

NOTICE OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

Notice is hereby given that an application has been made for planning approval for the following development:

SITE: 5 Fynbos Court, Primrose Sands

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT: DWELLING AND OUTBUILDING

The relevant plans and documents can be inspected at the Council Offices at 47 Cole Street, Sorell during normal office hours, or the plans may be viewed on Council's website at <u>www.sorell.tas.gov.au</u> until **Friday 9th May 2025.**

Any person may make representation in relation to the proposal by letter or electronic mail (<u>sorell.council@sorell.tas.gov.au</u>) addressed to the General Manager. Representations must be received no later than **Friday 9th May 2025.**

APPLICANT: Another Persepctive

 APPLICATION NO:
 DA 2025 / 00057 1

 DATE:
 17 April 2025

Part B: Please note that Part B of this form is publicly exhibited.

Full description of Proposal:	Use:		
	Development:		
	Large or complex proposals should be described in a letter or planning report.		
Design and construction cost of proposal:		\$	

Is all, or some the work already constructed:

No: 🛛 Yes: 🗆

Location of proposed works:	Street address: Suburb:
	Certificate of Title(s) Volume: Folio: Folio:

Is the Property on the Tasmanian Heritage Register?	No: 🗆 Yes: 🗆	If yes, please provide written advice from Heritage Tasmania	
Is the proposal to be carried out in more than one stage?	No: 🗌 Yes: 🗌	If yes, please clearly describe in plans	
Have any potentially contaminating uses been undertaken on the site?	No: 🗆 Yes: 🗆	If yes, please complete the Additional Information for Non-Residential Use	
Is any vegetation proposed to be removed?	No: 🗌 Yes: 🗌	If yes, please ensure plans clearly show area to be impacted	
Does the proposal involve land administered or owned by either the Crown or Council?	No: 🗆 Yes: 🗆	If yes, please complete the Council or Crown land section on page 3	
If a new or upgraded vehicular crossing is required from Council to the front boundary please complete the Vehicular Crossing (and Associated Works) application form			

https://www.sorell.tas.gov.au/services/engineering/

Sorell Council

Development Application: 5.2025.57.1 -Development Application - 5 Fynbos Court, Primrose Sands - P1.pdf Plans Reference: P1 Date Received: 07/03/2025

Declarations and acknowledgements

- I/we confirm that the application does not contradict any easement, covenant or restriction specified in the Certificate of Title, Schedule of Easements or Part 5 Agreement for the land.
- I/we consent to Council employees or consultants entering the site and have arranged permission and/or access for Council's representatives to enter the land at any time during normal business hours.
- I/we authorise the provision of a copy of any documents relating to this application to any person for the purposes of assessment or public consultation and have permission of the copyright owner for such copies.
- I/we declare that, in accordance with s52(1) of the Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993, that I have notified the owner(s) of the intention to make this application.
- I/we declare that the information in this application is true and correct.

Details of how the Council manages personal information and how you can request access or corrections to it is outlined in Council's Privacy Policy available on the Council website.

- I/we acknowledge that the documentation submitted in support of my application will become a public record held by Council and may be reproduced by Council in both electronic and hard copy format in order to facilitate the assessment process, for display purposes during public exhibition, and to fulfil its statutory obligations. I further acknowledge that following determination of my application, Council will store documentation relating to my application in electronic format only.
- Where the General Manager's consent is also required under s.14 of the *Urban Drainage Act 2013*, by making this application I/we also apply for that consent.

Applicant Signature:

Signature:

Crown or General Manager Land Owner Consent

If the land that is the subject of this application is owned or administered by either the Crown or Sorell Council, the consent of the relevant Minister or the Council General Manager whichever is applicable, must be included here. This consent should be completed and signed by either the General Manager, the Minister, or a delegate (as specified in s52 (1D-1G) of the Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993).

Please note:

- If General Manager consent if required, please first complete the General Manager consent application form available on our website <u>www.sorell.tas.gov.au</u>
- If the application involves Crown land you will also need a letter of consent.
- Any consent is for the purposes of making this application only and is not consent to undertaken work or take any other action with respect to the proposed use or development.

Ι			being responsible for the
administration of land at			
declare that I have given permiss	sion for the making of	f this application for	
Signature of General Manager, Minister or Delegate:	Signature	Da	te.

Page **3** of **4**

ion: 5.2025.57.1 ion - 5 Fynbos Court,

- P1.pdf

STORMWATER ASSESSMENT

5 Fynbos Court Primrose Sands January 2025



GEO-ENVIRONMENTAL SOLUTIONS



Development Application: 5.2025.57.1 -Development Application - 5 Fynbos Court, Primrose Sands - P1.pdf Plans Reference: P1 Date Received: 07/03/2025

Disclaimer: The author does not warrant the information contained in this document is free from errors or omissions. The author shall not in any way be liable for any loss, damage or injury suffered by the User consequent upon, or incidental to, the existence of errors in the information.

www.geosolutions.net.au



Investigation Details

Client:	Simon & Katie Wilson
Site Address:	5 Fynbos Court, Primrose Sands
Date of Inspection:	03/12/2024
Proposed Works:	New house
Investigation Method:	Hand Auger
Inspected by:	C. Cooper

Site Details

Certificate of Title (CT):	179164/3
Title Area:	Approx. 9986m ²
Applicable Planning Overlays:	Bushfire-prone areas
Slope & Aspect:	12° N facing slope within construction area reducing to
	approx. 3° within the proposed WW location
Vegetation:	Mixed Flora

Background Information

Geology Map:	MRT
Geological Unit:	Quaternary Sediments
Climate:	Annual rainfall 500mm
Water Connection:	Tank
Sewer Connection:	Unserviced-On-site required
Testing and Classification:	Onsite stormwater detention



Investigation

A number of bore holes were completed to identify the distribution and variation of the soil materials at the site, bore hole locations are indicated on the site plan. See soil profile conditions presented below. Tests were conducted across the site to obtain bearing capacities of the material at the time of this investigation.

Soil Profile Summary

BH 3 Depth (m)	USCS	Description
0.00-0.20	SW	Silty SAND: trace of clay, grey, slightly moist, loose,
0.20-0.40	SP	SAND: trace of clay, pale grey, slightly moist, loose,
0.40-1.20	SP	SAND: trace of clay, pale brown, slightly moist, medium dense
1.20-1.40	SC	Clayey SAND : with gravels, pale brown, slightly moist, dense, refusal

Soil Conditions

The soil onsite consists of deep sands overlaying Quaternary sediments. The soil has a high estimated permeability of approximately >3m/day

GES have identified the following at the site:

- The site has a ~20% grade within the construction area, reducing to approx. 5% within the proposed stormwater absorption area.
- There are no proposals for cuts or changes of grade which may impact on any proposed onsite stormwater absorption.
- The site soils have been identified as comprising of deep sands overlying Quaternary sediments.
- No soil dispersion was identified.
- No evidence of a water table was observed at the time of the investigation
- There is a low risk of the natural soils being impacted by contamination
- Bedrock was encountered at a depth of 1.40m.

Soil Dispersion

The soil is non-dispersive.



Existing Conditions and Assumptions

The site covers an area of approximately 1ha with a total roof area of approx. 301m² and driveway of approx. 250m². There is no public stormwater system that the property can connect therefore it is proposed that stormwater from the site would be routed through the proposed conventional underground drainage system comprising of Grated Sumps and PVC Pipes, coupled with soakage trench elements for on-site detention.

The stormwater management report is prepared in accordance with the design criteria listed below:

- The stormwater drainage system is designed using Bureau of Meteorology (BOM) published rainfall Intensity Frequency Duration (IFD) data as a minor / major system to accommodate the 5% AEP / 20 min storm events.
- The flow rate of stormwater leaving the site shall be designed so that it does not exceed the predeveloped flow rate for both the minor and major rain events.
- The total site discharges are modelled as described in *Storm Drainage Design in Small Urban Catchments,* a handbook for Australian practice by *Australian Rainfall and Runoff (ARR2019)*, Book 9 – Runoff in Urban Areas.

Detention Calculations

Detention calculations area provided in Appendix A

Summary and Conclusions

- Detention design to be adopted as per design and documentation.
- The designed solution complies with the performance solution design check carried out.
- The 30m² base (20m x 1.5m), 1.0m deep soakage trench is designed over a 20-minute storm duration for proposed development.
- The performance solution concept drawing is schematic only and must not be used for construction.
- DN100 slotted PVC pipe with geotextile covering on top of aggregate to be installed within the soakage trench.

It is also recommended that regular inspection and maintenance is conducted to ensure the stormwater system is operating without obstruction. A schematic of recommended checks is attached.



GES Stormwater Maintenance Plan Checklist

Indicative frequency	Inspection and criteria	Maintenance activities (where required)
Annual	Check whether any tree branches overhang the roof or are likely to grow to overhang the roof	If safe and where permitted, consider pruning back any overhanging branches
	Check that access covers to storage tanks are closed	Secure any open access covers to prevent risk of entry
	Check that screens on inlets, overflows and other openings do not have holes and are securely fastened	Repair any defective screens to keep out mosquitoes
	Inspect tank water for presence of rats, birds, frogs, lizards or other vermin or insects	Remove any infestations, identify point of entry and close vermin and insect- proof mesh
	Inspect tank water for presence of mosquito larvae (inspect more frequently in sub-tropical and tropical northern Australia, based on local requirements)	Identify point of entry and close with insect-proof mesh with holes no greater than 1.6 mm in diameter
	Inspect gutters for leaf accumulation and ponding	Clean leaves from gutters-remove more regularly if required. If water is ponding, repair gutter to ensure water flows to downpipe
	Check signage at external roof water taps and that any removable handle taps are being properly used	Replace or repair the missing or damaged signage and fittings
	Check plumbing and pump connections are watertight/without leakage	Repair any leaks as necessary
	Check suction strainers, in-line strainers and pump location for debris	Clean suction strainers, in-line strainers or debris from pump location
	Check pump installation is adequate for reliable ongoing operation	Modify and repair as required
	Check first flush diverter, if present	Clean first flush diverter, repair and replace if necessary
	Check health of absorption trench area and surrounding grass or plants	Investigate any adverse impacts observed that might be due to irrigation
	Check condition of roof and coatings	Investigate and resolve any apparent changes to roof condition, such as loss of material coatings



Triennial	Drain, clean out and check the condition of the tank walls and roof to ensure no holes have arisen due to tank deterioration	Repair any tank defects
	Check sediment levels in the tank	Organise a suitable contractor to remove accumulated sediment if levels are approaching those that may block tank outlets
	Undertake a systematic review of operational control of risks to the system	Identify the reason for any problems during inspections and take actions to prevent failures occurring in future
After 20 years and then every 5 years	Monitor the effectiveness of the stormwater absorption area to assess for any clogging due to algal growth, or blocking due to tree roots/grass growth/trench failure.	Clean or replace clogged equipment
Ongoing	Inspect and follow up on any complaints or concerns raised that could indicate problems with the system	Repair or replace any problems that are notified



APPENDIX A: STORMWATER DETENTION CALCULATIONS

RENCH		
rea	551	m2
	1	
e Interval (ARI)	20	yr
;		
vity (K)	5	m/day
	3.470	mm/min
<pre>6 clogging factor)</pre>	2.950	mm/min
	20	m
	1.5	m
	1	m
	30	m2
	0.35	%
	10.50	m3
	10500	L
Requirement	Design	Check
8280	10500	OK
	RENCH rea rea rea ce Interval (ARI) control (A	RENCH rea 551 rea 551 interval (ARI) 20 interval (ARI) 20 interval (ARI) 3.470 interval (ARI) 2.950 interval (ARI) 3.470 interval (ARI) 3.0 interval (ARI) 3.0 interval (ARI) 1.0500 interval (ARI) 1.0500



STORM CHECK					
Storm Duration	Intensity	Inflow Volume	Outflow Volume	Required Storage	Emptying time
	(mm/hr)	(m ³)	(L)	(L)	(hr)
1 min	143	1313	88	1225	0.23
2 min	113	2075	177	1898	0.36
3 min	102	2810	265	2545	0.48
4 min	94.4	3468	354	3114	0.59
5 min	88.1	4045	442	3603	0.68
10 min	66.5	6107	885	5222	0.98
15 min	54.1	7452	1327	6125	1.15
20 min	45.9	8430	1770	6661	1.25
25 min	40.3	9252	2212	7040	1.33
30 min	36	9918	2655	7263	1.37
45 min	28.1	11612	3982	7631	1.44
1 hour	23.5	12949	5309	7639	1.44
1.5 hour	18.5	15290	7964	7327	1.38
2 hour	15.7	17301	10618	6683	1.26
3 hour	12.7	20993	15927	5066	0.95
4.5 hour	10.3	25539	23891	1648	0.31
6 hour	9.01	29787	31855	-	-
9 hour	7.44	36895	47782	-	-
12 hour	6.48	42846	63709	-	-
18 hour	5.26	52169	95564	-	-
24 hour	4.48	59244	127418	-	-
30 hour	3.9	64467	159273	-	-
36 hour	3.46	68633	191128	-	-
48 hour	2.81	74319	254837	-	-
72 hour	2.03	80534	382255	-	-
			Full volume	10500	1.44
Notes:					
Inflow volume calculated	using Equation	10.1 (WSUD Guidelin	es: Chapter 10)		
Outflow volume calculate	ed using Fauation	n 10.2 (WSUD Guidel	ines: Chapter 10)		
Required storage and em	ptying time is le	ft blank when outflo	w volume exceeds in	nflow volume	



Location

 Label:
 5 Fynbos Crt Primrose Sands

 Easting:
 555220

 Northing:
 5250335

 Zone:
 55

 Latitude:
 Nearest grid cell: 42.8875 (5)

 Longitude:
 Nearest grid cell: 147.6875 (E)





Issued: 16 January 2025

Rainfall intensity for Durations, Exceedance per Year (EY), and Annual Exceedance Probabilities (AEP). FAQ for New ARR probability terminology

		Annual Exceedance Probability (AEP)							
Duration	63.2%	50%#	20%*	10%	5%	2%	1%		
1 min	66.0	74.2	102	122	143	174	199		
2 min	55.7	62.1	83.0	97.9	113	131	145		
3 <u>min</u>	49.6	55.4	74.5	88.2	102	120	133		
4 <u>min</u>	45.0	50.4	68.2	81.1	94.4	112	126		
5 min	41.3	46.3	63.1	75.4	88.1	106	120		
LO <u>min</u>	30.1	33.9	46.8	56.4	66.5	81.5	94.0		
15 min	24.4	27.5	37.9	45.8	54.1	66.4	76.7		
20 <u>min</u>	20.9	23.5	32.3	38.9	45.9	56.2	64.9		
25 <u>min</u>	18.4	20.7	28.4	34,2	40.3	49.1	56.4		
30 <u>min</u>	16.6	18.7	25.6	30.7	36.0	43.7	50.1		
15 <mark>min</mark>	13.3	14.9	20.2	24.1	28.1	33.6	38.1		
L hour	11.3	12.7	17.1	20.3	23.5	27.9	31.4		
L.5 hour	9.10	10.2	13.6	16.1	18.5	21.7	24.1		
2 hour	7.83	8.77	11.7	13.7	15.7	18.3	20.2		
hour 3	6.38	7.15	9.54	11.1	12.7	14.6	16.1		
1.5 hour	5.21	5.86	7.84	9.12	10.3	11.9	13.1		
i hour	4.51	5.09	6.83	7.96	9.01	10.4	11.5		
) hour	3.65	4.15	5.62	6.56	7.44	8.66	9.57		
12 hour	3.12	3.56	4.86	5.70	6.48	7,59	8.43		
L8 hour	2.46	2.82	3.90	4.60	5.26	6.23	6.97		
24 hour	2.05	2.35	3.28	3.89	4.48	5.34	6.00		
30 hour	1.76	2.02	2.84	3.38	3.90	4.68	5.28		
36 hour	1.54	1.78	2.50	2.99	3.46	4.16	4.71		
18 hour	1.24	1.43	2.02	2.42	2.81	3.40	3.85		
72 hour	0.891	1.02	1.45	1.74	2.03	2.45	2.78		
96 hour	0.697	0.800	1.13	1.35	1.57	1.89	2.15		
20 hour	0.575	0.659	0.920	1.10	1.27	1.52	1.73		
144 hour	0.493	0.564	0.781	0.924	1.06	1.27	1.45		
168 hour	0.434	0.495	0.681	0.800	0.911	1.09	1.24		

Note:

The 50% AEP IFD does not correspond to the 2 year Average Recurrence Interval (ARI) IFD. Rather it corresponds to the 1.44 ARI.

* The 20% AEP IFD does not correspond to the 5 year Average Recurrence Interval (ARI) IFD. Rather it corresponds to the 4.48 ARI.



