

# Annexure B

## Table of Issues from the Public Submissions to the EPA

---

Annexure to EPA Assessment No. 1403

Lot 4 Underwood Avenue, Shenton Park Response to  
Public Submissions 2007

*This table summarises the comments made in submissions. For each submission, comments that concern matters relevant to environmental assessment (fauna, vegetation, biodiversity, linkages etc) are noted first. The reference in the final column indicates where in Section 2 of this report the University's response may be found.*

*Where a submission also contains comments about matters outside of the scope of the environmental assessment these are listed under the heading 'Other'. The University's response on these matters may be found as indicated in Section 3 of this report.*

No	Author	Summary of submission	Response
1.	Unknown	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fauna</li> </ul> <p>Negative impact upon 'endangered' species, believed to use this bushland</p> <p>Carnaby's Black Cockatoo</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Habitat</li> <li>Vegetation</li> </ul> <p>Provides carbon sink</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Biodiversity</li> </ul> <p>High value for biodiversity conservation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Linkage/POS</li> </ul> <p>Important linkage between Kings Park and Bold Park – native birds.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bush Forever/Management</li> </ul> <p>Remaining bush only token, subject to degradation</p> <p>Smoke from bushfires will cause complaints from residents – result in bush being converted into European-style park land</p> <p><u>Other</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planning/Odour</li> </ul> <p>Proximity to SWWTP and University Field Station (agricultural chemical sprays)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General issues</li> </ul> <p>Range of educational and research opportunities if bush kept, for University and Shenton College. These outweigh benefit of development.</p>	<p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.4</p> <p>2.1.12</p> <p>2.1.11</p> <p>2.1.10 and 2.2.2</p> <p>2.2.1</p> <p>2.2.3</p> <p>3.3.3</p> <p>3.3.4</p>
2.	Unknown	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Biodiversity</li> </ul>	

No	Author	Summary of submission	Response
		<p>Reduction of bushland unacceptable if serious about biodiversity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Linkage/POS</li> </ul> <p>Important linkage between Kings Park and Bold Park for rare birds</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bush Forever/Management</li> </ul> <p>Little bushland left in metropolitan area</p> <p><u>Other</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General issues</li> </ul> <p>University should find other sites for development</p>	<p>2.1.11</p> <p>2.1.10 and 2.2.2</p> <p>2.1.5</p> <p>3.2.1</p>
3.	Unknown	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fauna</li> </ul> <p>Carnaby's Black Cockatoo roost on site</p> <p>Little Eagle seen to nest in the area</p> <p>List of birds and reptiles (see submission)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Biodiversity</li> </ul> <p>Loss of bushland will put pressure on flora and wildlife</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Linkage/POS</li> </ul> <p>Important linkage between Kings Park and Bold Park for birds.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bush Forever/Management</li> </ul> <p>Proposal worse because conservation area divided in two discrete and spatially separated block</p> <p>Area effects make it difficult to manage</p> <p>Bushland is cited in Perth Bushplan as regionally significant</p> <p><u>Other</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planning/Odour</li> </ul> <p>Additional clearance of bushland for site works</p> <p>Impact of odour on bush means it could be retained in perpetuity</p>	<p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.11</p> <p>2.1.10 and 2.1.2</p> <p>2.2.1 and 2.2.2</p> <p>2.2.1</p> <p>2.1.5</p> <p>3.1.1</p> <p>3.2.1</p>

