner PO Box 816 Murwillumbah NSW 2484

By Email: sphilbrook@tweed.nsw.gov.au

Direct: +617 3364 7103 Main: +617 3364 7111 Mobile: +61 434 073636 Fax: +617 3364 7102 scott.clark@bp.com

Dear Seth,

Ref: DA 10/0737 – BP Chinderah proposed alterations to existing highway service centre and expansion at Lot 1 DP 1127741 & Lot 2 DP 1010771

With reference to the correspondence received from the Tweed Shire Council dated 9th April 2013, for which BP's proposed development is deemed to be unsuitable due to ecological constraints.

In response, BP urgently met with council and commissioned a review of the original James Warran & Associates (JWA) Ecological Assessment submitted to council.

The following key findings are summarised as such -

* Inconsistencies between government agency constraints mapping and existing site conditions have led to a misrepresentation of the ecological values of the site.

* The Proposed development has been designed to utilise areas of the subject site that have a long history (at least 60 years) of modification and disturbance and is unlikely to contribute significantly to an increase in the fragmentation of native vegetation communities.

* All areas of high ecological constraint on, and adjacent to the site, including the Endangered Ecological Community (EEC) and the population of Endangered plant species will be retained and adequately buffered (at least 20m) by dense native planting, approximately 45% of the site that will remain undisturbed or be replanted.

* Approximately 95% of the area indicated as Secondary (A) habitat in the January 2011 Tweed Coast Koala Habitat Mapping, would be retained within the buffered EEC.

* The 'high ecological value' eastern corridor will not be compromised by the proposed development.

BP's Position

In consideration of this advice, BP has not resiled from its initially proposed development footprint and truck parking design.

To this point, BP has openly engaged with council in response to design consideration and site development constraints, such as regional/local flood mitigation, subsequently amending design and finished site level of the truck parking at considerable expense and project delay.

BP trusts the attached JWA Ecological assessment and detail survey provides further detail for your consideration in respect of this application.

Attached is the additional ecological assessment as requested.

Yours Faithfully BP Australia Pty Ltd Conveience Retail Operations

and

Scott Clark Network Development Manager - QLD