Project No.: J11151 Designed: 30/01/2025 5 Fynbos Court, Primrose Sands

Geo-Environmental Solutions

STORMWATER DETENTION V5.05

Location: Site: PSD: Storage:	Primrose Sands 551m ² with tc = AEP of 5%, Und AEP of 5%, Und	, TAS 20 and tcs = 15 erground rectan erground rectan	mins. gular tank PS gular tank vo	D = 2.12L/s lume = 8.28m ³	3						
Design Criteria	(Custom AEP IFD data used)										
			Location =	Primrose Sand	s, TAS						
			Method =	E	(A)RI 2001	,A(E)P 201	19				
	PSD annual e Storage annual e	exceedance proba exceedance proba	abiliy (APE) = abiliy (APE) =	5	% %						
	-	Channe			(A)h aa (D);		~)t			
		Stora	ge method =	U	(A)bove,(P)ipe,(U)nd	erground,(C	_)ustom			
Site Geometry											
		Sit	e area (As) =	551	m² =		0.0551 H	а			
	Pre-de Post de	evelopment coeff evelopment coeff	ficient (Cp) = icient (Cw) =	0.30 0.96							
		- -		20							
	Upstr	l otal catc eam catchment t	nment (tc) = :o site (tcs) =	20 15	minutes						
Coefficient Calc	ulations										
	Pre-developme	nt				Post	developme	nt			
	Zone	Area (m²)	С	Area * C			Zone	Area (m²))	С	Area * C
	Concrete	0	0.90	0			Concrete	250		0.90	225
	Roof	0	1.00	0			Roof	301		1.00	301
	Gravel	0	0.50	0			Gravel	0		0.50	0
	Garden	551	0.30	165			Garden	0		0.30	0
	Total	551 m	2	165			Total	551	m²		526
	Cp = ΣA	rea*C/Total =	0.300				Cw = ΣAr	ea*C/Tota	=	0.955	
Permissible Site	e Discharge (PSD)	(AEP of 5%)									
		PSD I	ntensity (I) =	45.9	mm/hr	For c	atchment to	: = 20 mins	•		
Pe	Pre-develo ak post developm	pment (Qp = Cp* ient (Qa = 2*Cw*	'l*As/0.36) = 'l*As/0.36) =	2.11 13.43	L/s L/s	=(0.2	92 x I)				Eg. 2.24
		-					- , 				1
	Permissib	Stora le site discharge	ge method = (Qu = PSD) =	U 2.115	(A)bove,(P L/s)ipe,(U)nd	lerground,((C)ustom			
		Above ground - E	a 3.8								
			0 =	PSD ² - 2*Qa/tc	*(0.667*tc	*Qp/Qa +	0.75*tc+0.2	25*tcs)*PS	D + 2*0	Qa*Qp	
		I	aking x as =	PSD and solvin	g	h	20.0			FC 7	
			d =	1.0	2-1	D =	-28.0	(C =	50.7	
			PSD =	2.196	L/s						
	1	Below ground pi	pe - Eq 3.3								
			Qp =	PSD*[1.6*tcs/{	tc*(1-2*PS	D/(3*Qa))	}-0.6*tcs ^{2.67}	'/{tc*(1-2*	PSDp/(3*Qa))} ^{2.67}]	
			= PSD =	2.11 2.180	L/s						
		Below ground ro	ctangular tan	k - Fa 3 4							
	+	=tcs/(tc*(1-2*PS	D/(3*Oa))) =	0.838							
	c c		= qQ	PSD*[0.005-0.4	455*t+5.22	8*t ² -1.045	5*t ³ -7.199*t	4+4.519*t ⁴	5]		
			=	2.11					-		
			PSD =	2.115	L/s						



STORMWATER DETENTION V5.05

Project No.: J11151 Designed: 30/01/2025 5 Fynbos Court, Primrose Sands

Geo-Environmental Solutions

	age Capacity (AEP (of 5%)	Fa = 4 = - 4 - 1 F/a				- 2 (-2 2	
	Abov	/e ground (Vs) =	[0.5*Qa*td-[(0).875*PSD*td)()	1-0.917*PSD/Qa)+(0.427*td*PS	SD²/Qa)]]*60/1	0³ m³	Eq 4.23
	Below ground pipe (Vs) = $[(0.5^{\circ}Qa-0.53)^{\circ}PSD+0.083^{\circ}PSD^{2}/Qa)^{\circ}(d)^{\circ}0/10^{\circ}m^{3}$							Eq 4.8 Eq 4.13	
	Below ground		[[0.5 Qa-0.57]	2 F3D+0.046 F	3D /Qa/ tuj 00	10 11			LQ 4.13
		td	I	Qa	Above Vs	Pipe Vs	B/G Vs		
		(mins)	(mm/hr)	(L/s)	(m³)	(m³)	(m³)		
		5	88.1	25.7			3.50		
		26	39.3	11.5			7.11		
		37	31.7	9.3			7.64		
		47	27.3	8.0			7.93		
		58	24.0	7.0			8.12		
		68	21.8	6.4			8.22		
		79	20.0	5.8			8.27		
		89	18.6	5.4			8.28		
		100	17.4	5.1			8.27		
		110	16.5 Table 1 - 9	4.8 Storage as fund	l tion of time for	AFP of 5%	8.23		
				torage as rune					
			td	I	Qa	Vs			
		Туре	(mins)	(mm/hr)	(L/s)	(m³)			
		Above							
		Pipe							
		B/ground	88.4	18.7	5.5	8.28			
	Qp2 =	Qop2*Qp1 (whe I = 360*Qp2/(2	re Qp1=PSD) = *Cw*As*10³) =	1.65 5.6	L/s at which tin mm/h	ne above groun	d storage occu	rs	Eq 4.24
riod of St	orage								
	Time to Fill:	up ground (tf) -	+4*/1 0 0 2*00						F~ 4 27
	ADO Rolow gr	round ning (tf) =	td (1-0.92 PS	D/Qd) 2*0a))					Eq 4.27
	Below ground	rect tank (tf) =	td*(1-2*PSD/(3*()					Eq 3.2
	Below ground rect. tank (tf) = td*(1-2*PSD/(3*Qa))								
	Below ground								1-
	Time to empt	y:	h			02 (00)			
	Time to empt	ve ground (te) =	(Vs+0.33*PSD	² *td/Qa*60/10 ³	³)*(1.14/PSD)*(1	.0 ³ /60)			Eq 4.28
	Time to empt Abo Below gr	y: ve ground (te) = ound pipe (te) =	(Vs+0.33*PSD ² 1.464/PSD*(Vs	^{2*} td/Qa*60/10 ⁵ 5+0.333*PSD ^{2*} t	³)*(1.14/PSD)*(1 :d/Qa*60/10 ³)*(0 ³ /60) 10 ³ /60)			Eq 4.28 Eq 4.32
	Time to empt Abo Below gr Below ground	y: ve ground (te) = ound pipe (te) = rect. tank (te) =	(Vs+0.33*PSD ⁷ 1.464/PSD*(V 2.653/PSD*(V	^{2*} td/Qa*60/10 ⁵ 5+0.333*PSD ^{2*} t 5+0.333*PSD ^{2*} t	²)*(1.14/PSD)*(1 :d/Qa*60/10³)*(:d/Qa*60/10³)*(0³/60) 10³/60) 10³/60)			Eq 4.28 Eq 4.32 Eq 4.36
	Time to empt Abo Below ground Storage perio	y: ve ground (te) = ound pipe (te) = rect. tank (te) = d (Ps = tf + te)	(Vs+0.33*PSD ² 1.464/PSD*(Vs 2.653/PSD*(Vs	^{2*} td/Qa*60/10 ⁵ 5+0.333*PSD ^{2*} t 5+0.333*PSD ^{2*} t	²)*(1.14/PSD)*(1 cd/Qa*60/10 ³)*(cd/Qa*60/10 ³)*(0 ³ /60) 10 ³ /60) 10 ³ /60)			Eq 4.28 Eq 4.32 Eq 4.36 Eq 4.26
	Time to empt Abo Below gr Below ground Storage perio	y: ve ground (te) = ound pipe (te) = rect. tank (te) = d (Ps = tf + te)	(Vs+0.33*PSD 1.464/PSD*(V 2.653/PSD*(V td	^{2*} td/Qa*60/10 ³ 5+0.333*PSD ^{2*} t 5+0.333*PSD ^{2*} t Qa	²)*(1.14/PSD)*(1 d/Qa*60/10 ³)*(d/Qa*60/10 ³)*(Vs	0 ³ /60) 10 ³ /60) 10 ³ /60) tf	te	Ps	Eq 4.28 Eq 4.32 Eq 4.36 Eq 4.26
	Time to empt Abo Below gr Below ground Storage perio	y: ve ground (te) = ound pipe (te) = rect. tank (te) = d (Ps = tf + te)	(Vs+0.33*PSD ⁷ 1.464/PSD*(Vs 2.653/PSD*(Vs td (mins)	^{2*} td/Qa*60/10 ³ s+0.333*PSD ^{2*} t s+0.333*PSD ^{2*} t Qa (L/s)	³)*(1.14/PSD)*(1 d/Qa*60/10 ³)*(d/Qa*60/10 ³)*(<u>Vs</u> (L/s)	0 ³ /60) 10 ³ /60) 10 ³ /60) tf (mins)	te (mins)	Ps (mins)	Eq 4.28 Eq 4.32 Eq 4.36 Eq 4.26
	Time to empt Abo Below gr Below ground Storage perio	y: ve ground (te) = ound pipe (te) = rect. tank (te) = d (Ps = tf + te) Type Above	(Vs+0.33*PSD ⁷ 1.464/PSD*(Vs 2.653/PSD*(Vs td (mins)	^{2*} td/Qa*60/10 ³ s+0.333*PSD ^{2*} t s+0.333*PSD ^{2*} t Qa (L/s)	²)*(1.14/PSD)*(1 cd/Qa*60/10 ³)*(cd/Qa*60/10 ³)*(Vs (L/s)	0 ³ /60) 10 ³ /60) 10 ³ /60) tf (mins)	te (mins)	Ps (mins)	Eq 4.28 Eq 4.32 Eq 4.36 Eq 4.26
	Time to empt Abo Below gr Below ground Storage perio	y: ve ground (te) = ound pipe (te) = rect. tank (te) = d (Ps = tf + te) Type Above Pipe	(Vs+0.33*PSD [*] 1.464/PSD*(Vs 2.653/PSD*(Vs td (mins)	^{2*} td/Qa*60/10 ³ s+0.333*PSD ^{2*} t s+0.333*PSD ^{2*} t Qa (L/s)	²)*(1.14/PSD)*(1 cd/Qa*60/10 ³)*(cd/Qa*60/10 ³)*(vs (L/s)	0 ³ /60) 10 ³ /60) 10 ³ /60) tf (mins)	te (mins)	Ps (mins)	Eq 4.28 Eq 4.32 Eq 4.36 Eq 4.26
	Time to empt Abo Below gr Below ground Storage perio	y: ve ground (te) = ound pipe (te) = rect. tank (te) = d (Ps = tf + te) Type Above Pipe B/ground	(Vs+0.33*PSD ⁷ 1.464/PSD*(Vs 2.653/PSD*(Vs td (mins) 88.4	^{2*} td/Qa*60/10 ⁵ s+0.333*PSD ^{2*} t s+0.333*PSD ^{2*} t Qa (L/s) 5.5	²)*(1.14/PSD)*(1 cd/Qa*60/10 ³)*(cd/Qa*60/10 ³)*(Vs (L/s) 8.3	0 ³ /60) 10 ³ /60) 10 ³ /60) tf (mins) 65.6	te (mins) 203.4	Ps (mins) 269.0	Eq 4.28 Eq 4.32 Eq 4.36 Eq 4.26
	Time to empt Abo Below gr Below ground Storage perio	y: ve ground (te) = ound pipe (te) = rect. tank (te) = d (Ps = tf + te) Type Above Pipe B/ground	(Vs+0.33*PSD ⁷ 1.464/PSD*(Vs 2.653/PSD*(Vs td (mins) 88.4 Table	^{2*} td/Qa*60/10 ³ 5+0.333*PSD ^{2*} t 5+0.333*PSD ^{2*} t Qa (L/s) 5.5 5.5 e 3 - Period of S	*)*(1.14/PSD)*(1 cd/Qa*60/10 ³)*(cd/Qa*60/10 ³)*(<u>Vs</u> (L/s) <u>8.3</u> Gtorage requirer	0 ³ /60) 10 ³ /60) tf (mins) 65.6 nents for AEP (te (mins) 203.4 Df 5%	Ps (mins) 269.0	Eq 4.28 Eq 4.32 Eq 4.36 Eq 4.26

Permissible site discharge (Qu=PSD) = 2.12 L/s (Underground storage) Orifice coefficient (CD) = 1 For sharp circular orifice Gravitational acceration (g) = 9.81 m/s² Maximum storage depth above orifice (H) = 600 mm Orifice flow (Q) = $CD^*Ao^*V(2^*g^*H)$ Therefore: Orifice area (Ao) = 616 mm² Orifice diameter (D = $\sqrt{4*Ao/\pi}$) = 28.0 mm

Design notes:

1. Absorption trench dimensions of up to 20m long by 1.0m deep by 1.5m wide

- total storage volume calculated at average 35% porosity.

2.Base of trenches to be excavated level and smearing and compaction avoided.

3.90-100mm slotted pipe should be placed in the top 100mm of the 20mm aggregate

4.Geotextile or filter cloth to be placed over the pipe to prevent clogging of the pipes and aggregate

5.All works on site to comply with AS3500 and Tasmanian Plumbing code.





S O L U T I O N S

29 Kirksway Place, Battery Point T| 62231839 E| office@geosolutions.net.au

20 mm AGGREGATE (450 mm DEEP)

90 - 100 mm DIA SLOTTED PIPE WITH GEOTEXTILE COVERING

Sheet 1 of 1



		678 - C			
G	E O - 1	e n v	IRO	NM	ENTAL
	S C) L 1	UΤ	I O	N S
	29 TL 6223	Kirkswa	ay Place,	Battery	Point
	1 0220	1009 El	onice@g	03010	lions.net.au
	TA	NKS	то	SEI	RVE DWI
ÀK		E	BOUI	ND/	ARY SET
			A		
///	New Ser	VICES STORM			
	\rightarrow	WITH FL	OW DIRECTIO	N R PIT	
/-;-	[450x450 ACO GA ENGINE	CLASS A LVANISED HEI ER APPROVEI	ELGUARD (DR SIMILAR
	Perform	ance Solu	ution Com	pliance	Notes:
~ / _	• 7.10.1 - 0 FREEBO	- CL 7.10 OVERFLOW ARD TO HA	IS SAFE AN BITABLE SP	D DOES N ACES.	OT COMPROMISE
	• AS/NZS : RAINFAL	3500.3: PAR L AND RUN	T 3 STORM	VATER DF 1E 8: URB	AINAGE AUSTRALIAN
	• AUSTRA URBAN [MENT LIAN RUNO DESIGN	FF QUALITY	- A GUIDE	TO WATER SENSITIVE
	STORM A HANDE WATER	DRAINAGE BOOK FOR A	DESIGN IN S AUSTRALIAN URBAN DES	MALL UR	BAN CATCHMENTS:
	• WATER	URE: STOR	ASSOCIATIO	N OF AUS	TRALIA CODE (WSAA)
	Stormwa 1. ALL SITE ACCORE SPECIFI	ater Servi E SAFETY 8 DANCE WIT CATIONS:	CES NOTES MANAGEME H THE DEPA	ENT PROC	EDURES SHALL BE IN OF STATE GROWTH
	& SECTIO & SECTI 2. ALL PIPI	ON 176 EN ES UNDER	/IRONMENT	AL MANAG E AREAS	ARE TO BE BACKFILLED
	FULL DE 3. ALL STO AS1254 4. ALL DRA THE LGA	EPTH WITH ORMWATER UNO. AIN AND TR AT STANDA	20 F.C.R. AN PIPES TO B ENCH CONS RD DRG TSI	D FULLY E PVC-U- TRUCTIO	COMPACTED. SWJ CLASS "SN8" TO N SHALL COMPLY WITH
	TO BE A WORKS	DEQUATEL	Y SHORED	TO PREVE	INT COLLAPSE DURING
an		1.500	@ ^ 2		Sheet 1 of 1
		1.500	w A3		Drawn by: SR

CERTIFICATE OF THE RESPONSIBLE DESIGNER

Section 94 Section 106 Section 129 Section 155

To:	Simon and Katie Wilson	Owner name	25	
	1 Cressbrook St	Address	Form JJ	
	Eight Mile Plains	4113	Suburb/postcode	2
Designer detail	S:			
Name:	Vinamra Gupta		Category:	Civil Engineer
Business name:	Geo-Environmental Solutions		Phone No:	03 6223 1839
Business address:	29 Kirksway Place]	
	Battery Point	7004	Fax No:	N/A
Licence No:	685982720 Email address:	office@geose	olutions.net.au	
Details of the p	roposed work:			
Owner/Applicant	Simon and Katie Wilson		Designer's proje reference No.	^{ct} J11151
Address:	5 Fynbos Court		Lot No:	179164/3
	Primrose Sands	7173		
Type of work:	Building work	F	Plumbing work	X (X all applicable)
Description of wor	'k:			
On-site stormwater	system - design		(ne ad re- wa sto on ma ba	ew building / alteration / dition / repair / removal / erection ater / sewerage / ormwater / -site wastewater anagement system / ckflow prevention / other)

Description of the Design Work (Scope, limitations or exclusions): (X all applicable certificates)

Certificate Type:	Certificate		Responsible Practitioner		
	Building design		Architect or Building Designer		
	□ Structural design		Engineer or Civil Designer		
	☐ Fire Safety design		Fire Engineer		
	Civil design		Civil Engineer or Civil Designer		
	Hydraulic design		Building Services Designer		
	☐ Fire service design		Building Services Designer		
	Electrical design		Building Services Designer		
	Mechanical design		Building Service Designer		
	Plumbing design		Plumber-Certifier; Architect, Building Designer or Engineer		
	□ Other (specify)				
Deemed-to-Satisfy:		Performance S	Solution: 🗵 (X the appropriate box)		
Other details:					
Onsite stormwater retention					
Design documents	provided:				

The following documents are provided with this Certificate -

Document description:		
Drawing numbers:	Prepared by: Geo-Environmental Solutions	Date: Jan-25
Schedules:	Prepared by:	Date:
Specifications: Performance Solution Report	Prepared by: Geo-Environmental Solutions	Date: Jan-25
Computations:	Prepared by:	Date:
Performance solution proposals: Onsite stormwater retention	Prepared by: Geo-Environmental Solutions	Date: Jan-25
Test reports:	Prepared by: Geo-Environmental Solutions	Date: Jan-25

Standards, codes or guidelines relied on in design
process:
AS1547:2012 On-site domestic wastewater management.
AS3500 (Parts 0-5)-2013 Plumbing and drainage set.

Any other relevant document	tation:
-----------------------------	---------

GES Stormwater Assessment – 5 Fynbos Court Primrose Sands

Attribution as designer:

I Vinamra Gupta, am responsible for the design of that part of the work as described in this certificate;

The documentation relating to the design includes sufficient information for the assessment of the work in accordance with the *Building Act 2016* and sufficient detail for the builder or plumber to carry out the work in accordance with the documents and the Act;

This certificate confirms compliance and is evidence of suitability of this design with the requirements of the National Construction Code.

	Name: (print)	Signed	Date
Designer:	Vinamra Gupta	Rupta	17/01/2025
Licence No:	685982720		

|--|

Note: single residential dwellings and outbuildings on a lot with an existing sewer connection are not considered to increase demand and are not certifiable.

If you cannot check ALL of these boxes, LEAVE THIS SECTION BLANK.

TasWater must then be contacted to determine if the proposed works are Certifiable Works.

I confirm that the proposed works are not Certifiable Works, in accordance with the Guidelines for TasWater CCW Assessments, by virtue that all of the following are satisfied:

X	The works will not increase the demand for water supplied by TasWater
X	The works will not increase or decrease the amount of sewage or toxins that is to be removed by, or discharged into, TasWater's sewerage infrastructure
X	The works will not require a new connection, or a modification to an existing connection, to be made to TasWater's infrastructure
X	The works will not damage or interfere with TasWater's works
x	The works will not adversely affect TasWater's operations
x	The work are not within 2m of TasWater's infrastructure and are outside any TasWater easement
X	I have checked the LISTMap to confirm the location of TasWater infrastructure
X	If the property is connected to TasWater's water system, a water meter is in place, or has been applied for to TasWater.

Certification:

I Vinamra Gupta....... being responsible for the proposed work, am satisfied that the works described above are not Certifiable Works, as defined within the *Water and Sewerage Industry Act 2008,* that I have answered the above questions with all due diligence and have read and understood the Guidelines for TasWater CCW Assessments.