No	Author	Summary of submission	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General issues</li> </ul> <p>University not a leader in environmental issues, should be</p> <p>Fundraising for teaching and research activities should not be at expense of one of the last bushland areas close to CBD</p>	<p>3.3.1</p> <p>3.3.1 and 2.1.5</p>
4.	Unknown	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fauna</li> </ul> <p>Very little mention of value of fauna, birds, reptiles, frogs and invertebrates</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Biodiversity</li> </ul> <p>Grave threat to biodiversity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Linkage/POS</li> </ul> <p>Important linkage between Kings Park, Shenton bushland, Bold Park and coastal bushland</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bush Forever/Management</li> </ul> <p>Splitting of bushland into two areas will make management of the smaller one near impossible</p> <p>Smaller area unsustainable long term surrounded by dense urban living</p> <p>Extended perimeter will make conservation area extremely sensitive to disturbance</p> <p>Best outcome not to clear any bushland</p> <p><u>Other</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General issues</li> </ul> <p>Scandalous for organisation such as the University that prides itself on excellence to push for inappropriate proposal</p> <p>Standing of University diminished</p> <p>Expertise amongst University staff to formulate best outcome to conserve bushland</p>	<p>2.1.1 and 2.1.3</p> <p>2.1.11</p> <p>2.1.10 and 2.2.2</p> <p>2.2.1 2.2.2</p> <p>2.2.1</p> <p>2.1.5</p> <p>3.3.1</p> <p>3.3.1</p> <p>3.3.4</p>
5.	Unknown	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fauna</li> </ul> <p>Very little habitat left</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Vegetation</li> </ul>	<p>2.1.4</p>



No	Author	Summary of submission	Response
		<p>Little bushland left in the area</p> <p>Cumulative impact of development</p> <p>Increase in greenhouse gases from clearing</p> <p><u>Other</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General issues</li> </ul> <p>No end to University's greed – University is one of wealthiest organisations – don't need to develop bushland</p> <p>Abbey Brook estate has destroyed bushland habitat</p> <p>Edith Cowan University destroying bushland trees and habitat on Churchlands campus</p> <p>Proposed Stephenson Avenue development – small corridor between Newman College and Edith Cowan Campus destroyed</p> <p>Pressure on Government to provide services</p> <p>Development on expensive land v need for cheaper public housing – houses on Lot 4 will be 'large energy gobbling edifices'</p>	<p>2.1.5</p> <p>3.3.6</p> <p>2.1.12</p> <p></p> <p>3.3.1</p> <p>3.3.6</p> <p>3.3.6</p> <p>3.3.6</p> <p>3.4.7</p> <p>3.2.3 and 3.4.7</p>
6.	Unknown	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fauna</li> </ul> <p>EPA should take into account impact on fauna</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Vegetation</li> </ul> <p>EPA should take into account impact on vegetation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Biodiversity</li> </ul> <p>Dependency on all things to fragile part of ecology</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Linkage/POS</li> </ul> <p>Important linkage to Shenton Bushland.</p> <p><u>Other</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Process</li> </ul> <p>Duty of EPA to exercise foresight and common sense</p>	<p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.4</p> <p>2.1.5</p> <p>2.1.11</p> <p>2.2.2</p> <p>3.4.2</p>
7.	Unknown	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bush Forever/Management</li> </ul> <p>Alarmed at plans to destroy bushland</p>	<p>2.1.5</p>

No	Author	Summary of submission	Response
		Strongest disapproval of any more land being cleared	2.1.5
		<u>Other</u>	
		• Process	
		Matter has been criticised many, many times	3.4.1
8.	Unknown	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fauna</li> </ul> <p>Several species are uncommon or declining as a result of habitat loss:</p> <p>Carnaby's Black Cockatoo</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- loss of feeding habitat</li> <li>- feeding habitat – B.Prionotes woodland</li> </ul> <p>Weebill, Yellow-rumped Thornbill, Varied Sitella, Painted Button-quail, Grey Fantail, Tawny Frogmouth, Western Gerygone, Grey Butcherbird</p> <p>Viable populations of reptile species and frogs: Gould's Monitor, Moaning Frog, Banjo Frog, Turtle Frog</p> <p>Dependent on size of bushland, diversity of habitats and linkages</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Vegetation</li> </ul> <p>B.Prionotes woodland seasonally significant– feeding habitat for Carnaby's Cockatoo and honeyeaters</p> <p>Karrakatta Central and South Vegetation Community not well reserved.</p> <p>Controlled burning used near residential areas causes degradation of bushland litter and alters the plant populations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Biodiversity</li> </ul> <p>Likely impact of proposal on biodiversity values, loss of species of fauna and flora.</p> <p>Intrusion of residential development will have unmanageable impacts on the biodiversity values of bushland.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Linkage/POS</li> </ul> <p>Regionally significant bushland/wetland linkage</p>	<p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.1, 2.1.6</p> <p>2.1.4</p> <p>2.1.6</p> <p>2.1.7</p> <p>2.2.3</p> <p>2.1.11</p> <p>2.1.11</p> <p>2.2.2</p>

No	Author	Summary of submission	Response
		<p>Regional connectivity between Kings Park and Bold Park critical for birds and flora.</p> <p><u>Other</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Process</li> </ul> <p>Loss of feeding habitat for Carnaby's Cockatoo is a controlled action under the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act (EPBC Act) and must be referred and considered in the EIA process.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General issues</li> </ul> <p>Widespread community support to retain entire bushland</p>	<p>2.2.2 and 2.1.10</p> <p>2.1.1 and 2.1.6</p> <p>3.3.2</p>
9.	Unknown	<p><u>Other</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General</li> </ul> <p>Lack of wisdom in clearing precious woodland</p> <p>Possible future change of attitude towards environmental damage</p>	<p>3.3.1</p> <p>3.3.1</p>
10.	Unknown	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fauna</li> </ul> <p>Bushland is breeding habitat of native birds including honey eaters</p> <p>Contains Little Eagle nesting sites</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Linkage/POS</li> </ul> <p>Important green corridor between Kings Park and Bold Park for native birds.</p>	<p>2.1.4</p> <p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.2.2</p>
11.	Unknown	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fauna</li> </ul> <p>Important habitat for 32 species of native birds, 18 of which breed there</p> <p>Additional 8 species of birds, Shenton Park Bushland</p> <p>Red Wattlebirds and Rainbow Lorikeets aggressive – reduction in area of bushland increase aggression due to competition for food and nesting, lead to reduced bird species richness and diversity</p> <p>Reducing the bushland leads to increased predatory pressure, mainly aerial predators</p> <p>Development would be barrier for small passerines</p>	<p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.2</p> <p>2.1.2</p> <p>2.1.1</p>

No	Author	Summary of submission	Response
		species e.g. Varied Sitella, Western Gerygone, Weebill, Yellow-rumped Thornbill, Striated Pardalote	
		Carnaby's Cockatoo – threats include clearance and fragmentation of habitat and shortage of tree hollows, development could lead to species abandoning site	2.1.1
		Little Eagles – probable bushland is foraging home range of breeding pair – impact on breeding success not evaluated	2.1.1
		• Vegetation	
		Structural complexity of bushland important in maintaining bird species richness and diversity	2.1.11
		Proposal very likely to reduce structural complexity – reduced patch sizes and increased likelihood of weed invasion	2.1.11
		• Biodiversity	
		Richness and diversity of bird life	2.1.11
		Remnant bushland needs to be at least 10ha in size, preferably 20ha to preserve bird species richness and diversity	2.2.1
		• Linkage/POS	
		Important linkage between Kings Park and Bold Park for native birds.	2.1.10 and 2.2.2
		• Bush Forever/Management	
		Significantly important area of remnant bushland	2.1.5
		Figure for conservation area is misleading – includes POS and is divided in two discrete and spatially separated blocks	2.2.1, 2.2.2
		Remnant bushland need to be at least 10ha in size, preferably 20ha to preserve bird species richness and diversity	2.2.1
		Bushland is identified as regionally significant in Perth Bushplan	2.1.5
		Retain one of last remaining patches of bushland close to CBD	2.1.5
12.	Unknown	• Fauna	
		Should be saved as bushland as it is vital for the	2.1.5, 2.1.4