Note: the Guidelines for TasWater Certification of Certifiable Works Assessments are available at: <u>www.taswater.com.au</u>

Designer:

	Name: (print)
Vinamra	Gupta	

Signed	
Rupta	

Signad

Date

17/01/2025

ON-SITE WASTEWATER ASSESSMENT

5 Fynbos Court Primrose Sands January 2025



GEO-ENVIRONMENTAL SOLUTIONS



Development Application: 5.2025.57.1 -Development Application - 5 Fynbos Court, Primrose Sands - P1.pdf Plans Reference: P1 Date Received: 07/03/2025

Disclaimer: The author does not warrant the information contained in this document is free from errors or omissions. The author shall not in any way be liable for any loss, damage or injury suffered by the User consequent upon, or incidental to, the existence of errors in the information.



Investigation Details

Client:	Simon & Katie Wilson
Site Address:	5 Fynbos Court, Primrose Sands
Date of Inspection:	03/12/2024
Proposed Works:	New house
Investigation Method:	Hand Auger
Inspected by:	C. Cooper

Site Details

Certificate of Title (CT):	179164/3
Title Area:	Approx. 9986m ²
Applicable Planning Overlays:	Bushfire-prone areas
Slope & Aspect:	12° N facing slope within construction area reducing to
	approx. 3 within the proposed WW location
Vegetation:	Mixed Flora

Background Information

Geology Map:	MRT
Geological Unit:	Quaternary Sediments
Climate:	Annual rainfall 500mm
Water Connection:	Tank
Sewer Connection:	Unserviced-On-site required
Testing and Classification:	AS1547:2012



Investigation

A number of bore holes were completed to identify the distribution and variation of the soil materials at the site, bore hole locations are indicated on the site plan. See soil profile conditions presented below. Tests were conducted across the site to obtain bearing capacities of the material at the time of this investigation.

Soil Profile Summary

BH 3 Depth (m)	USCS	Description
0.00-0.20	SW	Silty SAND: trace of clay, grey, slightly moist, loose,
0.20-0.40	SP	SAND: trace of clay, pale grey, slightly moist, loose,
0.40-1.20	SP	SAND: trace of clay, pale brown, slightly moist, medium dense
1.20-1.40	SC	Clayey SAND : with gravels, pale brown, slightly moist, dense, refusal

Site Notes

Soils on the site are deep sands overlying quaternary sediments



Wastewater Recommendations

According to AS1547-2012 for on-site wastewater management the soil on the property is classified as **Sand (Category 1)**. It is proposed to install a dual-purpose septic tank with onsite absorption sized to accommodate the expected wastewater load. A Design Loading Rate (DLR) of 20L/m²/day has therefore been assigned for primary treated wastewater.

The proposed dwelling has a calculated maximum wastewater output of 840L/day. This is based on a tank water supply and a maximum occupancy of 7 people (120L/day/person).

Using the DLR of $20L/m^2/day$, an absorption area of at least $42m^2$ will be required. It is proposed to accommodate this by installing two $20m \times 1.5m \times 0.6m$ absorption trenches connected to a dual-purpose septic tank (min 3000L) via a two-way splitter box to ensure equal distribution.

A cut-off drain will be required upslope of the application area to divert any surface water flows. A 100% reserve area will need to be set aside and kept free from development for any future wastewater requirements. There is sufficient space available onsite to accommodate the required reserve due to the large property size (approx. 1ha). Therefore, a formal reserve area has not been assigned.

The following setback distances are required to comply with Building Act 2016:

Upslope or level buildings:	3m
Downslope buildings:	6m
Upslope or level boundaries:	1.5m
Downslope boundaries:	6m
Downslope surface water:	100m

Compliance with Building Act 2016 Guidelines for On-site Wastewater Management Systems is outlined in the attached table.

During construction GES will need to be notified of any variation to the soil condition or wastewater loading as outlined in this report.

Dr John Paul Cumming B.Agr.Sc (hons) PhD CPSS GAICD Director



GES

Land suitability and system sizing for on-site wastewater management

Trench 3.0 (Australian Institute of Environmental Health)

Assessment Report

Site assessment for wastewater system

Assessment for	Simon & Katie Wilson	Assess.Date	16-Dec-24
		Ref. No.	
Assessed site(s)	5 Fynbos Court, Primrose Sands	Site(s) inspected	3-Dec-24
Local authority	Sorell	Assessed by	John Paul Cumming

This report summarises wastewater volumes, climatic inputs for the site, soil characteristics and sustem sizing and design issues. Site Capability and Environmental sensitivity issues are reported separately, where 'Alert' columns flag factors with high (A) or very high (AA) limitations which probably require special consideration for system design(s). Blank spaces on this page indicate data have not been entered into TRENCH.

Wastewater Characteristics

'astewater volume (L/day) used for this assessment = 840 Septic tank wastewater volume (L/day) = 280 Sullage volume (L/day) = 560 Total nitrogen (kg/year) generated by wastewater = 4.5

otal phosphorus (kg/year) generated by wastewater = 2.0

Climatic assumptions for site

(Evapotranspiration calculated using the crop factor method)

	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Mean rainfall (mm)	41	36	36	47	44	48	48	47	49	55	47	49
Adopted rainfall (R, mm)	41	36	36	47	44	48	48	47	49	55	47	49
Retained rain (Rr, mm)	36	32	32	42	40	43	43	42	44	50	42	44
Max. daily temp. (deg. C)												
Evapotrans (ET, mm)	130	110	91	63	42	29	32	42	63	84	105	126
Evapotr. less rain (mm)	94	78	59	21	2	-14	-12	0	19	35	63	82
					Annual e	evapotran	spiration	less reta	ined rain	(mm) =	4	25

Annual evapotranspiration less retained rain (mm) =

(using the 'No. of bedrooms in a dwelling' method)

Soil characterisitics

Texture = Sand Thick. (m) = 1.4 Category = 1 Adopted permeability (m/day) = 3Adopted LTAR (L/sq m/day) = 20 Min depth (m) to water = 5

Proposed disposal and treatment methods

Proportion of wastewater to be retained on site:	All wastewater will be disposed of on the site
The preferred method of on-site primary treatment:	In dual purpose septic tank(s)
The preferred method of on-site secondary treatment:	In-ground
The preferred type of in-ground secondary treatment:	Trench(es)
The preferred type of above-ground secondary treatment:	None
Site modifications or specific designs:	Notneeded

Suggested dimensions for on-site secondary treatment system

- Total length (m) = 28
 - Width (m) =1.5
 - Depth (m) =0.6 42

Total disposal area (sq m) required = comprising a Primary Area (sq m) of: 42

and a Secondary (backup) Area (sq m) of:

Sufficient area is available on site

To enter comments, click on the line below 'Comments'. (This yellow-shaded box and the buttons on this page will not be printed.)

Comments

The assigned DLR for the site is 20L/m2/day, with a required absorption area of 42m2.



GES

Land suitability and system sizing for on-site wastewater management

Trench 3.0 (Australian Institute of Environmental Health)

Site Capability Report

Site assessment for wastewater system

Assessment for	Simon & Katie Wilson	Assess. Date	16-Dec-24
		Ref. No.	
Assessed site(s)	5 Fynbos Court, Primrose Sands	Site(s) inspected	3-Dec-24
Local authority	Sorell	Assessed by	John Paul Cumming

This report summarises data relating to the physical capability of the assessed site(s) to accept wastewater. Environmental sensitivity and system design issues are reported separately. The 'Alert' column flags factors with high (A) or very high (AA) site limitations which probably require special consideration in site acceptability or for system design(s). Blank spaces indicate data have not been entered into TRENCH.

				Confid	Limi	tation	
Alert	Factor	Units	Value	level	Trench	Amended	Remarks
	Expected design area	sq m	1,000	V. high	Moderate		
Α	Density of disposal systems	/sq km	30	High	High		
	Slope angle	degrees	3	V. high	Verylow		
	Slope form	Straight si	mple	V. high	Low		
	Surface drainage		Good	High	Very low		
	Flood potential Site	floods <1:10	0 yrs	High	Very low		
	Heavy rain events	Infree	quent	High	Moderate		
	Aspect (Southern hemi.)	Fac	ces N	V. high	Very low		
	Frequency of strong winds	Com	nmon	High	Low		
	Wastewater volume	L/day	840	High	Moderate		
	SAR of septic tank effluent		1.7	Mod.	Low		
	SAR of sullage		2.1	Mod.	Moderate		
	Soil thickness	m	1.4	V. high	Verylow		
	Depth to bedrock	m	1.4	High	Moderate		
	Surface rock outcrop	%	0	High	Verylow		
	Cobbles in soil	%	0	High	Verylow		
	Soil pH		7.0	High	Verylow		
	Soil bulk density gn	1/cub. cm	1.4	High	Verylow		
	Soil dispersion Eme	erson No.	8	V. high	Verylow		
AA	Adopted permeability	m/day	3	High	Very high		
	Long Term Accept. Rate L/	day/sq m	20	High	Low	Moderate	

To enter comments, click on the line below 'Comments' . (This yellow-shaded box and the buttons on this page will not be printed.)

The site has the capability to accept onsite was tewater disposal.



GES

Land suitability and system sizing for on-site wastewater management

Trench 3.0 (Australian Institute of Environmental Health)

Environmental Sensitivity Report

Site assessment for wastewater system

Assessment for	Simon & Katie Wilson	Assess. Date	16-Dec-24
		Ref. No.	
Assessed site(s)	5 Fynbos Court, Primrose Sands	Site(s) inspected	3-Dec-24
Local authority	Sorell	Assessed by	John Paul Cumming

This report summarises data relating to the environmental sensitivity of the assessed site(s) in relation to applied wastewater. Physical capability and system design issues are reported separately. The 'Alert' column flags factors with high (A) or very high (AA) limitations which probably require special consideration in site acceptability or for system design(s). Blank spaces indicate data have not been entered into TRENCH.

				Confid	Limitation	
Alert	Factor	Units	Value	level	Trench Amended	Remarks
AA	Cation exchange capacity m	nmol/100g	25	High	Very high	
Α	Phos. adsorp. capacity	kg/cub m	0.3	Mod.	High	
	Annual rainfall excess	mm	-425	High	Verylow	
	Min. depth to water table	m	5	High	Verylow	
	Annual nutrient load	kg	6.5	High	Low	
	G'water environ. value	Agric non-s	ensit	High	Low	
	Min. separation dist. require	d m	2	High	Verylow	
	Risk to adjacent bores	Ver	ylow	High	Verylow	
Α	Surf. water env. value	Recreat	onal	High	High	
	Dist. to nearest surface wate	er m	500	High	Low	
	Dist. to nearest other feature	e m	40	V. high	Moderate	
	Risk of slope instability	Ver	ylow	High	Verylow	
	Distance to landslip	m	100	Mod.	Moderate	

To enter comments, click on the line below 'Comments'. (This yellow-shaded box and the buttons on this page will not be printed.)

Compliance **Acceptable Solutions Performance Criteria** P1 A1 Complies with A1 (b) (i) Horizontal separation distance from a building to a The land application area is located so that a) Land application area will be located with a land application area must comply with one of the minimum separation distance of 3m from an following: the risk of wastewater reducing the (i) upslope or level building. bearing capacity of a building's a) be no less than 6m; or foundations is acceptably low.; and is setback a sufficient distance from a b) be no less than: (ii) downslope excavation around or (i) 3m from an upslope building or level under a building to prevent building; inadequately treated wastewater (ii) If primary treated effluent to be no less than seeping out of that excavation 4m plus 1m for every degree of average gradient from a downslope building; (iii) If secondary treated effluent and subsurface application, no less than 2m plus 0.25m for every degree of average gradient from a downslope building. A2 P2 Complies with A2 (a) Horizontal separation distance from downslope Horizontal separation distance from downslope Land application area located > 100m from surface water to a land application area must comply surface water to a land application area must downslope surface water comply with all of the following: with (a) or (b) (a) be no less than 100m; or a) Setbacks must be consistent with AS/NZS 1547 Appendix R; (b) be no less than the following: b) A risk assessment in accordance with (i) if primary treated effluent 15m plus 7m for Appendix A of AS/NZS 1547 has been every degree of average gradient to completed that demonstrates that the risk is downslope surface water; or acceptable. (ii) if secondary treated effluent and subsurface application, 15m plus 2m for every degree of average gradient to down slope surface water.

Demonstration of wastewater system compliance to Building Act 2016 Guidelines for On-site Wastewater Disposal

A3	P3	
 Horizontal separation distance from a property boundary to a land application area must comply with either of the following: (a) be no less than 40m from a property boundary; or (b) be no less than: (i) 1.5m from an upslope or level property boundary; and (ii) If primary treated effluent 2m for every degree of average gradient from a downslope property boundary; or (iii) If secondary treated effluent and subsurface application, 1.5m plus 1m for every degree of average gradient from a downslope property boundary. 	 Horizontal separation distance from a property boundary to a land application area must comply with all of the following: (a) Setback must be consistent with AS/NZS 1547 Appendix R; and (b) A risk assessment in accordance with Appendix A of AS/NZS 1547 has been completed that demonstrates that the risk is acceptable. 	Complies with A3 (b) (i) Land application area will be located with a minimum separation distance of 1.5m from an upslope or level property boundary Complies with A3 (b) (ii) Land application area will be located with a minimum separation distance of 6m of downslope property boundary
A4 Horizontal separation distance from a downslope	P4 Horizontal separation distance from a downslope	Complies with A4 No bore or well identified within 50m
bore, well or similar water supply to a land application area must be no less than 50m and not be within the zone of influence of the bore whether up or	bore, well or similar water supply to a land application area must comply with all of the following:	
down gradient.	(a) Setback must be consistent with AS/NZS 1547 Appendix R; and	
	(b) A risk assessment completed in accordance with Appendix A of AS/NZS 1547 demonstrates that the risk is acceptable	

 A5 Vertical separation distance between groundwater and a land application area must be no less than: (a) 1.5m if primary treated effluent; or (b) 0.6m if secondary treated effluent 	 P5 Vertical separation distance between groundwater and a land application area must comply with the following: (a) Setback must be consistent with AS/NZS 1547 Appendix R; and (b) A risk assessment completed in accordance with Appendix A of AS/NZS 1547 that demonstrates that the risk is acceptable 	Complies with A5 (a) No groundwater encountered
 A6 Vertical separation distance between a limiting layer and a land application area must be no less than: (a) 1.5m if primary treated effluent; or (b) 0.5m if secondary treated effluent 	P6 Vertical setback must be consistent with AS/NZS1547 Appendix R.	Complies with P6 Vertical separation of 0.6m is consistent with AS1547 Appendix R
A7 nil	P7 A wastewater treatment unit must be located a sufficient distance from buildings or neighbouring properties so that emissions (odour, noise or aerosols) from the unit do not create an environmental nuisance to the residents of those properties	Complies



AS1547:2012 – Loading Certificate – Septic System Design

This loading certificate sets out the design criteria and the limitations associated with use of the system.

Site Address: 5 Fynbos Court, Primrose Sands

System Capacity: 840L/day

Summary of Design Criteria

DLR: $20L/m^2/day$.

Absorption area: $42m^2$

Reserve area location /use: Not assigned – more than 100% available

Water saving features fitted: Standard fixtures

Allowable variation from design flows: 1 event @ 200% daily loading per quarter

Typical loading change consequences: Expected to be minimal due to capacity of system and site area (provided loading changes within 25% of design)

Overloading consequences: Continued overloading may cause hydraulic failure of the absorption area and require upgrading/extension of the area. Risk considered acceptable due to visible signs of overloading and owner monitoring.

Underloading consequences: Lower than expected flows will have minimal consequences on system operation unless the house has long periods of non occupation. Under such circumstances additional maintenance of the system may be required. Risk considered acceptable.

Lack of maintenance / monitoring consequences: Issues of underloading/overloading and condition of the absorption area require monitoring and maintenance, if not completed system failure may result in unacceptable health and environmental risks. Septic tank de-sludging must also be monitored to prevent excessive sludge and scum accumulation. Monitoring and regulation by the property owner required to ensure compliance.

Other operational considerations: Owners/occupiers must be aware of the operational requirements and limitations of the system, including the following; the absorption area must not be subject to traffic by vehicles or heavy stock and should be fenced if required. The absorption area must be kept with adequate grass cover to assist in evapotranspiration of treated effluent in the absorption trenches. The septic tank must be desludged at least every 3 years, and any other infrastructure such as septic tank outlet filters must also be cleaned regularly (approx. every 6 months depending upon usage). Foreign materials such as rubbish and solid waste must be kept out of the system.

CERTIFICATE OF THE RESPONSIBLE DESIGNER

Section 94 Section 106 Section 129 Section 155

To:	Simon & Katie Wilson	Owner name	25		
	1 Cressbrook Street	Address	Form JJ		
	Eight Mile Plains	4113	Suburb/postcode	3	
Designer detail	s:				
Name:	John-Paul Cumming		Category:	Bld. Srvcs. Dsgnr Hydraulic	
Business name:	Geo-Environmental Solutions		Phone No:	03 6223 1839	
Business address:	29 Kirksway Place]		
	Battery Point	7004	Fax No:	N/A	
Licence No:	CC774A Email address:	office@geos	olutions.net.au		
	. <u>.</u> .				
Details of the p	roposed work:				
Owner/Applicant	Cincer & Katia Wilcon		Designer's proje		
Owner/Applicant	Simon & Katle Wilson		reference No.	4 J11151	
Address:	5 Fynbos Court		Lot No:	179164/3	
	Primrose Sands	7173]		
Type of work:	Building work	I	Plumbing work	X (X all applicable)	
Description of work:					
On-site wastewater	management system - design		(ne ad re- wa sto on ma ba	ew building / alteration / dition / repair / removal / erection ater / sewerage / brmwater / -site wastewater anagement system / ckflow prevention / other)	

Description of the Design Work (Scope, limitations or exclusions): (X all applicable certificates)

Certificate Type:	Certificate		Responsible Practitioner	
	☐ Building design		Architect or Building Designer	
	☐ Structural design		Engineer or Civil Designer	
	☐ Fire Safety design		Fire Engineer	
	Civil design		Civil Engineer or Civil Designer	
	🗷 Hydraulic design		Building Services Designer	
	☐ Fire service design		Building Services Designer	
	Electrical design		Building Services Designer	
	 Mechanical design Plumbing design 		Building Service Designer Plumber-Certifier; Architect, Building Designer or Engineer	
	□ Other (specify)			
Deemed-to-Satisfy:		Performance S	Solution: (X the appropriate box)	
Other details:		·		
Dual-purpose septic tank with onsite absorption				
Design documents	provided:			

Director of Building Control - date approved: 2 August 2017

The following documents are provided with this Certificate -

Document description: Date: Jan-25 Drawing numbers: Prepared by: Geo-Environmental Solutions Schedules: Prepared by: Date: Prepared by: Geo-Environmental Solutions Specifications: Date: Jan-25 Computations: Prepared by: Date: Performance solution proposals: Prepared by: Date: Prepared by: Geo-Environmental Solutions Test reports: Date: Jan-25

Standards, codes or guidelines relied on in design
process:
AS1547:2012 On-site domestic wastewater management.
AS3500 (Parts 0-5)-2013 Plumbing and drainage set.