No	Author	Summary of submission	Response
		<p>protection of fauna</p> <p>Native birdlife habitat has been reduced by introduction of pesky Rainbow Lorikeet and infill housing with high plot ratios</p> <p>Urban development pressure on Metropolitan native bird population</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Biodiversity</li> </ul> <p>Loss of diversity in Shenton Bush and Bold Park</p> <p>Should be saved as bushland as it is vital for the protection of flora</p> <p>Once trees that sustain the flora and fauna are gone they are gone forever</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Linkage/POS</li> </ul> <p>Pathway from Bold Park to Kings Park and the lakes.</p> <p><u>Other</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planning/Odour</li> </ul> <p>Large houses on small blocks will exacerbate loss of diversity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General issues</li> </ul> <p>Loss of Abbey Brook Estate and Edith Cowan University will exacerbate loss of diversity</p> <p>Government should do land swap</p> <p>Universities that promote environmental teaching want to destroy environment</p>	<p>2.1.2</p> <p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.11</p> <p>2.1.11</p> <p>2.1.11</p> <p>2.2.2</p> <p>3.2.3, 3.3.9</p> <p>3.3.7</p> <p>3.2.1</p> <p>3.3.1</p>
13.	Unknown	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Linkage/POS</li> </ul> <p>Important corridor to Kings Park – necessary for preservation of bird and animal life.</p> <p><u>Other</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planning/Odour</li> </ul> <p>If development must take place, should have small footprint by concentrating multiple storey building</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General issues</li> </ul>	<p>2.2.2</p> <p>3.2.3, 3.3.9</p>

No	Author	Summary of submission	Response
		University is institute of learning, should make more intelligent decision about preserving bushland	3.3.1
14.	Dr Jane E Ralls, President, Doctors' Reform Society	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fauna</li> </ul> <p>Carnaby's Black Cockatoo habitat</p> <p>Many other birds, insects, reptiles and plants</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Vegetation</li> </ul> <p>Urban bushland has ecological significance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Biodiversity</li> </ul> <p>Urban bushland has ecological significance</p> <p>Kings Park too small to maintain biodiversity alone in long term</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Linkage/POS</li> </ul> <p>Important corridor between Kings Park and Bold Park – native birds</p> <p>Healthy survival of biodiversity in Kings Park depends on linkages to surrounding areas</p> <p>Corridor to Bold Park is the only remaining linkage, Underwood Avenue bushland is a key part of linkage</p> <p><u>Other</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Process</li> </ul> <p>Similar proposal rejected as environmentally unacceptable in 2004</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General issues</li> </ul> <p>Maintenance of environment concern to world survival</p> <p>Urban bushland paramount importance to physical and psychological health</p>	<p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.11</p> <p>2.1.11</p> <p>2.1.11, 2.1.10</p> <p>2.1.10, 2.2.2</p> <p>2.1.10</p> <p>2.1.10, 2.2.2</p> <p>3.4.1</p> <p>3.4.7</p> <p>2.1.5</p>
15.	Unknown	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fauna</li> </ul> <p>Habitat for many animals and birds (including birds that frequent backyards from these [urban bushland] areas)</p> <p>Carnaby's Black Cockatoo habitat</p> <p>Increased pressure from dogs and cats</p>	<p>2.1.4</p> <p>2.1.1, 2.1.4</p> <p>2.1.2</p>

No	Author	Summary of submission	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Vegetation</li> </ul> <p>Urban bushland areas are rare in the suburbs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Linkage/POS</li> </ul> <p>Important corridor with Bold Park and Army land at Swanbourne.</p> <p><u>Other</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planning/Odour</li> </ul> <p>Will increase traffic problems Underwood Avenue and Alfred Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General issues</li> </ul> <p>Bush areas add to ambience of an area</p> <p>Unique opportunity to offer the people of Western Australia a local bush park</p> <p>In the long term, financial gains dwarfed by the benefits</p>	<p>2.1.5</p> <p>2.1.10 and 2.2.2</p> <p>3.1.6</p> <p>3.3.2</p> <p>3.2.1</p> <p>3.3.1</p>
16.	Unknown	<p><u>Other</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General issues</li> </ul> <p>Hospice buildings front onto land in south-west corner designated to be cleared and earthworked – would like to know what measures are in place to ensure privacy, security and noise reduction during earth works and any future development</p>	<p>3.3.8</p>
17.	Unknown	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Vegetation</li> </ul> <p>Provides carbon sink</p> <p>Windbreak</p> <p>Erosion preventer</p> <p>Pollution absorber</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Biodiversity</li> </ul> <p>Store of biodiversity</p> <p>Acceleration of species loss highlight in Perth by problems faced by iconic banksias, eucalypts, sheoaks and dependent animals</p>	<p>2.1.12</p> <p>2.1.13</p> <p>2.1.13</p> <p>3.4.7</p> <p>2.1.11</p> <p>2.1.11</p>

No	Author	Summary of submission	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Linkage/POS</li> </ul> <p>Important for passive recreation</p>	2.2.2, 2.2.3
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bush Forever/Management</li> </ul> <p>Instead of clearing, degraded bush should be revegetated and cleared of weed</p>	2.2.3, 2.2.4
18.	Unknown	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Vegetation</li> </ul> <p>Fertilisers and chemicals from houses and gardens and escaping exotic plants and weeds will degrade natural bush</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Biodiversity</li> </ul> <p>If regeneration of natural bush not successful, present biodiversity is disturbed</p> <p>Bushland home to many species of native trees, animals, birds, reptiles and insects and these living creatures will most certainly be lost forever</p> <p><u>Other</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Process</li> </ul> <p>Previous proposal turned down in 2002</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Social/heritage</li> </ul> <p>Have the indigenous community been consulted?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planning/Odour</li> </ul> <p>Combination of SWWTP and housing development not wise</p> <p>- will probably create costly legal problems</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General issues</li> </ul> <p>Would donor of land approve of University's plans</p> <p>University may prosper financially but long term legacy may not be profitable</p>	<p>2.2.3</p> <p>2.2.4</p> <p>2.1.1, 2.1.11</p> <p>3.4.1</p> <p>3.3.5</p> <p>3.3.3</p> <p>3.3.3</p> <p>3.4.7</p> <p>3.3.1</p>
19.	Unknown	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Linkage/POS</li> </ul> <p>Area is vital part of wildlife corridor, which is slowly becoming smaller because of development (Hollywood High School site).</p>	2.1.10, 2.2.2



No	Author	Summary of submission	Response
		<u>Other</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General issues</li> </ul> <p>No point having Environmental Day or Plant A Tree Day if unique areas of bushland are under threat</p>	3.4.7
20.	Unknown	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fauna</li> </ul> <p>Several species are uncommon or declining as a result of habitat loss:</p> <p>Carnaby's Black Cockatoo loss of feeding habitat in B.Prionotes woodland</p> <p>Weebill, Yellow-rumped Thornbill, Varied Sitella, Painted Button-quail, Grey Fantail, Tawny Frogmouth, Western Gerygone, Grey Butcherbird</p> <p>Viable populations of reptile species and frogs: Gould's Monitor, Moaning Frog, Banjo Frog, Turtle Frog</p> <p>Dependent on size of bushland, diversity of habitats and linkages</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Vegetation</li> </ul> <p>B.Prionotes woodland seasonally significant– feeding habitat for Carnaby's Cockatoo and honeyeaters</p> <p>15% flora species at Underwood Avenue considered less than well reserved</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Biodiversity</li> </ul> <p>Significant value for biodiversity</p> <p>Diverse, large ecosystem on Swan Coastal Plain has been lost</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Linkage/POS</li> </ul> <p>Regional connectivity between Kings Park and Bold Park and nearby suburban parkland.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bush Forever/Management</li> </ul> <p>Site could be used for research into environmental management of urban bushland</p> <u>Other</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Process</li> </ul>	<p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.1, 2.1.4</p> <p>2.1.6</p> <p>2.1.5</p> <p>2.1.11</p> <p>2.1.11</p> <p>2.1.10, 2.2.2</p> <p>3.3.4</p> <p>2.1.1, 2.1.6</p>