Any other relevant documentation:

Onsite Wastewater Assessment - 5 Fynbos Court Primrose Sands - Jan-25

Onsite Wastewater Assessment - 5 Fynbos Court Primrose Sands - Jan-25

Attribution as designer:

I John-Paul Cumming, am responsible for the design of that part of the work as described in this certificate;

The documentation relating to the design includes sufficient information for the assessment of the work in accordance with the *Building Act 2016* and sufficient detail for the builder or plumber to carry out the work in accordance with the documents and the Act;

This certificate confirms compliance and is evidence of suitability of this design with the requirements of the National Construction Code.

	Name: (print)	Signed	Date
Designer:	John-Paul Cumming	J	16/01/2025
Licence No:	CC774A		

Assessment of Certifiable Works: (TasWater)

Note: single residential dwellings and outbuildings on a lot with an existing sewer connection are not considered to increase demand and are not certifiable. If you cannot check ALL of these boxes, LEAVE THIS SECTION BLANK. TasWater must then be contacted to determine if the proposed works are Certifiable Works. I confirm that the proposed works are not Certifiable Works, in accordance with the Guidelines for TasWater CCW Assessments, by virtue that all of the following are satisfied: The works will not increase the demand for water supplied by TasWater х The works will not increase or decrease the amount of sewage or toxins that is to be removed by, x or discharged into, TasWater's sewerage infrastructure х The works will not require a new connection, or a modification to an existing connection, to be made to TasWater's infrastructure x The works will not damage or interfere with TasWater's works x The works will not adversely affect TasWater's operations x The work are not within 2m of TasWater's infrastructure and are outside any TasWater easement x I have checked the LISTMap to confirm the location of TasWater infrastructure If the property is connected to TasWater's water system, a water meter is in place, or has been Х applied for to TasWater.

Certification:

I John-Paul Cumming....... being responsible for the proposed work, am satisfied that the works described above are not Certifiable Works, as defined within the *Water and Sewerage Industry Act 2008,* that I have answered the above questions with all due diligence and have read and understood the Guidelines for TasWater CCW Assessments.

Note: the Guidelines for TasWater Certification of Certifiable Works Assessments are available at: <u>www.taswater.com.au</u>





Design notes:

- 1. Absorption trench dimensions of up to 20m long by 0.60m deep by 1.5m wide.
- 2. Base of trenches to be excavated level and smearing and compaction avoided.
- 3. Lower 450mm of bed to be filled with 20mm drainage aggregate and slotted 100mm distribution pipes packed into upper 100mm of aggregate
- 4. Final finished surface with sandy loam from on site to be 100 mm above natural surface to allow for settlement.
- 5. Construction on slopes up to 20% to allow trench depth range 650mm upslope edge to 450mm on down slope edge.

6. On slopes over 5% the sandy loam cover should be 75-100mm above natural with a toes no less than 500mm in length to avoid surface water accumulation (up slope ag drain also recommended to divert surface water flows).

7. The distribution pipe grid must be absolutely level to allow even distribution of effluent around the absorption area - it is recommended that the level be verified by running water into the system before backfilling and commissioning the trench

8. The slotted 90-100mm PVC distribution pipes must be slotted at "8 and 4 o'clock" when looking at the pipe section end-on, with the slots running level along the horizontal length of the pipe - please see figure 2 - or commercially available pre-slotted PVC pipe utilised

9.All works on site to comply with AS3500 and Tasmanian Plumbing code.





S O L U T I O N S

29 Kirksway Place, Battery Point T| 62231839 E| office@geosolutions.net.au

INSPECTION OPENING

Inlet from septic tank

20 mm AGGREGATE (450 mm DEEP)

90 - 100 mm DIA SLOTTED PIPE WITH GEOTEXTILE COVERING

Figure 2 - Distribution Pipe Detail

Cross Section

	Slotted 100mm d - slots at "8 and 4	istribution pipe I o'clock"		
Side View				
Slots min 20mm		P 90	Pipe diameter 0-100mm	
 ✓ Slots min appro 50-75 in length 	Slots approx spacing 200mm			
			Inlet from septic tank	Top view of Trench: Slotted 90-100mm pvc pipe @ 500mm 90 degree corner joins- 500mm space
Do not scale from these drawings. Dimensions to take precedence over scale.	Geo-Environmental Solutions		Date: Feb 20	Terraced Absorption Trench Detail



29 Kirksway Place, Battery Point T| 62231839 E| office@geosolutions.net.au



nm spacing- connected with cing from ends of trench

Sheet 2 of 2


Do not scale from these drawings. Dimensions to take precedence	Geo-Environmental Solutions	Date: Nov 2021	Cut-Off Drain Detail
over scale.			



Vents must terminate in accordance with AS/NZS 3500.2

ground vent in not recommended

Inspection openings must be located at the inlet to an on-site wastewater management system treatment unit and the point of connection to the land application system and must terminate as close as practicable to the underside of an approved inspection opening cover installed at the finished surface level

level

Do not scale from these drawings. Dimensions to take precedence over scale.		Tas Figure C2D6 Alternative Venting Arrangements



GEO-ENVIRONMENTAL

S O L U T I O N S 29 Kirksway Place, Battery Point T| 62231839 E| office@geosolutions.net.au

Tas Figure C2D6 Alternative Venting Arrangements

Alternative venting to be used by extending a vent to terminate as if an upstream vent, with the vent connection between the last sanitary fixture or sanitary appliance and the on-site wastewater management system. Use of a

Access openings providing access for desludging or maintenance of on-site wastewater management system treatment unites must terminate at or above finished surface



NATURAL VALUES ASSESSMENT



5 FYNBOS COURT, PRIMROSE SANDS

For

Sorell Council

Court, Primrose Sands - P2 .pdf Plans Reference: P2 Pate Received: 01/04/2025

Development Application: 5.2025.57.1 -Response to Request For Information - 5 Fynbos

S & K WILSON

1st April 2025

LARK & CREESE PTY LTD D. Summers (BAppsc)



Table of Contents

1.	Summary	4
	Legislative Implications	4
	Threatened Flora	4
	Vegetation Communities	4
	Threatened Fauna	4
	Weed Management	5
	Conclusions	5
2.	Proposal	7
	Purpose	7
	Scope	7
	Site description	7
	Aboriginal Cultural heritage	7
	Geology	7
	Limitations	7
3.	Flora Assessment	9
	Methodology	9
	Initial assessment	9
	Site assessment	9
	Assessment objectives	9
	Native vegetation communities1	0
	Desktop vegetation type & classification1	0
4.	Introduced Plants	6
	Phytophthora cinnamomi (Pc)1	7
5.	Potential threatened flora, vegetation communities & fauna habitat values	1
	Flora2	1
	Fauna2	4
	Swift Parrot2	4
	Grey Goshawk	4
	Masked Owl	4
	Tasmanian Devil, Eastern Quoll & Eastern-barred bandicoot2	5
6.	Discussion	9
	Threatened flora species	0



	Vegetation community types and distribution	.30
	Fauna	.30
	Swift parrot	30
	Tasmanian Wedge-tailed eagle, White-bellied sea eagle and Grey Goshawk	30
	Masked Owl	.30
	Devils, Quolls & Eastern-barred bandicoots	30
	Planning implications	31
	Stormwater Management Code	.33
	On-site Wastewater Management Code	.33
7.	Conclusion	.34
	Threatened flora	.34
	Vegetation communities	.34
	Threatened fauna	.34
	Weed management	.35
8.	References	.36
9.	Appendix A - Vascular plants species list.	.39
10.	Appendix C - Supporting documentation.	.42
	Definitions of terms	.42
	Disclaimer	.42
	General Report Assumptions:	.42

Citation

This report can be cited as: Lark & Creese (2025). Natural Values Assessment, 5 Fynbos Court, Tasmania 30765_52538_02 for S & K. Wilson, 1st April 2025.



1. Summary

The following is a natural values assessment of the property 5 Fynbos Court, Primrose Sands (C.T.179164/3) on behalf of S & K Wilson. Currently the property is classified as Zone Number 11, Rural Living, Zone subgroup Rural Living Zone A, as identified in Tasmanian Government LISTmap under the Tasmanian Planning Scheme (TPS) and Sorell Municipality Local Provisions Schedule. This report assesses the proposed construction of a Class 1A dwelling and the likely short and long term impacts on existing ecological functions and potential natural values within the allotment to assist local, State and Commonwealth agencies during the assessment process. The study site was assessed by Doug Summers, 6th December 2024.

Legislative Implications

Threatened Flora

- A search of Department of natural Resources and Environment's Natural Values Atlas and Forestry Practices Authority's Biodiversity Values Database indicates no threatened plant species listed under Tasmania's *Threatened Species Protection Act 1995* or the Commonwealth's *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999* had previously been recorded on site. No threatened species were recorded at the time of assessment,
- Assessment found the study site supports dry *Eucalyptus amygdalina* woodland on sediments (DAC) and a small area of Lowland grassland complex (GCL). These communities represent potential habitat for the Narrowleaf new holland daisy (*Vittadinia muelleri*) and grass species Doublejointed speargrass (*Austrostipa bigeniculata*),
- Site plans show the altered development site and associated BAL-19 bushfire hazard management area (HMA) will impact DAC and GCL that represent potential habitat values for threatened flora species recorded within 5km of the site. However, it is unlikely the proposal will result in a significant loss of potential habitat for threatened flora species previously recorded within proximity of the site. No further assessment or permit under Section 51 of Tasmania's *Threatened Species Protection Act 1995*. No formal referral to the Commonwealth's Department of Environment under *Significant Impact Guidelines*.

Vegetation Communities

- TASVEG 4.0 classify native vegetation within the allotment as dry *Eucalyptus amygdalina* woodland/forest coastal facies (DAC), & Urban / Modified land (FUR),
- At the time of assessment, flora surveys found the vegetation structure, species composition and distribution of native vegetation occupying the study site were generally consistent with TASVEG 4.0 DAC vegetation classification and distribution. However, assessment found the open area in the southern section of the study site was consistent with TASVEG 4.0 Lowland grassland complexes (GCL) vegetation community classification.
- Site plans indicate the current proposed development site will impact DAC and a small area of GCL however, development will avoid fragmenting the core DAC vegetation community occupying the central and northern section of the allotment,
- DAC and GCL vegetation communities are not listed as vulnerable under Schedule 3A of Tasmania's *Nature Conservation Act 2002* or *Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993*.

Threatened Fauna

• The site is within Swift Parrott Important Breeding Area (SPIBA) that have previously been recorded 500m to the east. No potential core foraging habitat values was recorded. Assessment recorded one potential nesting habitat tree exceeding 70cm diameter at breast height in the north-west corner clear of the proposed development site. Given the proposed development is positioned clear of potential nesting habitat values, it is anticipated no further assessment or permit under Section 51 of Tasmania's *Threatened Species Protection Act 1995*. No formal



referral to the Commonwealth's Department of Environment under Significant Impact Guidelines.

- Site assessment indicates DAC vegetation occupying the study site represents a Nil likelihood of suitable nesting habitat for the Tasmanian Wedge-tailed eagle, White-bellied sea eagle and Grey Goshawk. Natural Values Database indicates no known Tasmanian Wedge-tailed eagle, White-bellied sea eagle or Grey Goshawk nests have previously been recorded within 500m or 1km line of sight. No further assessment or permit under Section 51 of Tasmania's *Threatened Species Protection Act 1995*. No formal referral to the Commonwealth's Department of Environment under *Significant Impact Guidelines*.
- The proposed development site is within range boundaries for the Eastern Quoll, Eastern-barred bandicoot and the Tasmanian Devil. Assessment indicates the proposal will impact potential foraging habitat values for these species however, assessment indicates future development will result in disturbance only and unlikely to result in significant loss of potential foraging or denning habitat for these species and unlikely to trigger Significant Impact Threshold a described in the Commonwealth's *Environmental Protection Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999* for this species. Post construction pressure such as domestic pets can potentially cause further disturbance or displacement for these species and non-threatened species. No further assessment or referral is required under Tasmania's *Threatened Species Protection Act 1999*,
- A survey for Masked owl nesting habitat (eucalypts >70cm dbh) recorded one potential hollow in a tree located clear of the proposed development site located in the north-west corner. Assessment of potential nesting habitat values found the site supported less than 8 trees / ha. Given the proposal will not result in loss of potential nesting or roosting habitat for this species, no further assessment or permit under Section 51 of Tasmania's *Threatened Species Protection Act 1995*. No formal referral to the Commonwealth's Department of Environment under *Significant Impact Guidelines*.
- The small dam within the study site represents potential habitat values for the Green and Gold frog listed as vulnerable under Tasmania's *Threatened Species Protection Act 1995* or the Commonwealth's *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999*. Assessment indicates works and future development will not impact potential habitat values for this species. No formal referral to the Commonwealth's Department of Environment under *Significant Impact Guidelines* necessary. No further assessment or referral required under the Commonwealth's *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999*,

Weed Management

- Boneseed (*Chrythanolidies monilifera*) and Serrated tussock (*Nassella trichotoma*) recorded within the study site are both listed as Declared plant species and Weeds of National Significance (WoNS) under the National Weed Strategy and the Tasmanian *Biosecurity Act 2019* and *Weed Management Act 1999*,
- In accordance with the Serrated tussock Statutory Weed Management Plan, Sorell Municipality is classified as Zone A, with eradication considered appropriate management objective. Boneseed is widespread and is classified as Zone B with control and contain considered appropriate. Given surrounding properties support Boneseed, control and containment is appropriate management.

Conclusions

Providing the proposed alternative future development is limited to the location identified and management recommendations for the establishment of the BAL-19 bushfire hazard management area are complied with, is anticipated the alternative proposal will not compromise the existing ecological systems and functions within the vegetation communities or surrounding environs. Significant Impact Guidelines issued by the Commonwealth Dept of the Environment to determine if referral to the department is required, indicates the proposal will not:



- Significantly impact potential threatened flora values or high priority native vegetation community,
- Directly impact potential fauna threatened species habitat,
- Lead to a long-term decrease in the size of populations, reduce area of occupancy of a significant population, fragment an existing population or destroy habitat critical to the survival of flora & fauna species,
- Disrupt the breeding cycle of an important population(s),
- Modify, destroy, remove or isolate or decrease the availability or quality of habitat to the extent that the species is likely to decline,
- Result in invasive species that are harmful to a threatened species becoming established I the threatened species habitat.

Management prescriptions to address the construction phase of the development and potential future works or land use should include:

- Prior to commencement of works implement a hygiene management plan including in accordance with *Tasmanian Washdown Guidelines for Weed and Disease Control: Machinery, Vehicles and Equipment (Edition 1, 2004)* ensuring contractors have washed down vehicles and machinery to prevent accidental importation of new weed species and *Phytophthora cinnamomi* and other plant pathogens during the construction phase. Given the absence of declared weed species, no hygiene facility for vehicles or machinery existing the site required,
- Prior to commencement of works implement a soil, water and erosion management plan following guidelines set out in Environmental Best Practice Guidelines for all development detailing location for soil, waste material storage and parking,
- Stage removal of vegetation to avoid blanket clearance and avoid any unnecessary traffic outside the development footprint.



2. Proposal

Purpose

The owner and proponent has engaged Lark and Creese Pty Ltd to detail the natural values supported within 5 Fynbos Court, Primrose Sands (C. T. 179164/3), specifically within the proposed development site, as part of a development application to the Sorell Council for the construction of an access and Class 1A dwelling area to assist local, State and Commonwealth agencies during the assessment process. The study site was assessed by Doug Summers 6th December 2024.

Scope

The survey focuses on impacts within the proposed development footprint (study site), 5 Fynbos Court, Primrose Sands (C.T. 179164/3), assessing the proposal's capacity to accommodate proposed development including the associated bushfire hazard management area (HMA) and appropriate wastewater infrastructure, including, but not limited to:

- Potential threatened flora and fauna habitat values present, including species of conservation significance and determining possible implications regarding the Tasmanian *Threatened Species Protection Act 1995* and the Commonwealth *Environmental Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999*,
- Vegetation types within the study site including descriptions on the condition, distribution, and conservation status under Local, State and Commonwealth policy and legislation.

Site description

The 1.004 ha allotment is currently zoned Rural Living under Sorell Council Local Area Provisions Schedule and the TPS. The wedge-shaped allotment supports an undulating land with a predominant westerly aspect but southerly on the northern boundary with gradients in the order of 5-10° (Centre coordinates (E:555233, N:5250530. GDA2020, MGA55).

Aboriginal Cultural heritage

A desktop assessment of the Tasmanian Aboriginal Heritage Register indicates no Aboriginal or cultural heritage sites have been identified or documented within the study site (PS0366038).

Geology

A desktop assessment (Listmap geological layer - Geological Polygons 250K) indicates the proposed development site supports a geology classified Undifferentiated Quaternary sediments described as Sand gravel and mud of alluvial, lacustrine and littoral origin. A desktop survey (LISTmap) found no geomorphic conservation features or geoconservation sites within the property.

Limitations

The natural values assessment of the proposed access and subdivision footprint identified by designers/proponents was undertaken on 6th December 2024. Every effort was made to sample the range of habitats within the study site. Many plant species have seasonal growth and flowering, patchy distribution. During the flora and fauna survey it is possible some species were missed, particularly grass species, and not recorded at time of survey. Whilst every effort was made to survey the range of habitat to overlap likelihood occurrence. Optimum survey times are usually spring to summer, however their potential for occurrence is discussed. The survey was also limited to vascular plant species and did not include mosses, lichens and fungi. Surveys for threatened fauna were limited to the likelihood of species the study site represented potential range habitat and the identification of tracks, scats and other signs.





Figure 1 - Locality map, 5 Fynbos Court, Primrose Sands (red) (Ref: LISTmap).



Figure 2 – Approved subdivision site plan (Ref: Rogerson & Birch SIMMP10 11022-01)



Figure 3 - Proposed development, 5 Fynbos Court, Primrose Sands (Ref:)



3. Flora Assessment

Methodology

Survey methodology is based on 'Site Examination for Threatened and Endangered Plant Species' supported by methodology outlined in "Manual for Assessing Vegetation Condition in Tasmania". The report also specifically addresses possible environmental issues that may arise under the Tasmanian Planning Scheme (TPS) particularly in relation to the Biodiversity Code. Vegetation classification is in accordance with TASVEG 4.0, as described in 'From Forest to Fjaeldmark: Descriptions of Tasmania's vegetation (Kitchener & Harris 2013). A previous Natural Values Assessment undertaken by enviro-dynamics in October 2018 was also referenced (A. Welling 2018).

Vascular plant species nomenclature is consistent with de Salas & Baker (2014) for scientific names. Fauna species scientific and common names is in accordance with fauna listed in the Natural Values Atlas report for the site (NRE). Any features surveyed measured using Trimble R12(i) RTK GNSS, GDA94, MGA55.