No	Author	Summary of submission	Response
		<p>Loss of feeding habitat for Carnaby's Cockatoo is a controlled action under the EPBC Act and must be referred and considered in the EIA process</p> <p>The EPA has not assessed the degree of impact of the proposal on linkages</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planning/odour</li> </ul> <p>Odour issues not addressed in ERR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General issues</li> </ul> <p>Widespread community support to retain entire bushland</p> <p>The University must seek consent of the Governor before developing land</p> <p>Government should do everything possible to save all remaining bushland with close proximity to Perth</p> <p>Government should purchase area from the University and preserve site in perpetuity</p> <p>Leave bush intact and return it to traditional owners</p> <p>For years developers have destroyed our wetlands and bush – only reason is 'almighty dollar'</p>	<p>2.1.10, 2.2.2</p> <p>3.3.3</p> <p>3.3.2</p> <p>3.1.2</p> <p>3.2.1</p> <p>3.2.1</p> <p>3.2.1, 3.3.5</p> <p>3.3.1</p>
21.	Unknown	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Biodiversity</li> </ul> <p>Land should not be developed – high conservation values</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bush Forever/Management</li> </ul> <p>Conservation values directly proportional to size and shape of land concerned, not a case where compromise is appropriate</p> <p>Development of site should be in accordance with approved management plan</p> <p><u>Other</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planning/Odour</li> </ul> <p>Land should not be developed because of close proximity to SWWTP; complaints from residents, possible enclosure of SWWTP, impossibility of deriving workable odour line, cost of relocation prohibitive</p> <p>Land Should be rezoned under MRS from 'Urban' to 'Public Purposes – University'</p>	<p>2.1.11</p> <p>2.1.5, 2.1.11</p> <p>2.2.3</p> <p>3.3.3</p>

No	Author	Summary of submission	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General issues</li> </ul> <p>University's intentions over development of the land</p> <p>University short-sighted – does not need to develop site</p> <p>University is one of Australia's wealthier universities</p> <p>'Whole of Government' approach needed to resist short term pressure for long term community benefit</p>	<p>3.1.1</p> <p>3.3.1</p> <p>3.3.1</p> <p>3.2.1, 3.3.2</p>
22.	Unknown	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fauna</li> </ul> <p>Several 'uncommon' bird species will be affected</p> <p>Carnaby's Black Cockatoo feeding habitat – B.Prionotes woodland</p> <p>Small bush birds</p> <p>- wellbeing depends on variety of habitat</p> <p>- Examples – Fantail, Grey Butcherbird, Weebill</p> <p>Number of species of reptiles and several varieties of frogs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Vegetation</li> </ul> <p>Jarraah woodland rare in metropolitan area – should be protected</p> <p>Grand old Tuart trees should be protected</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Biodiversity</li> </ul> <p>Loss of flora and fauna cannot be supported</p> <p>If size of Underwood Avenue Bushland decreased by 66%, approximately 20% flora and fauna liable to be lost</p> <p><u>Linkage/POS</u></p> <p>Reptiles and frogs rely on bush corridors between Bold Park, Underwood Avenue, Shenton Bushland.</p> <p><u>Other</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General</li> </ul> <p>Consider children and grandchildren</p>	<p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.1, 2.1.6</p> <p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.1, 2.1.4</p> <p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.5, 2.1.7</p> <p>2.1.5, 2.1.7</p> <p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.10, 2.2.2</p> <p>3.3.2, 3.4.7</p>
23.	Unknown	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Biodiversity</li> </ul>	