Initial assessment

A desktop assessment of natural values data bases recording of flora and fauna listed as threatened under the Threatened Species Protection Act 1995 and Commonwealth Environment Protection & Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999, vegetation communities listed under Tasmania's Nature Conservation Act 2002 including additional conservation values. Remote assessment resources using:

- The LIST (Land Information Systems Tasmania), Department of Natural Resources and Environment, Tasmania,
- Department of Natural Resources and Environment's Natural Values Atlas Report (5 Fynbos Court, Primrose Sands 5/12/2024,) 5km search radius (E:555233, N:5250530. GDA2020, MGA55).
- TASVEG 4.0 vegetation classification, Land Information Systems Tasmania, Department of Natural Resources and Environment, Tasmania,
- Forest Practices Authority's Biodiversity Values Database generated report, 5km search radius 551796E, 5258677N, GDA94, MGA55,
- Commonwealth Department of the Environments' Protected Matters Search Tool. 5km search radius 551793E, 5258671N, GDA94, MGA55.

Site assessment

Site assessment was conducted on the 6th of December 2024. No vascular plant species listed under Schedule 3, 4 or 5 of the Threatened Species Protection Act 1995 or listed in the Commonwealth Environment Protection & Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 have previously been recorded on site including A. Wellings 2018 assessment, or at the time of assessment. Assessment of the proposal impacts against the planning provisions in the TPS, Threatened Species Protection Act 1995 and Commonwealth Environment Protection & Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999. Assessment of habitat values and vegetation type including small scale surveys of disturbed sites, differences due to geology, drainage, hilltops and ridgeline outcrops. Maps were generated from LISTmap & Google Earth. Vegetation mapping (LISTmap TASVEG 4.0 layer, Forestry Practices Authority Biodiversity Values Database & Department of Natural Resources and Environment Natural Values Atlas).

Assessment objectives

- Broad scale habitat value and vegetation type assessment,
- Small scale assessment such as disturbed sites, open areas, existing tracks, variations due to • geology, elevated outcrops, and areas with poor drainage,
- Assessment of the proposal impacts against the planning provisions in the TPS, Threatened Species Protection Act 1995 and Commonwealth Environment Protection & Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999.

Native vegetation communities

Desktop vegetation type & classification

Department of Natural Resources and Environment *Natural Values Atlas* (TASVEG 4.0 overlay) classify the majority of the native vegetation within the study site as dry *Eucalyptus amygdalina* woodland on sediments (DAC). TASVEG 4.0 vegetation classification and mapping was undertaken mainly using a desktop analysis based on aerial photography and can differ from site assessment vegetation mapping, particularly at a small scale. However, TASVEG 4.0 can be useful in determining and understanding the potential range of habitat values that could be present.



Figure 4 – Image showing TASVEG 4.0 distribution of vegetation communities surrounding and within the subject property. DAC – Dry *Eucalyptus amygdalina* coastal facies, FUR - Modified / Urban land (REF: LISTmap TASVEG 4.0 layer).

Assessment of vegetation type & classification

Flora and vegetation type assessment found previous land use, land management and topography have dictated the distribution of native vegetation types and classification that occupies the study site. Native vegetation occupying the central and northern section is consistent with LISTmap TASVEG 4.0 dry *Eucalyptus amygdalina* woodland/forest coastal facies (DAC) classification. The cleared area in the southern part of the study site is classified by TASVEG 4.0 Urban areas / Modified land (FUR).



Figure 5 – Image showing the ground based vegetation classification and distribution based on TASVEG 4.0 classification DAC – Dry *Eucalyptus amygdalina* coastal facies, FUR - Modified / Urban land (REF: LISTmap State Aerial Photo).

Assessment found Eucalyptus amygdalina and E. viminalis are the dominant canopy species with Exocarpos cupressiformis, Allocasuarina littoralis, Bursaria spinosa, Acacia dealbata and A. mearnsii. The understorey structure is dominated by the low shrub layer including Ozothamnus obcordatus, Pteridium esculentum. Small and tall shrub layer is typical where DAC dominates consisting of Lomandra longifolia, Hibbertia prostrata, Astroloma humifusum, Pultenaea daphnoides, P. juniperina, Epacris impressa, Ozothamnus obcordatus, with herbs such as Pimelea humilis, Gonocarpus tetragynus. Grass species included Austrodanthonia caespitosa, Austrodanthonia geniculate, Austrodanthonia setacea, Austrostipa flavescens.

Assessment indicated the vegetation structure and species composition occupying the cleared area in the southern section of the study site is consistent with TASVEG 4.0 Lowland grassland complex (GCL) vegetation community. Lowland grassland complex (GCL) generally supports natural, or disturbance induced grasslands dominated by species of *Rytidosperma* or *Austrostipa*, but commonly also containing *Poa labillardierie* and *Themeda triandra*. Semi improved pasture can revert to this community over time, especially where drought conditions favour native species. GCL is distinguished from Agricultural land (FAG) by having a cover of more than 25% native grass species and distinguished from Regenerating cleared land (FRG) by the prominence of native grass species without significant woody pioneers or sedges.

Assessment found the vegetation is consistent with descriptions by Harris and Kitchener, 2005 in that the site is generally dominated by *Austrodanthonia, Rytidosperma* or *Austrostipa* species, without a clear dominant species, but where *Austrodanthonia, Poa, Themeda and/or Austrostipa* species are all commonly present. A patch of *Themeda triandra* in grasslands dominated by *Austrodanthonia and Austrostipa* species are often mapped as Lowland Grassland Complex. The Lowland Native Grasslands of Tasmania ecological community may be adjacent to, similar to, or intergrade with, a number of other native vegetation communities. For example, it may intergrade with grassy woodland communities and with wetter vegetation communities in riparian zones. It may also occur as part of a mosaic of other native vegetation communities. Examples of vegetation types which may be similar to, intergrade with, or occur close to the Lowland Native Grasslands of Tasmania include:

- Eucalyptus ovata Callitris oblonga (Black Gum) Forest (EPBC Act listed)
- Lowland Sedgy grassland (TASVEG 4.0 code: GSL)
- Rockplate grassland (TASVEG 4.0 code: GRP)
- Lowland grassland Complex (TASVEG 4.0 code: GCL)
- Bursaria-Acacia woodland and scrub (TASVEG code: NBA)
- Highland *Poa* grassland (TASVEG 4.0 code: GPH)

These vegetation types are excluded from the national ecological Lowland Native Grassland community in their own right. However, where a patch of vegetation meets the description, and the condition thresholds of the Lowland Native Grasslands of Tasmania presented in the listing advice (Figure 6), it then forms part of the listed national ecological community.





Figure 6 – Image looking north at the disturbance induced Lowland grassland complex (GCL) in foreground and DAC beyond that will require removal to establish the alternate development site.



Figure 7 – Image of works within the DAC vegetation community and site of proposed alternate development site.





Figure 8 – Looking west at proposed development site on the southern margin of DAC vegetation community within the study site.



Figure 9 – Image of typical vegetation structure and species composition of DAC vegetation community occupying the western boundary of the study site.





Figure 10 – Image looking north at vegetation management within DAC veg community within the central section of the study site.



Figure 11 – Image of typical DAC vegetation structure and species occupying the north-east section of the study site.





Figure 12 – Image of DAC vegetation occupying the eastern boundary of the study site.



4. Introduced Plants

Boneseed (*Chrysanthemoides monilifera*) and Serrated tussock (*Nassella trichotoma*) were recorded within the study site. Both listed as Declared plant species and Weeds of National Significance (WoNS) under the and the Tasmanian *Biosecurity Act 2019*, *Weed Management Act 1999* and National Weed Strategy. Serrated tussock is a significant weed of grazing land and threatens the biodiversity values of Tasmania's native grasslands through displacing native species and often going undetected until infestations reach a large size. Serrated tussock will also invade other vegetation types such as grassy woodlands, and coastal communities. Boneseed occurs occasionally as a weed of disturbed bushland and coastal vegetation. It competes with native plants and reduces biodiversity, and dense infestations can be a significant fire hazard.

Boneseed can invade the understorey of native forests and bushland and is particularly invasive in coastal areas. Boneseed is widespread and is classified as Zone B with control and containment considered appropriate. Given surrounding properties support Boneseed, control and containment is an appropriate management objective. Ideally, surrounding properties should be included in the eradication program.

Serrated tussock

In accordance with the Serrated tussock Statutory Weed Management Plan (SWMP), Sorell Municipality is classified as Zone A, with eradication considered appropriate management objective. Assessment indicates a moderate infestation 30-35 plants within approx. 50-55m2, it is anticipated proposed future development and recommended management mechanisms could eradicate this species from the property. It must be noted, adjacent property to the north-east supports a small number of plants and should be included in the eradication program.

For long term control, all control programs should aim at reducing the amount of serrated tussock seed production, germination, and mitigate the spread of Serrated tussock within the allotment. A small patch of Serrated tussock can produce millions seeds that can remain dormant for several years. In line with best practice, it is recommended Serrated tussock plants located within the access footprint are physically removed prior to commencement of works. All other plants outside the footprint are treated with herbicide to avoid unnecessary disturbance (see below for recommendations).

The substrate within the works footprint is likely to support weed seeds and must be retained on-site and stockpiled in a designated location to be managed (existing waste pile). It is important that machinery / equipment used in the construction of the access within the Serrated tussock infestation is appropriately cleaned of soil and debris on-site in an appropriate designated location to avoid accidentally transporting Serrated tussock seeds within the allotment or dispersed during transportation or at the nest works site.

It is anticipated an established, all-weather access for future development and fencing to exclude traffic from a Serrated tussock exclusion zone will effectively mitigate the risk of potentially contaminating other machinery and vehicles and transportation of seeds within and off-site. It is anticipated these hygiene recommendations will negate the need for a wash-down facility at the entry / exit of the site.

In accordance with Department of Natural Resources and Environment guidelines, small medium flowering and non-flowering Serrated tussock plants that are physically removed are to be double-bagged and disposed of in general waste. Given the plants have finished flowering and no longer hold seeds, it is acceptable to stockpiled removed plants in a designated site clear of native vegetation community to be monitored and managed. To avoid disturbance within the possible seed bank



footprint, it is recommended plants outside the access corridor also within the BAL-19 hazard management area are spot sprayed as this method generally results in better efficacy and less disturbance.

Chipping

- Chipping / physically removal is used to control isolated or small patches of serrated tussock in this type of rural / urban environment.
- Chip tussocks with a mattock preferably before the tussocks set seed.
- Disposal through double bag in general waste. Must retain veg material and contaminated soil onsite.

Herbicides

- Glyphosate is a registered herbicides for spot spraying serrated tussock (See NRE web site for Serrated Tussock Herbicides Control for further information).
- Spray to completely wet the plant and cause runoff. Add a dye to the spray mixture to identify areas sprayed. Always follow label instructions.

Site hygiene

In line with the SWMP and the Tasmanian *Biosecurity Act 2019*, and best hygiene practice / management mechanisms are adopted and implemented prior to, and during the construction phase, and also include post construction activities regarding future land use /management practices and the importation of landscaping materials.

Management prescriptions to address site hygiene for future works or land use should include:

- In accordance with weed management recommendations, ensure installation of fencing clearly delineating the Serrated tussock weed management area,
- Prior to commencement of works implement a site management plan and fencing to clearly indicate the limit of the development zone for machinery and vehicles.
- Prior to commencement of works implement an appropriate soil, water and erosion management plan following guidelines set out in Environmental Best Practice Guidelines for all development detailing location for soil, waste material storage and parking,
- Prior to commencement of works implement a hygiene management plan including in accordance with *Tasmanian Washdown Guidelines for Weed and Disease Control: Machinery, Vehicles and Equipment (Edition 1, 2004)* ensuring contractors have washed down vehicles and machinery to prevent accidental importation of new weed species and *Phytophthora cinnamomi* and other plant pathogens during the construction phase.
- Prior to commencement of works ensure a well-formed access is established prior to commencement of building works to .
- Stage removal of vegetation to avoid blanket clearance and ensure the movement of machinery and vehicles is limited to the access and development site (BAL-19 hazard management area) footprint.

Phytophthora cinnamomi (Pc)

A biosecurity desktop assessment of the Natural Values Database indicated no Pc infestation within the site or within 1km of the study site. Dry *Eucalyptus amygdalina* woodland is considered low to moderately susceptible to *Phytophthora cinnamomi* including individual species present such as *Pultenaea* spp., and *Epacris* species susceptible to *Pc*.



Table 1 – Introduced plant species recorded within study site.

Species	Comments	Easting /	Recommendations					
		Northing						
Plant specie	s listed as 'Declared'	& Weeds of	National Significance plant species under the Tasmanian					
	Weed Manag	gement Act 1	999 (WMA) & Biosecurity Act 2019.					
Council municipality Zone ranking in accordance with the								
	Boneseed & Serrated tussock Statutory Weed Management Plans							
Boneseed Declared weed, See Implement Statutory Weed Mgt Plan.								
(Chrysanthemoides	Weed of National	Weed	Cut and paint herbicide methodology prior to next flowering					
monilifera)	Significance –	Plan	season.					
	WMA.		Leave plant in-situ.					
	Zone B: Control		Physically remove small plants.					
	and containment		Likely to be a small seed bank present.					
	Mgt objective.		Follow up surveys and mapping of new plants.					
			Physical removal of seedlings & small plants.					
			Monitor the site for minimum of 5 yrs. for new plants.					
			Control and contain is the management objective.					
Serrated tussock	Declared weed,	See	Implement Statutory Weed Mgt Plan.					
(Nassella	Weed of National	Weed	Recommend targeted herbicide application in 2025 prior to					
trichotoma)	Significance –	Plan	winter dormancy. Follow up application Spring 2025.					
	WMA.		Not recommended to physically remove small plants as small					
	Zone A:		roots can shoot new plants.					
	Eradication Mgt		Likely to be a small seed bank present.					
	objective.		Proposed access footprint within infestation.					
			Recommended excavated substrate from within infestation m					
			be retained on-site in designated stockpile location.					
			Limit movement of machinery and vehicles to established access					
			corridor and within the BAL-19 hazard management area.					
			Follow up surveys and mapping of new plants.					
			Physical removal of seedlings & small plants.					
			Monitor the site for minimum of 5 yrs. for new plants.					
			Anticipated proposed development will provide effective					
			management and expected eradication is an achievable					
			management objective.					



Figure 13 – Image showing the distribution of Boneseed (yellow) and Serrate tussock (green) within the study site with reference to the proposed alternative development site (purple) and the extent of the BAL-19 hazard management area (red).





Figure 14 – Image of Boneseed within DAC vegetation and proposed development site.



Figure 15 - Image of typical size and maturity of Boneseed plants within DAC in the north-west corner of the study site.





Figure 16 – Image showing typical sized Serrated tussock plants within the southern grassed section of the allotment.



Figure 17 – Image of previously slashed Serrated tussock plant in the southern section of the allotment.



5. Potential threatened flora, vegetation communities & fauna habitat values

Flora

An assessment for flora species listed under *Threatened Species Protection Act 1995* and Commonwealth *Environment Protection & Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999* was undertaken assessing potential habitat values. Assessment found native vegetation community DAC within the study site represent potential habitat for some of the threatened species recorded within 5km of the site. Whilst most species can be identified year round, such *Vittadinia gracilis and V. muelleri*, some orchid species (*Caladenia caudata, C. filamentosa* and *Pterostylis wapstrarum*) required mature inflorescences for accurate identification. Whilst not recorded within 5km of the location, the study site, particularly manmade open grassland areas dominated by *Austrostipa* spp, sparse *Themeda triandra, Rytidosperma* spp, represents potential habitat for some threatened grass species *Austrostipa bigeniculata* (Doublejointed speargrass), *Austrostipa scabra subsp scabra* (Rough Speargrass) and *Austrostipa blackii* (Crested speargrass).

Site surveys found previous land use and management practices within DAC vegetation community has resulted in the modification of the vegetation structure whilst previous clearance and conversion of vegetation in the southern section of the study site has resulted in disturbance induced grassland. Potential threatened flora habitat values for some species, such as orchids, are limited to the current distribution of relatively undisturbed DAC vegetation community. Whilst it is likely the proposal will result in the minor loss of potential habitat values for some threatened fauna species, it is not considered the proposal will result in a significant loss of potential habitat values for species recorded within 5km of the site.

Vegetation types and distribution

Remnant Lowland Native Grasslands of Tasmania are regarded as one of Tasmania's most threatened and fragmented ecosystems and most depleted vegetation formation in Tasmania. It is not listed under Schedule 3A, B or C of Tasmania's *Nature Conservation Act 2002* but listed as a Critically Endangered ecological community under the Commonwealth's *Environmental Protection*, *Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999*. Descriptions and the *Key to Native grassland* (P5, *From Forest to Fjaeldmark Ed 2, Native Grassland*) indicates the open area is consistent with TASVEG 4.0 Lowland Grassland Complex (GCL) vegetation community classification (Harris and Kitchener, 2005).

Assessment found the small area in the southern section of the study site is dominated by *Austrodanthonia spp, Rytidosperma spp, Agrostis spp,* and *Austrostipa* species however, assessment indicates *Themeda triandra* is sparse and does not exceed the 50% composition threshold. Harris and Kitchner (2005) indicate when *Themeda triandra* mixed with *Austrodanthonia, Austrostipa* and *Rytidosperma*, this vegetation is often mapped as TASVEG 4.0 Lowland Grassland Complex and not classified as a remnant of the endangered ecological community Lowland Native Grasslands of Tasmania. TASVEG 4.0 description of Lowland grassland complex (GCL) indicate these communities generally support natural, or disturbance induced grasslands. GCL is distinguished from Agricultural land (FAG) and Urban/Modified land use (FUR) by having a cover of more than 25% native grass species and distinguished from Regenerating cleared land (FRG) by the prominence of native grass species without significant woody pioneers or sedges.

Dry eucalypt forest and woodland vegetation communities (Forest to Fjaeldmark)

Site assessment identified the native vegetation occupying the study site is consistent with dry *Eucalyptus amygdalina* woodland on sediments (DAC) classification (Kitchner & Harris 2013). Whilst *E. viminalis* appears as sub to co-dominant in the canopy, the occurrence of this species is within a significantly larger community of DAC. Descriptions by Harris and Kitchener, 2013 indicate that *E. viminalis* can be co-dominant but not considered dry *Eucalyptus viminalis / E. globulus*



woodland on coastal sands (DVC) that is largely confined to coastal formation of alluvial origin. DAC is not listed as a threatened vegetation community under the Tasmania *Nature Conservation Act 2002*.

Table 2 – Threatened plant species previously recorded within 5 km radius of the study area with discussion on likelihood of potential habitat within the study site and listed under the Tasmanian *Threatened Species Protection Act 1995* (TSPA), and the Commonwealth's *Environmental Protection, Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999* (EPBCA). Flora surveys were not limited to threatened flora species listed under TSPA & EPBCA but also included species considered within potential range and suitable habitat.

CONSERVATION STATUS									
Species	Species TSPA EPBCA Observations/Comments								
	No Threatened Flora Previously Recorded Within 500m								
	Thre	eatened Flora	a Previously Recorded Within 5000m						
Austrostipa scabra subsp scabra Rough Speargrass	rare	-	Not previously recorded on site or at the time of assessment. Mature inflorescences generally required for identification (Nov-Dec) Previously recorded from dry open habitats in grassy remnants, roadside banks and coastal vegetation. GCL and DAC within study site constitute potential habitat. Likely development within the southern section will impact the small area of GCL and potential habitat values for this species. However, despite the disturbance, it is unlikely the proposed development will result in a significant loss of high priority habitat values for this species. No referral or further assessment required under the TSPA.						
Austrostipa blackii Crested speargrass	rare	-	Not previously recorded on site or at the time of assessment. Mature inflorescences generally required for identification (Nov-Dec) Previously recorded from dry open habitats in grassy remnants, roadside banks and coastal vegetation. GCL and DAC within study site constitute potential habitat. Likely development within the southern section will impact the small area of GCL and potential habitat values for this species. However, despite the disturbance, it is unlikely the proposed development will result in a significant loss of high priority habitat values for this species. No referral or further assessment required under the TSPA.						
Asperula scoparia subsp scoparia Prickly woodruff	rare	-	Not previously recorded on site or at the time of assessment. Previously recorded in grassy woodlands and tall eucalypt forest. DAC bushland constitutes potential habitat. Anticipated the proposal will not impact potential habitat and unlikely to result in a significant loss of potential habitat. Not expected proposal will impact populations or impact survival of this species. No referral or further assessment is required under the TSPA.						
Austrostipa bigeniculata Doublejointed speargrass	rare	-	Not previously recorded on site or at the time of assessment. Mature inflorescences are required for identification (Nov - Jan, Feb). Distribution generally limited to the southeast and midlands in open woodlands and grasslands, often associated with <i>Austrostipa nodosa</i> . GCL and DAC within study site constitute potential habitat. Likely development within the western section will impact GCL and potential habitat values.						



			However, it is unlikely the proposal will result in a significant loss of high priority habitat values for this species. No referral or further assessment required under the TSPA.
<i>Caladenia</i> <i>caudata</i> Tailed spider- orchid	vulnerable	Vulnerable	Not previously recorded on site or at the time of assessment. Flowers are required for identification (Oct-Nov). Generally occurs on sunny north facing sites in open eucalypt forest and woodland often with sheoaks, and in heathland on sandy and loamy soils in areas of low rainfall in grassy woodland with silver wattle and bracken on well-drained sandy soil. DAC veg community represents potential but marginal habitat. Given the proposal is clear of DAC and potential habitat values, it is unlikely future development will result in a significant loss of potential habitat, impact populations or impact long term, survival of this species. No referral or further assessment required under the TSPA or EPBCA.
<i>Cotula vulgaris</i> var. <i>austaliasica</i> Slender buttons	rare	-	Not previously recorded on site or at the time of assessment. Flower stems required for the identification of this small annual herb (Aug-Nov) The species occurs in saline herbfields, rocky coastal outcrops, and wet or brackish swamps. Assessment indicates the study site does not constitute potential. Unlikely proposed development will result in a loss of potential habitat. No referral or further assessment required under the TSPA.
<i>Cuscuta tasmanica</i> Golder dodder	rare	-	Not previously recorded on site or at the time of assessment. Generally occurs in saline areas and brackish marshes. Assessment indicates the study site does not constitute potential. Unlikely proposed development will result in a loss of potential habitat. No referral or further assessment required under the TSPA.
<i>Limonium</i> <i>australe</i> var. <i>australe</i> Yellow sea- lavender	rare	-	Not previously recorded on site or at the time of assessment. Generally restricted to saltmarshes. Assessment indicates the study site does not constitute potential. Unlikely proposed development will result in a loss of potential habitat. No referral or further assessment required under the TSPA.
<i>Ruppia</i> magacarpa Largefruit seatassel	rare	-	Not previously recorded on site or at the time of assessment. Perennial aquatic herb. The 3 dams within the study site represent possible habitat however, the proposed development will not impact potential habitat. No referral or further assessment required under the TSPA.
Ruppia tuberosa Tuberous seatassel	rare	-	Not previously recorded on site or at the time of assessment. Generally restricted to holes and channels in salt marsh. Study site does not represent possible habitat. Proposed development will not impact potential habitat. No referral or further assessment required under the TSPA.
Scleranthus fasciculatus Spreading knawel	vulnerable	-	Not previously recorded on site or at the time of assessment. Can resemble <i>S. biflorus</i> Distribution in Tas is restricted to a few locations in the midlands and south-east in conjunction with silver tussock grassland / grassy woodland needing the gaps between tussocks for protection and survival. Unlikely the proposal will result in a significant loss of potential habitat. No referral or further assessment required under the TSPA.
Vittadinia muelleri	rare	-	Not previously recorded on site or at the time of assessment. Species prefers areas of low precipitation on both fertile and infertile soils predominantly found in dry sclerophyll forest around Hobart. DAC and disturbed areas within the study site represent potential habitat values. Proposed development will result in a loss of potential habitat values however, it is not expected the proposal will result in a significant loss of



potential habitat values or impact populations of this species. No referral or further assessment required under the TSPA.

Note: Information outlined above is derived from Department of Natural Resources and Environment (NRE) *Natural Values Atlas, Forestry Practices Authority* (FPA) *Biodiversity Values Database,* Comments from *Threatened Species Unit* for potential habitat values and descriptions and Author's experience.

Fauna

Fauna assessment for fauna species listed under *Threatened Species Protection Act 1995* and Commonwealth *Environment Protection & Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999* was undertaken assessing potential habitat values.

Swift Parrot

Swift parrots have previously been recorded to the east within 5km. Site assessment did not record potential core foraging habitat within the study site (*Eucalyptus globulus & E. ovata*). Assessment for potential nesting habitat values found the study site supports 2 *Eucalyptus amygdalina* that exceed 70cm diameter at breast height (dbh) and constitute potential nesting habitat for the Swift parrot. Technical Note No. 3: Identifying foraging and nesting habitat (Forestry Practices Authority), indicates vegetation within in the allotment represents:

- 'Nil' as no potential foraging habitat recorded within the study site and,
- 'Nil' to 'Low' potential nesting habitat in dry sclerophyll as there are greater than 70cm dbh but less than 8 trees per hectare.

Tasmanian Wedge-tailed eagle and White-bellied sea eagle

Tasmanian Wedge-tailed eagle generally require ≥ 10 ha of relatively undisturbed forest with trees exceeding 27m in height that are protected from strong prevailing north-west winds. Habitat nesting modelling for potential Tasmanian Wedge-tailed eagle nesting sites below 850 metres indicates the study site represents a Nil - Low likelihood of suitable habitat for these raptor species. Ground based assessment in accordance with Forestry Practice Authority Fauna Technical Note #1 and #6, indicates the vegetation type does not support preferred nesting habitat for these species. A desktop assessment indicates no nest have been recorded within 500m or within 1km line of sight.

Grey Goshawk

The site is within range boundaries of the Grey Goshawk, listed as vulnerable under the Tasmanian *Threatened Species Protection Act 1995*. Ground based assessment of nesting habitat in accordance with D. Young (2020) and Forestry Practice Authority Fauna Technical Note #12: *Goshawk habitat categories*, provide guidance for Goshawk nesting habitat categories. Assessment indicates the proposed location does not represent preferred nesting habitat values and lacks suitable vegetation / tree types commonly associated with nesting / roosting habitat.

Masked Owl

The site is also within potential range boundaries for the Tasmanian Masked Owl. This subspecies occurs only in Tasmania and listed as endangered under the Tasmanian *Threatened Species Protection Act 1995* and Vulnerable under the Commonwealth's *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999* due to small population and ongoing habitat loss. Nesting habitat generally consists of eucalypt forests and woodlands containing old growth trees with suitable hollows (>15cm) for nesting/roosting but will also nest in isolated old growth trees with suitable hollows. In accordance with Fauna Technical Note #16: Identifying masked owl habitat and #14: Nest Identification assessment, assessment found the surrounding diverse range of forest, woodland and non-forest vegetation including agricultural forest mosaics in the vicinity of the proposed development site represents potential suitable foraging habitat. A hollows survey recorded only 1 hollow measuring approx. 8-10cm in a large (>70cm dbh) *Eucalyptus viminalis* located in the north-west corner.

Inspection found little evidence of use, such as droppings around the base of the tree with inspection of the hollow not showing evidence of occupation. A survey for potential hollow bearing trees found no other eucalypts exceeding 70cm dbh. However, this does not mean that hollows are not present with some *E. amygdalina*, regardless of age, showing characteristics, such as senescence from wind damage, that can generate nesting hollows.



Figure 18 – Image of 8-10cm hollow in *Eucalyptus viminalis* located in the north-west corner clear of proposed development.



Figure 19 – Image showing the location of the *Eucalyptus viminalis* supporting an 8-10cm hollow E: 555238, N: 5250602 GDA94, MGA55 (10m±).

Tasmanian Devil, Eastern Quoll & Eastern-barred bandicoot

The site is considered to be within range boundaries for Tasmanian Devils, Eastern Quolls and to a lesser extent, the Eastern-Barred Bandicoot. The eastern quoll and Eastern-barred bandicoot prefer a habitat consisting of a mosaic of agricultural land juxtaposed to bushland constituting potential refuse / foraging habitat for insects and worms from the soil. However, instead of nesting under vegetation, Quolls and bandicoots will use dens as refuge and for birthing. Numbers have been declining in Tasmanian, in large due to predation by cats. Devils range from coastal heath, open dry sclerophyll



and mixed sclerophyll-rainforest where shelter and food are available and will hide in dens but at night it can roam up to 16 km and although not territorial, have a home range. In accordance with FPA Fauna Technical Note #10, the surrounding mosaic of agricultural land juxtaposed to bushland constituting potential refuse / foraging habitat for this species. A survey of the site recorded typical shaped diggings that can be associated with the Eastern-barred bandicoots however the common Brown bandicoot and Potoroo also make similar shaped diggings.

Table 3- Threatened fauna species previously recorded within 5 km radius of the study area with discussion on likelihood of potential habitat within the study site and listed under the Tasmanian *Threatened Species Protection Act 1995* (TSPA), and the Commonwealth's *Environmental Protection, Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999* (EPBCA). Flora surveys was not limited to threatened flora species listed under TSPA & EPBCA but also included species considered within potential range and suitable habitat.

CONSERVATION STATUS							
SPECEIES	TSPA	EPBC	COMMENTS				
		Threatene	d Fauna within 500 metres				
Accipiter novaehollandiae Grey Goshawk	endangered	-	Previously recorded within 500m although is location conflicts with a White-bellied sea eagle recorded in the same location. Not previously recorded on site or at the time of assessment. Proposed development site does not support suitable nesting habitat categories. No nest recorded with 500m or 1km line of sight. Proposed development envelopes not within potential nesting habitat and unlikely to disrupt breeding / nesting activities. No further assessment or referral is required under the TSPA.				
Haliaeetus leucogaster White-bellied sea eagle	vulnerable	-	Not previously recorded on site or at the time of assessment. Previously recorded within 500m to the east. Proposed development will not encroach into areas that represent suitable nesting habitat. Anticipate the proposal will not impact priority habitat, nesting or breeding activities. Anticipate no further assessment or referral is required under the TSPA.				
<i>Lathamus discolor</i> Swift parrot	endangered	Critically Endangered	Not previously recorded on site. Site within Swift parrot Important Breeding Area. No core foraging habitat (<i>Eucalyptus globulus & E.</i> <i>ovata</i>) recorded within the study site. Assessment found DAC vegetation represents a 'Nil' to 'Low' likelihood of potential nesting habitat. Given the proposal will not impact potential foraging or nesting habitat values, no further assessment or referral is required under the TSPA or EPBCA.				
		Threateneo	l Fauna within 5000 metres				
Accipiter novaehollandiae Grey Goshawk	endangered	-	Previously recorded within 500m although is location conflicts with a White-bellied sea eagle recorded in the same location. Not previously recorded on site or at the time of assessment. Proposed development site does not support suitable nesting habitat categories. No nest recorded with 500m or 1km line of sight. Proposed development envelopes not within potential nesting habitat and unlikely to disrupt breeding / nesting activities. No further assessment or referral is required under the TSPA.				
Aquila audax fleayi Tasmanian Wedge-tailed eagle	endangered	Endangered	Not previously recorded on site or at the time of assessment. No nest within 500m or 1km within line-of-sight. Proposed development envelope will not encroach into areas that represent suitable nesting habitat. Anticipate the proposal will not impact priority nesting habitat or breeding activities. Anticipate no further assessment or referral is required under the TSPA or EPBCA.				
Dasyurus maculatus	rare	Vulnerable	Not previously recorded on site or at the time of assessment. The proposed development site does not represent favoured habitat				



Spotted-tailed quoll			values for this species but within range boundaries. Not expected development will result in a significant loss of potential habitat values under Significant Impact Guidelines. Anticipate no further assessment or referral is required under the TSPA or EPBCA
Dasyurus viverrinus Eastern Quoll	-	Endangered	Not previously recorded on site or at the time of assessment. Site represents potential habitat values. Given the proposal is clear of DAC, it is likely the proposal will impact potential habitat but expected the small scale development will result in disturbance only and not result in a significant loss of potential habitat under Significant Impact Guidelines. Anticipate no further assessment or referral is required under the EPBCA.
Haliaeetus leucogaster White-bellied sea eagle	vulnerable	-	Not previously recorded on site or at the time of assessment. Previously recorded within 500m to the east. Proposed development will not encroach into areas that represent suitable nesting habitat. Anticipate the proposal will not impact priority habitat, nesting or breeding activities. Anticipate no further assessment or referral is required under the TSPA.
<i>Hirundapus</i> <i>caudacutus</i> White-throated needletail	-	Vulnerable	Not previously recorded on site. Site assessment indicates considered potential core foraging habitat. Assessment found the DGL & DAC vegetation represents a 'Low' to 'Moderate' likelihood of potential nesting habitat. Given the proposal will not result in significant impacts on potential nesting habitat values, no further assessment or referral is required under the EPBCA.
Lathamus discolor Swift parrot	endangered	Critically Endangered	Not previously recorded on site. Site within Swift parrot Important Breeding Area. <i>Eucalyptus globulus</i> recorded within the study site considered potential core foraging habitat. Assessment found the DGL & DAC vegetation represents a 'Low' likelihood of potential nesting habitat. Given the proposal will not impact potential foraging or nesting habitat values, no further assessment or referral is required under the TSPA or EPBCA.
<i>Litoria raniformis</i> Green and Gold frog	vulnerable	Vulnerable	Not previously recorded or at time of assessment. The site is within potential range boundary of this frog species. Generally recorded from coastal areas of south-eastern and northern Tas. The small dam in the eastern boundary represents potential breeding habitat for this species whilst adjacent woodland that supports logs, rocks and other ground features can be important for feeding and hibernation. Given the proposal will not impact potential habitat values, no further assessment or referral is required under the TSPA or EPBCA.
<i>Sarcophilus harrisii</i> Tasmanian devil	endangered	Endangered	Not previously recorded on site or evidence within the study site at the time of survey. The proposed site is within range boundaries with DAC bushland represents potential refuge habitat for open area to the east. The proposal and future development will result in a loss of potential foraging and priority denning habitat for this species. Despite the disturbance it is not expected future development will result in a significant loss of potential habitat values under Significant Impact Guidelines. Anticipate no further assessment or referral is required under the TSPA or EPBCA.
<i>Thinornis</i> <i>cucullatus</i> Hooded plover	-	PVU	Not previously recorded on site or evidence within the study site at the time of survey. This species restricted to the littoral zone. No further assessment or referral is required under the TSPA or EPBCA.
<i>Thinornis</i> <i>rubricollis</i> Hooded plover	-	vulnerable	Not previously recorded on site or evidence within the study site at the time of survey. This species restricted to the littoral zone. No further assessment or referral is required under the TSPA or EPBCA.
Tyto novaehollandiae Masked owl	endangered	Vulnerable	Not previously recorded on site or at the time of assessment. This endangered species requires mature old growth forest that supports large nesting hollows. Assessment recorded eucalypts within DAC that exceeded 70cm dbh supporting hollows not within DAC. Given the proposal will not impact native vegetation. Unlikely the proposal will impact important nesting or roosting habitat. No



	further	assessment	or	referral	is	required	under	the	TSPA	or
	EPBCA	ι.								

Note: Information outlined above is derived from Department of Natural Resources and Environment (NRE) *Natural Values Atlas, Forestry Practices Authority* (FPA) *Biodiversity Values Database, Threatened Species Unit* for potential habitat values and descriptions and Author's experience.



6. Discussion

At the time of subdivision approval, Rogerson & Birch (Ref: SIMMP10 11022-01) subdivision site plan indicates the approved development envelope for the allotment is positioned within the central section of the allotment (see below). However, to mitigate environmental impacts within the allotment, the current owners would prefer to develop in the southern part of the allotment in an effort to effectively reduced the clearance and conversion of high priority DAC vegetation community.



Figure 20 – Image of approved subdivision showing the original location of approved development envelope an extent of the bushfire hazard management area within 5 Fynbos Court (Lot 3) (REF: A. Welling 2018).



Figure 21 – Image showing proposed location of development within Fynbos Court (Lot 3) and extent of the BAL-19 hazard management area into the high priority vegetation within the study site (green hatching) (Ref: LISTmap TASVEG 4.0 layer).



Threatened flora species

At the time of assessment, DAC vegetation was largely in good condition, however, works to established access tracks and establishment of Boneseed within the study site has resulted in the minor disturbance and alteration to flora structure and species composition. The open area in the southern section supports a mix of native grass species classified as human induced Lowland grassland complexes vegetation community (GCL) (Kitchner & Harris 2005).

Assessment indicates the current proposed development access, development site and BAL-19 hazard management area will impact potential habitat for some threatened flora species, it is anticipated the proposal is unlikely to result in a significant loss of potential habitat for threatened flora previously recorded within 5km.

Vegetation community types and distribution

Site assessment indicates the vegetation structure and species composition of bushland is consistent with TASVEG 4.0 dry *Eucalyptus amygdalina* woodland/forest shrubby facies (DAC) (Kitchner & Harris 2013). The open area in the southern section supports a mix of native grass species classified as human induced Lowland grassland complexes vegetation community (GCL) (Kitchner & Harris 2005 Classification of the Lowland Native Grasslands of Tasmania ecological community under the National Vegetation Information System (NVIS) version 3.1. Current October 2008.(Ref: P10, *From Forest to Fjaeldmark Ed 2, Lowland Native Grasslands of Tasmania Listing Advice - Page 10*).

Sorell Council Local Provisions Schedule classify DAC vegetation within the allotment as priority under the Natural Assets Code (Code #7) (see Figure 4). Generally, the classification and distribution of such priority is generated at a desktop level and can display discrepancies to actual on-ground distribution. Whilst the priority vegetation area boundary does not encapsulate all the vegetation within the site, it is anticipated all vegetation within the study site is classified as priority vegetation.

The original subdivision site plan (Rogerson & Birch SIMMP10 11022-01) indicates the proposed development envelope was positioned centrally within the allotment. In comparison to the current development site proposal that encompasses a section of GCL, it is likely this original configuration would impact a significantly larger area of priority DAC to establish the BAL-19 HMA. DAC and GCL are not listed as a threatened vegetation community under Tasmania's *Nature Conservation Act 2002* (see planning implications).

Fauna

Swift parrot

Geographically the allotment is within Swift Parrot Important Breeding Areas (SPIBA's) with Swift parrot observations to the 600m to the north-east of the site. Site assessment did not record potential core foraging habitat within the study site. A survey found the proposal will not impact potential nesting habitat values.

Tasmanian Wedge-tailed eagle, White-bellied sea eagle and Grey Goshawk

The site is within range boundaries of the Tasmanian Wedge-tailed eagle and White-bellied sea eagle. Ground based habitat assessment found the study site did not support typical suitable nesting vegetation types and proximity to surrounding rural and residential style development indicates the site does not represent potential nesting habitat.

Masked Owl

A survey for potential nesting habitat recorded a single tree exceeding 1m dbh in the north-west corner of the study site clear of development. One hollow was recorded however, assessment found it was unlikely to be large enough for a Masked owl. Devils, Quolls & Eastern-barred bandicoots



The site is within range boundaries for Devils and Quolls, and it is likely the proposal will impact potential habitat for the Tasmanian Devil, Eastern and Spotted-tailed Quolls and to a lesser extent, the Eastern-barred bandicoot. Ground based assessment recorded no evidence such as scats or dens, of quolls or devils during surveys. It is anticipated the proposal will impact potential foraging habitat for these species, but likely impacts will be limited to disturbance only and not result in a significant loss of potential core denning or foraging habitat.

Planning implications

C7.0 Natural Assets Code

A desktop assessment indicates DAC and GCL vegetation communities within the study site are classified as 'Priority' vegetation under the TSP and Sorell Local Provisions Schedule C7.0 Natural Assets Code. In accordance with clause C7.6.2 *Clearance within a priority vegetation area* (C7.6 Development Standards for Buildings and Works), it appears the proposal does not satisfy A1 Acceptable Solutions (*not within a building area on sealed plan approved under this planning scheme*. However, assessment indicates the proposal addresses Performance Criteria P1.1, in that: '*Clearance of native vegetation within a priority vegetation area must be for:*

(a) an existing use on the site, provided any clearance is contained within the minimum area necessary to be cleared to provide adequate bushfire protection, as recommended by the Tasmania Fire Service or an accredited person:

The current development application proposes and alteration to the previously approved subdivision and BAL-19 development envelope. Whilst the new proposal is also BAL-19 construction standard, site assessment indicates the proposed new location will effectively minimise clearance and conversion to establish the required bushfire hazard management area (HMA) as outlined in L. Brightman's bushfire hazard report (Ref: 52245-01).

(b) buildings and works associated with the construction of a single dwelling or an associated outbuilding;

The application indicates the proposal is associated with the construction of a Class 1A dwelling and associated outbuilding,

- (c) subdivision in the General Residential Zone or Low Density Residential Zone; New allotment within the Rural Living: Zone A (Zone #11),
- (d) use or development that will result in significant long term social and economic benefits and there is no feasible alternative location or design;
 The approved subdivision provides land for rural / residential style development that would be consistent with the size of surrounding properties,
- (e) clearance of native vegetation where it is demonstrated that on-going pre-existing management cannot ensure the survival of the priority vegetation and there is little potential for long-term persistence,

Assessment indicates the proposed subdivision footprint and designated development envelopes have been re-located to minimise impacts to priority DAC vegetation community. Flora assessment indicates typical recruitment levels and moderate potential for long term persistence for remaining priority DAC and CGL vegetation communities.

(f) the clearance of native vegetation that is of limited scale relative to the extent of priority vegetation on the site,

Assessment of the approved Rogerson & Birch Subdivision indicates the proposed new development site will effectively reduce and minimise impacts to DAC vegetation community. Assessment also indicates the current proposal is of typical scale to surrounding rural / residential style development.



Performance Criteria P1.2:

'Clearance of native vegetation within a priority vegetation area must minimise adverse impacts on priority vegetation, having regard to:

a) the design and location of buildings and works and any constraints such as topography or land hazards;

Assessment indicates the proposed new development site in the southern section of the allotment has been relocated clear of moderate gradients to mitigate environmental impacts to priority DAC vegetation and potential threatened flora and fauna habitat values.

- *b)* any particular requirements for the buildings and works; N/A,
- c) minimising impacts resulting from bushfire hazard management measures through siting and fire-resistant design of habitable building;

Assessment of Lark & Creese Hazard Management Plan 52245-01 indicates the proposed new development site have been re-positioned to mitigate impacts associated with the hazard management area but will require the clearance and conversion of priority DAC vegetation occupying the designated development envelopes. Proposed rural / residential style development is consistent with the size and scale of surrounding development,

- *d)* any mitigation measures implemented to minimise the residual impacts on priority vegetation; The proposed new BAL-19 construction standard is the same BAL rating as the previously approved BAL-19 construction standard and will not result in additional impacts to priority DAC vegetation community,
- e) any on-site biodiversity offsets; Remaining priority DAC vegetation community within the allotment is protected under the Natural Asserts Code. DAC could provide an appropriate offset under 'Guidelines for the use of Biodiversity Offsets in the local planning approval process' under Tasmania's Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993,

f) any existing cleared areas on the site;
 Despite allotment boundary setback limitations and provisions requiring the HMA to be wholly contained within the allotment, assessment indicates the proposed new development site and associated HMA will incorporate an area of human induced GCL vegetation. Access will be entirely contained within GCL.

In accordance with 11.4: *Development Standards for Buildings and Works* it appears the proposal meets with 11.4.1 *Site coverage* objectives. It appears the proposal does not satisfy A1 Acceptable Solutions. However, assessment indicates the proposal addresses alternative Performance Criteria P1.1, in that:

'The site coverage must be consistent with that existing on established properties in the area, having regard to:

(a) The topography of the site:

The proposed alternate development site demonstrates the proposal can support and comply with Tasmanian Fire Service recommended Bushfire Attack Level -19 (BAL) construction standard outlined in Lark & Creese Bushfire Hazard Management and allotment boundary setbacks.

- (b) The capacity of the site to absorb runoff; Subject to assessment by geotechnical engineer.
- (c) The size and shape of the site; Not applicable.
- (d) The existing buildings and any constraints imposed by existing development; Not applicable.
- (e) The need to remove vegetation, and



Assessment indicates the proposed alternative development site and extent vegetation removal is likely to be less than the previously approved development envelope and will not result in the fragmentation of the surrounding vegetation community.

(f) The character of development existing of established properties in the area:

Assessment shows the size of the allotments within the approved subdivision provides for rural / residential style development that would be consistent with the size of surrounding properties,

In accordance with 11.4: *Development Standards for Buildings and Works* it appears the proposal meets with 11.4.2 *Buildings heights, setback and siting* objectives. It appears the proposal satisfies A1, A2, A3 & A4 Acceptable Solutions.

Stormwater Management Code

Stormwater quantity requirements must always comply with requirements of the local authority including catchment-specific standards. All stormwater flow management estimates should be prepared according to methodologies described in Australian Rainfall and Runoff (Engineering Australia 2004) or through catchment modelling completed by a suitably qualified person. Providing the proposal comply with standards, it appears the proposal complies in that 'Stormwater from new impervious surfaces must be managed by any of the following'

a) Collected for re-use on the site. Site plans indicate the stormwater will be collected on-site for re-use in 225000L collection tanks. Overflow point will implement mechanisms to mitigate erosion and mobilisation of sediments.

On-site Wastewater Management Code

Providing the wastewater management system is appropriately designed and located to geotechnical specifications by approved manufactures and installed by certified operators within the HMA, it appears there is sufficient separation distances to adjacent vegetation and WCPA's and unlikely the output of tertiary treated wastewater will result in any long-term residual impacts on native vegetation down-slope from the facility or surface or groundwater quality. Site plans indicate the land application area is of sufficient size to comply with the requirements of AS/NZ1547.



7. Conclusion

Threatened flora

Assessment of the study site indicates previous land use and vegetation management practices within the study site have in some cases reduced habitat values, native vegetation communities DAC and GCL represent potential habitat for a number of threatened flora species recorded within 5km including *Vittadinia muelleri*, *Austrostipa bigeniculata* and *Cotula vulgaris* var. *australasica*. Assessment indicates the proposed alteration to the development site will result in the loss of DAC and GCL vegetation community however, given the scale of proposed development, it is unlikely development and establishment of the BAL-19 hazard management area will result in a significant loss of critical habitat values for threatened flora previously recorded within 5km of the site. No further assessment or permit under Section 51 of Tasmania's *Threatened Species Protection Act 1995*. No formal referral to the Commonwealth's Department of Environment under *Significant Impact Guidelines*.

Vegetation communities

At the time of assessment, native vegetation communities within the study site are consistent with TASVEG 4.0 (Kitchner & Harris, 2013) descriptions and benchmark species associated with DAC The small area open area occupying the southern section of the study site has been classified as Lowland grassland complex (GCL) under the TASVEG classification. At the time of assessment and in accordance with criteria in Policy 3.18 of the EPBCA, these areas do not qualify as the EPBCA listed 'Lowland Native Grasslands of Tasmania'.

A site plan indicates the proposed alteration to the location of the approved development envelope will move the development site clear of Council's high priority vegetation layer however, knowing these areas are identified through desktop mapping, it is likely this is a mapping error and therefore should be considered high priority. As indicated, the current proposal will still require the removal of priority DAC vegetation community however, it appears the new location of the development site in the southern section of the allotment will reduce the impacts to DAC to the southern margin and will not impact the core area of DAC veg community occupying the central and northern section of the allotment thereby avoiding fragmentation of the larger DAC community. DAC and GCL are not listed as threatened vegetation communities under Schedule 3A of Tasmania's *Nature Conservation Act 2002* and therefore will not require further assessment or referral under Tasmania's Nature *Conservation Act 2002* or the *Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993* however, where possible no further removal of DAC should occur without appropriate approval.

Threatened fauna

Swift parrots have been recorded within 500m to the east of the study site however, no potential core foraging habitat (*Eucalyptus globulus* or *E. ovata*) was recorded. Site assessment for potential nesting habitat values (eucalypts >70cm dbh) found the DAC veg community represent Nil to Low potential nesting habitat. Site assessment indicates the current proposal will impact DAC vegetation but will not impact potential habitat values. On this basis, the proposal is not considered a threatening process under the Significant Impact Guidelines issued by the Commonwealth agency for this species. No further assessment or referral required under Tasmania's *Threatened Species Protection Act 1995* or the Commonwealth's Department of Environment under *Significant Impact Guidelines*.

Desktop assessment also indicates the Grey Goshawk has previously been recorded within 500m of the site. Site assessment found the proposed development site does not represent potential nesting habitat values for this species, or other raptor species including the Tasmanian Wedge-tailed eagle or the White-bellied sea eagle. Given the proposal will not impact potential habitat values and no nests have been recorded within 500m or 1km line of sight, no further assessment or referral is required
under Tasmania's *Threatened Species Protection Act 1995* or the Commonwealth's Department of Environment under *Significant Impact Guidelines*.

Whilst not recorded within 500m of the site, the area is within range boundaries for the Tasmanian Devil, Eastern quoll and Eastern-barred bandicoot. Site assessment indicates the current proposal will result in the loss of potential habitat for these species but not expected impacts will result in a significant loss of foraging a refuge habitat for these species. However, development and future occupation and possible introduction of domestic pets is likely to place extra pressure and further restrict range boundaries. Despite these likely impacts, the proposal is not considered a threatening process under the Significant Impact Guidelines for these species issued by the Commonwealth agency. No further assessment or referral required under Tasmania's *Threatened Species Protection Act 1995* or the Commonwealth's Department of Environment under *Significant Impact Guidelines*.

Weed management

Boneseed and Serrated tussock recorded within the study site are listed as Declared weed species and Weeds of National Significance under the Tasmanian *Weed Management Act 1999*. Under this Act, landowners are obligated to manage 'Declared' weed species in accordance with respective Statutory Weed Management Plans. Management objectives for Serrated tussock and Boneseed in the Sorell Municipality is eradication (Zone A) and Containment (Zone B) respectively. Best hygiene management practices require all plant and soil material to be retained on site in designated locations with machinery cleaned in accordance with guidelines (see management recommendations). Provided management recommendations are implemented it is anticipated management objectives for both Serrated tussock and Boneseed can be achieved.

Providing future development is limited to the proposed development site identified and, the management recommendations for the BAL-19 bushfire hazard management area are complied with, is not anticipated the impacts to DAC and CGL vegetation communities, will compromise the existing ecological systems and functions within the vegetation communities or surrounding environs. Significant Impact Guidelines issued by the Commonwealth Dept of the Environment to determine if referral to the department is required, indicates the proposal will not:

- Significantly impact native vegetation or a native vegetation community,
- Directly impact potential threatened species habitat,
- Lead to a long-term decrease in the size of populations, reduce area of occupancy of a significant population, fragment an existing population or destroy habitat critical to the survival of species,
- Disrupt the breeding cycle of an important population,
- Modify, destroy, remove or isolate or decrease the availability or quality of habitat to the extent that the species is likely to decline,
- Result in invasive species that are harmful to a threatened species becoming established I the threatened species habitat.

As such, it is unlikely the proposal will result in "significant impacts" as described in the EPBC Act. No further assessment or referral is required under Tasmania's *Threatened Species Protection Act* 1995 or Commonwealth's *Environmental Protection Biodiversity Conservation Act* 1999.



8. References

A Census of the Vascular Plants of Tasmania and Index to the Student's Flora of Tasmania and Flora of Tasmania Online (2014 ed) MF de Salas & ML Baker. Tasmanian Herbarium, Tasmanian Museum and Art Gallery, Hobart, Tasmania, 7001.

Department of Primary Industries, Parks, Water and Environment, 2000, TASVEG 2000 Manual, Department of Primary Industries, Parks, Water and Environment, Hobart.

Department of Primary Industries, Parks, Water and Environment. *Threatened Native Vegetation Communities 2014*, Released May 2015. Tasmanian Vegetation Monitoring and Mapping Program, Natural and Cultural Heritage Division

Duncan, F. (1996). 'A field key to Tasmanian species of Eucalyptus' Tasforests vol. 8, Forestry Tasmania. Tasmanian State Government, Government Printer, Hobart, Tasmania.

Environmental Protection & Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999. Commonwealth Government, Office of Legislative Drafting and Publishing, Canberra.

Forest Practices Act (1985). Tasmanian State Government, Government Printer, Hobart, Tasmania.

Forest Practices Authority. 'Eagle Nest Searching, Activity Checking and Nest Management' Version 2.2 Fauna Technical Note No. 1, Forest Practices Authority, Hobart, Tasmania.

Forest Practices Authority. 'Identifying swift Parrot breeding Habitat', Fauna Technical Note No. 3 Forest Practices Authority, Hobart, Tasmania.

Forest Practices Authority. 'Identifying Tasmanian devil and Spotted-tail Quoll habitat', Fauna Technical Note No. 10. Forest Practices Authority, Hobart, Tasmania.

Forest Practices Authority. '*Phytophthora cinnamomi* in working forests', Flora Technical Note No. 8. Forest Practices Authority, Hobart, Tasmania.

Forest Practices Authority 2010, 'Goshawk habitat categories', Fauna Technical Note No. 12, Forest Practices Authority, Hobart, Tasmania.

Forest Practices Authority.' Nest identification', Fauna Technical Note No. 14 'Forest Practices Authority, Hobart, Tasmania.

Forest Practices Authority.' Identifying Masked Owl habitat', Fauna Technical Note No. 17 'Forest Practices Authority, Hobart, Tasmania.

Forest Practices Authority (2005). Forest Botany Manual: Module 6 – D'Entrecasteaux Region. Forest Practices Authority, Tasmania.

Forest Practices Authority (2013), 'Wedge-tailed Eagle Nest Monitoring Project 2007–12: Nest site use, timing of breeding, and a review of the nesting habitat model', Report to Roaring 40s, Threatened Species and Marine Section (NRE), April 2013, Forest Practices Authority Scientific Report.

Forest Practices Authority 2012, Biodiversity landscape planning guideline: a framework for managing biodiversity values, including RFA priority species, across the landscape in areas covered



by the Tasmanian forest practices system - a report to the Commonwealth Government and the Forest Practices Authority, July 2012.

Forest Practices Authority (2010) Interim Species Habitat Planning Guideline for the conservation management of Lathamus discolor (Swift Parrot) in areas regulated under the Tasmanian Forest Practices System. Internal report to the Forest Practices Authority, Hobart, Tasmania.

Goff, F.G, Dawson, G.A. and Rochow, J.J. (1982). 'Site Examination for Threatened and Endangered Plant Species'. Environmental Management 6 (4) pp 307-316.

Harris, S & Kitchener, A. eds (2005). From Forest to Fjaeldmark: Descriptions of Tasmania's Vegetation. Department of Primary Industries, Water and Environment, Printing Authority of Tasmania, Hobart.

HYPERLINK "http://www.dpiw.tas.gov.au/inter" http://www.dpiw.tas.gov.au/inter

Koch, A. 'Tree hollows in Tasmania: A Guide' FPA Hollows Project Officer. CRC for Forestry and the Forest Practices Authority, November 2009.

Land Use Planning and Approvals Act (1993). Tasmanian State Government, No. 70 of 1993. Government printer, Hobart, Tasmania.

Nicolle, D. 2006, 'Eucalypts of Victoria and Tasmania' Blooming Books, Melbourne, Australia.

North, A. & Barker, P. (2004) 'Vegetation Assessment – Sandy Bay Developments' North Barker, 163 Campbell Street, Hobart, TAS, 7000.

Schrammeyer, E., 2005. Southern Tasmanian Weed Strategy, Management Regional Committee (NRM South) NRM South, Hobart.

Tasmanian State Government (2023). Tasmanian Planning Scheme – State Planning Provisions

Tasmanian State Government (1993). *Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993*. No. 70 of 1993. Government Printer, Hobart, Tasmania.

Tasmanian State Government (2002). Nature Conservation Act 2002. No. 63 of 2002. Government Printer, Hobart, Tasmania.

Tasmanian State Government (1995). *Threatened Species Protection Act 1995*. No. 83 of 1995. Government Printer, Hobart, Tasmania.

Tasmanian State Government (1999). Tasmanian Weed Management Act 1999. Government Printer, Hobart, Tasmania.

Tasmanian State Government (1997). Tasmanian *Plant Quarantine Act*: Section 12 – Publications of pests and diseases. Government Printer, Hobart, Tasmania.

Threatened Species Unit; Threatened Flora of Tasmania. NRE, 2003.



http://NRE.tas.gov.au/conservation/threatened-species/lists-of-threatened-species/threatenedspecies-vertebrates/wedge-tailed-eagle

Wapstra, M., Wapstra, A., Wapstra. H. 2010. 'Tasmanian Plant Names Unravelled' Fullers Books, Launceston, Tasmania.

Wapstra, M., Roberts, N., Wapstra, H. & Wapstra, A. (2010). Flowering Times of Tasmanian Orchids: A Practical Guide for Field Botanists. Self-published by the authors (September 2010 version).

Young, D. (2020) 'Conservation of the 'endangered' Grey Goshawk in south-east Tasmania - *Interim Nesting Habitat Technical Note*.



30765_52538_02

9. Appendix A - Vascular plants species list.

VASCULAR PLANT SPECIES LIST 5 Fynbos Court, Primrose Sands

I = Introduced; E = Endemic; D = Declared weed under Tas *Weed Management Act 1999*; e = Environmental weed WoNS – Weed on National Significance

DICOTYLEDON

AIZOA	CEAE		
	Tetragonia implexicoma	Ice plant	
ASTEF	RACEAE		
Ι	Cirsium vulgare	Spear thistle	
	Cassinia aculeata	Dolly bush	
Ι	Chrysanthemoides monilifera	Boneseed	D, WoNS
	Euchiton sp		
	Lagenophora stipitata Senecio minimus		
CASU	ARINACEAE		
011001	Allocasuarina littoralis	Bull sheoak	
	Allocasuarina verticillata	Drooping sheoak	
CAMP	ANULACEAE		
	Wahlenbergia gracilis	Tall bluebell	
CHEN	OPODIACEAE		
	Einadia nutans	Climbing saltbush	
CONV	OLVULACEAE		
	Dichondra repens	Kidney weed	
DROSI	ERACEAE		
	Drosera peltata	Pale sundew	
EPACH	RIDACEAE		
	Epacris impressa	Common heath	
ERICA	CEAE		
	Acrotriche serrulata	Ants delight	
	Astroloma humifusum	Native cranberry	
	Lissanthe strigosa subsp. subulata		
FABA	CEAE		
	Acacia dealbata subsp dealbata	Silver wattle	
	Acacia mearnsii	Black wattle	
	Acacia melanoxylon	Blackwood	
	Acacia siculiformis	Dagger wattle	
	Bossiaea prostrata	Creeping bossia	
	Daviesia ulicifolia Dultangga daphugidas	Native gorse	
	r unenaea aapnnoiaes	nearuear bushpea	



Pultenaea juniperina

GENTIANACEAE

I Centaurium erythraea

GERANIACEAE Geranium sp

GOODENEACEAE Goodenia lanata

HALORAGACEAE Gonocarpus tetragynus Gonocarpus teucrioides

LAURACEAE Cassytha pubescens

MYRTACEAE Eucalyptus globulus Eucalyptus obliqua Eucalyptus amygdalina var. amygdalina

> Eucalyptus viminalis Leptospermum scoparium

ORCHIDACEAE

Acianthus pusillus Caladenia sp Prasophyllum sp Glossodia major Thelymitra sp Pterostylis sp

PITTOSPORACEAE Bursaria spinosa

ROSACEAE Acaena echinate / novae-zelandiae

SANTALACEAE

Exocarpos cupressiformis Leptomeria drupacea

THYMELAEACEAE Pimelea humilis

MONOCOTYLEDONAE

CYPERACEAE

Lepidosperma concavum Lepidosperma laterale Swordsedge Swordsedge

Prickly bushpea

Century plant

Cranesbill

Trailing native primrose

Common raspwort Forest raspwort

dodder

Blue gum Stringy bark

Common Teatree

Mayfly orchid

Leek orchid Wax-lip orchid Sun orchid Greenhood orchid

Prickly box

Buzzy

Native cherry



30765_52538_02

HEMEROCALLIDACEAE Dianella revoluta

IRIDACEAE

Diplarrena moraea

JUNCUSACEAE Juncus pallidus

LOMANDRACEAE

Lomandra longifolia

POACEAE

- I Aira caryophyllea
- I Agrostis capillaris
- I Agrostis stolonifera
- I Anthoxanthum odoratum Austrodanthonia caespitosa Austrodanthonia geniculata Austrostipa flavescens
- I Briza minor
- I Bromus hordeaceus
- I Cynosurus echinatus
- I Dactylis glomerata Deyeuxia quadriseta Deyeuxia sp. Dichelachne crinita Dichelachne sp. Lachnagrostis sp.
- I Phalaris sp. Festuca sp
- I Holcus lanatus
- I Nasella trichotoma Poa labillarderei var. labillardierei Poa sieberiana var sieberiana Poa rodwayi Rytidosperma caespitosum Rytidosperma racemosum var. racemosum Themeda triandra

Spreading flaxlily

White flag-iris

Pale rush

Sagg

Silvery hairgrass Browntop bent Creeping bent Sweet vernal grass Common wallaby grass Kneed wallaby grass

lesser quaking-grass soft brome Rough dogstail Cocksfoot Reed bentgrass bent grass longhair plumegrass plume-grass blown grass canarygrass

Fog grass Serrated tussock Silver tussock grass Grey tussock grass velvet tussockgrass common wallabygrass stiped wallabygrass Kangaroo grass

D, WoNS



10. Appendix C - Supporting	g documentation.
Author	Description / Summary
Lark & Creese	Bushfire Hazard Assessment Report 5 Fynbos Court, Primrose Sands
	#52245-01_BHMP
Andy Welling	Enviro-dynamics. Environmental Values Report For the proposed
	subdivision at Lot 4 Primrose Sands Road, Primrose Sands, October
	2018
Rogerson & Birch	Proposed Subdivision Ref: SIMMP10 11022-01, 21-06-2018

10. Appendix C - Supporting documentation.

Definitions of terms

Term /	Definition
Acronym	
BAL	Bushfire Attack Level
BHA	Bushfire Hazard Assessment
C.T.	Certificate of Title
DVG	Dry Eucalyptus viminalis woodland vegetation community
DAC	Dry Eucalyptus amygdalina on sediments woodland vegetation community
EPBC	Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 (Commonwealth)
FAG	Agricultural / Modified land
FPA	Forestry Practices Authority
FRG	Regenerating land
FUR	Urban / Modified land
FWU	Weed infestation
HMA	Hazard Management Area
TPS	Tasmanian Planning Scheme
LUPA	Land Use Planning and Approvals Act (1993) Tasmania.
NBA	Bursaria / Acacia woodland
NCA	Nature Conservation Act 2002 (Tasmanian)
NRE	Department of Natural Resources and Environment
Pc	Phytophthora cinnamomi
TPZ	Tree Protection Zone
TSPA	Threatened Species Protection Act 1995 (Tasmanian)
WMA	Weed Management Act 1995 (Tasmanian)
WCPA	Waterways and Coastal Protection Area

Disclaimer

Although the Author (*Douglas Summers*) has used all due care in providing information made available in this report, to the extent permitted by law, the Author otherwise excludes all warranties of any kind, either expressed or implied. To the extent permitted by law, you agree The Author is not liable to you or any other person or entity for any loss or damage caused or alleged to have been caused (including loss or damage resulting from negligence), either directly or indirectly, by use of the information made available to you in this report. Without limiting this disclaimer, in no event will the Author be liable to you for any lost revenue or profits, or for special, indirect, consequential or incidental damage (however caused and regardless of the theory of liability) arising out of or related to your use of that information, even if the Author has been advised of the possibility of such loss or damage. This disclaimer is governed by the law in force in the State of Tasmania, Australia.

General Report Assumptions:



- Any legal description provided to the Author is assumed to be correct. Any titles and ownerships to any property are assumed to be correct. No responsibility is assumed for matters outside the consultant's control,
- The Author assumes that any property or project is not in violation of any applicable codes, ordinances, statutes or other local, state or federal government regulations,
- The Author shall take care to obtain all information from reliable sources. All data shall be verified insofar as possible; however,
- the Author can neither guarantee nor be responsible for the accuracy of the information provided by others not directly under the Author's control,
- The Author shall be not required to give testimony or to attend court by reason of the report unless subsequent contractual arrangements are made, including payment of an additional fee for such services,
- Loss of the report or alteration of any part of the report not undertaken by the Author invalidates the entire report,
- Possession of the report or a copy thereof does not imply right of publication or use for any purpose by anyone but the Client or their directed representatives, without the prior consent of the Author,
- The report and any values expressed therein represent the opinion of The Author and The Author's fee is in no way conditional upon the reporting of a specified value, a stipulated result, the occurrence of a subsequent event, nor upon any finding to be reported,
- Sketches, diagrams, graphs and photographs used in the report, being intended as visual aids, are not

necessarily to scale and should not be construed as engineering or architectural drawings, reports or surveys,

- Unless expressed otherwise:
 - Information contained in the report will cover those items that were outlined in the project brief or that were examined during the assessment and reflect the condition of those items at the time of inspection; and
 - The inspection is limited to visual examination of accessible components without dissection, excavation or probing unless otherwise stipulated.
- There is no warranty or guarantee, expressed or implied by The Author., that the problems or deficiencies of the plants or site in question may not arise in the future,
- All instructions (verbal or written) that define the scope of the report have been included in the report and all documents and other materials that The Author has been instructed to consider or to take into account in preparing the report have been included or listed within the report,
- To The Author's knowledge all facts, matter and all assumptions upon which the report proceeds have been stated within the body of the report and all opinion contained within the report will be fully researched and referenced and any such opinion not duly researched is based upon the writers experience and observations.

Copyright notice:

©Lark & Creese 2025. All rights reserved, except as expressly provided otherwise in this publication.



30765_52538_02





AP2024-2418 - PROPOSED WILSON RESIDENCE 5 Fynbos Court PRIMROSE SANDS

SHEET		DRAWING TITLE
01		LOCATION PLAN
01a	А	SITE PLAN
01b	А	DRAINAGE LOCATIO
01c	А	DRAINAGE PLAN
01d		EROSION & SEDIME
02		LOWER GROUND &
02a		FIRST FLOOR PLAN
03	А	ELEVATIONS SHEET
03a		ELEVATIONS SHEET
03b		PERSPECTIVE VIEW
03c		PERSPECTIVE VIEW
03d	А	SHED PLAN & ELEV
03e	А	RETAINING WALL E

Development Application: 5.2025.57.1 -Response to Request For Information - 5 Fynbos Court, Primrose Sands - P3.pdf Plans Reference: P3 Date Received: 09/04/2025

Notes Builder to verify all dimensions and levels on site prior to commencement of work All work to be carried out in accordance	Designer: ANOTHER PERSPECTIVE PTY LTD PO BOX 171	Client / Project info PROPOSED WILSON RESIDENCE	Soil Classification: Title Reference: Floor Areas: Porch / Deck Areas:
 All materials to be installed according to manufacturers specifications. 	NORTH HOBART LIC. NO. 685230609 (S. Turvey) Ph: (03) 6231 4122	5 Fynbos Court PRIMROSE SANDS	Climate Zone: Alpine Zone:
 Do not scale from these drawings. No changes permitted without consultation with designer. 	Fx: (03) 6231 4166 Email: info@anotherperspective.com.au		Certified BAL: Designed BAL: (Refer to Standard Notes for Expl

		_			
Α	Council RFI: Additional details around retaining walls, parking spaces, stormwater detention & shed	09 Apr. 2025	RJ	CK	01a-01c,03,03d & 03e
	max build height				
	DA plan set	03 Feb. 2025	RJ	CK	01-03
No.	Amendment	Date	Drawn	Checked	Sheet

ON PLAN

ENT CONTROL PLAN GROUND FLOOR PLANS

T 1 T 2 VS 1 VS 2 /ATIONS SHEET ELEVATIONS SHEET

M CT179164/3 See floor plans		COVER S	HEET
74.81m² N3			AP2024-2418
7 N/A	Date	20 January 2025	Sheet
Very High BAL 19	Scale		
BAL 19			00/03



0.2m contour interval BOUNDARIES SOURCED FROM PLANS PROVIDED BY CLIENT & TITLE INFORMATION







with designer.

No.

Date

Int.

Amendment changes as per cover sheet

info@anotherperspective.com.au

					חו
	•	ALL			
	1	Appreviation		ure	Win. Outlet Size
	1	В	l Ba	ISIN	40Ø
	1	Bth	Ba	ath	40Ø (incl. trap)
	1	Shr	Sho	ower	40Ø (Note 3)
25 57 1 -	1	S	S	nk	500
20.07.1 -		Tr	Tro	uah	400
rmation - 5 Fynbos	5	WC	Water C	loset Don	1007
lf	1	VVC	water C	iusel Pan	1000
II.	1	a.p.		npipe	9010
	1	ORG	Overflo	w Kelief	100Ø
			Gi	ully	
	-	FWG	Floor Wa	aste Gully	65Ø (Note 2)
			S	ewer Line	(100Ø UPVC)
			(unless not	ed otherwise)
			Ctor	mulator Li	a (1000 LID)(C)
			3101	IIIWalei Li	
			(uniess not	ed otherwise)
			Stor	mwater Li	ne (150Ø UPVC)
			(unless not	ed otherwise)
		1. Flexible col pipes emergin accordance w 2. Untrapped trap not acce: 3. 50Ø require 4. Showers to 5. Falls to floo maximum 1:5	nnections ng from b with AS28 Bath tub ssible from ed for mu comply v or waste to 0	are to be eneath the 70 & AS/N pipe to co n below or hitple show with N.C.C b be minim	installed on any building in ZS3500.2:2021. nnect to FWG if access panel. er heads. 10.2.14. um 1:80 &
^h 2 ⁴⁵ ∂r					
				Refe	r to Roof Plan for npipe calculations
All work WSA 03 Australia MRWA	s are to in a -2011-3.1 Ve a Melbourne Version 2.0 a	ccordance with ersion 3.1 MRW Retail Water A and TasWater's	the Wate /A Edition gencies (supplem	r Supply C V2.0 and Code WSA ents to the	ode of Australia Sewerage Code o 02-2014-3.1 se codes.
ROOF L Min. me N.C.C. p max. roo	DRAINAGE N dium rectan part 7.4. The of catchmen	IOTE: gular gutter & r se sizes and do t area of 70m ²	min. 90ø c ownpipe o	lownpipe s quantities a	specified as per are based on a
	0	7.5	15	22.5	30m 1:750
	DR	AINAGE	LOC		I PLAN
thor	Drawn		RJ	AP2024	-2418
ווונו	Data	oo = :	000-	Shoot	
nochive	Dale	03 Febru	ary 2025	SILEEL	
Dective	Scala		1.750		
drafting 0 design	Jualt		1.700	1	n/117
∎aranng∝aesign					$(J/(J_{1}))$





	Soil Refe dep All M AS/I	il classification: M fer to Soil Report for nominated founding pth and description of founding material. Materials and construction to comply with VNZ3500 Part 2 & Part 3	 Notes Builder to verify all dimensions and levels on site prior to commencement of work All work to be carried out in accordance with the current National Construction Code. All materials to be installed according to manufacturers specifications. Do not scale from these drawings. 	Designer: ANOTHER PERSPECTIVE PTY LTD PO BOX 171 NORTH HOBART LIC. NO. 685230609 (S. Turvey) Ph: (03) 6231 4122 Fx: (03) 6231 4166	Client / Project info PROPOSED WILSON RESIDENCE 5 Fynbos Court PRIMROSE SANDS	and
			Do not scale from these drawings. No changes permitted without consultation	Fx: (03) 6231 4166 Email:		Pere
Date Ir	nt. Amer	endment changes as per cover sheet	with designer.	info@anotherperspective.com.au		







Colour
Woodland Grey
Woodland Grey
Dune

♦ - W18,W19,
W20-W24
& W28 & W29
Protection of openable
windows to comply with
N.C.C. 11.3.7 & 11.3.8

pment Application: 5.2025.57.1 esponse to Request For Information - 5 Fynbos ourt, Primrose Sands - P3.pdf lans Reference: P3 ate Received: 09/04/2025

		ELEVATIONS	SHEET 1
	Drawn	RJ	AP2024-2418
e ign	Date	20 January 2025	Sheet
	Scale	1 : 100	02/02
		Capurisht®	00/00





No.

Development Application: 5.2025.57.1 -Response to Request For Information - 5 Fynbos Court, Primrose Sands - P3.pdf Plans Reference: P3 Date Received: 09/04/2025



				 Notes Builder to verify all dimensions and levels on site prior to commencement of work All work to be carried out in accordance with the current National Construction Code. All materials to be installed according to manufacturers specifications. Do not scale from these drawings. 	Designer: ANOTHER PERSPECTIVE PTY LTD PO BOX 171 NORTH HOBART LIC. NO. 685230609 (S. Turvey) Ph: (03) 6231 4122 Ex: (03) 6231 4165	Client / Project info PROPOSED WILSON RESIDENCE 5 Fynbos Court PRIMROSE SANDS	anoth
-				 Do not scale from these drawings. No changes permitted without consultation 	Fx: (03) 6231 4166 Email:		perspe
Date	Int.	Amendment changes as per cover sheet Shadows shown for st	ylisations purpose only	with designer.	into@anotherperspective.com.au		

	PERSPECTIVE VIEWS 1			
or	Drawn	??	AP2024-2418	
	Date	??/??/??	Sheet	
ective	Scale		02h/02	
affing&design		Copyright ©	000/00	

No.



Copyright ©

		Notes Builder to verify all dimensions and levels on site prior to commencement of work	Designer:	Client / Project info	
Doto	Amandmont abanaga as par aguar abast	 All work to be carried out in accordance with the current National Construction Code. All materials to be installed according to manufacturers specifications. Do not scale from these drawings. No changes permitted without consultation with designer 	ANOTHER PERSPECTIVE PTY LTD PO BOX 171 NORTH HOBART LIC. NO. 685230609 (S. Turvey) Ph: (03) 6231 4122 Fx: (03) 6231 4166 Email: info@anothernerspective.com au	PROPOSED WILSON RESIDENCE 5 Fynbos Court PRIMROSE SANDS	ano pers
Date IIIt.	Amenument changes as per cover sheet Shadows Sho	JWIT IOT Stylisations purpose only			





			+	
other spective draffing&design	RETAINI Drawn Date Scale	NG WALL SHEE RJ 09 March 2025 1 : 100	ELEVATIONS <u>F</u> AP2024-2418 Sheet 03e/03	<u>}</u>