No	Author	Summary of submission	Response
		EPA report states that proposed Conservation Area in its current state does not provide for adequate protection of core conservation values of the site	2.1.5
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bush Forever/Management</li> </ul>	
		Spare Underwood Avenue Bushland from being destroyed	2.1.5
		<u>Other</u>	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General issues</li> </ul>	
		Destruction of bush for housing shortsighted	3.3.1, 3.3.2
24.	Unknown	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Vegetation</li> </ul>	
		Loss of B.Prionotes	2.1.6
		Bushland important in face of climate change	2.1.12
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Biodiversity</li> </ul>	
		Cannot expect completely cleared land to be regenerated to a complex ecosystem	2.1.11
		Even after twenty years, underlying fungal population does not return	2.1.3, 2.1.11
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Linkage/POS</li> </ul>	
		Plays important role in corridor from Bold Park, Shenton Bushland to Kings Park	2.1.10, 2.2.2
		Corridor not maintained by two blocks of 2ha and 10ha, 3ha is degraded	2.2.2
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bush Forever/Management</li> </ul>	2.1.5
		Clearing 5ha for Very Good quality bushland shows lack of respect	2.1.5
		Regionally significant bushland	
		<u>Other</u>	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Process</li> </ul>	3.4.2
		EPA does not appear to be assessing the impacts on the environment of the matters raised	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planning/Odour</li> </ul>	3.1.1
		Clearing bushland from odour buffer zone is a waste of a	

No	Author	Summary of submission	Response
		precious resource	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General issues</li> </ul> <p>Government should take land back to preserve it for future generations</p>	3.3.1, 3.3.2
25.	Unknown	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fauna</li> </ul> <p>Fauna significant at local, regional and national level</p> <p>Substantial stands of <i>b.menziesii</i>, <i>b.attenuata</i> and <i>B.Prionotes</i> significant food for variety of bird species.</p> <p>Negative impact upon 'endangered' species, believed to use this bushland</p> <p>Carnaby's Black Cockatoo</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>B.Prionotes</i> woodland – feeding habitat</li> <li>- breeding habitat has continued to decline</li> <li>- large flock roost at Perry Lakes, feed in Underwood Avenue – needs nearby tracks of high quality feeding habitat for breeding</li> <li>- significant loss of habitat - hollows</li> <li>- loss of corridor connecting Kings Park and Bold Park</li> </ul> <p>Graceful Sun Moth</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- rarity and regulatory classification of Graceful Sun Moth</li> <li>- Graceful Sun Moth found nearby (in Shenton Bushland, linked to Underwood Avenue Bushland site via a bushland corridor along Bedbrook Place, contains woodland favoured by Graceful Sun Moth)</li> <li>- clearing of bush tracts may remove potential microhabitats and ecotones</li> </ul> <p>More than 30 native bird species, 18 have been recorded breeding there</p> <p>Viable populations of reptile species and frogs: Gould's Monitor, Moaning Frog, Banjo Frog, Turtle Frog</p> <p>Dependent on size of bushland, diversity of habitats and linkages</p>	<p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.5, 2.1.6, 2.1.7</p> <p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.6</p> <p>2.1.4</p> <p>2.1.6</p> <p>2.1.4</p> <p>2.1.10, 2.2.2</p> <p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.1, 2.1.4</p> <p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.4,</p> <p>2.1.10, 2.2.2</p> <p>2.1.3</p>

No	Author	Summary of submission	Response
		<p>Quality of ecosystem depends on invertebrate and fungi presence – no research data in ERR (valuable for more complete evaluation of adverse environmental impacts)</p> <p>Risk to fauna population from fire, pets and predation</p> <p>Contraction of diversity of vegetation associations will likely have an impoverishing effect on range of bird species – more limited food and nesting resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Vegetation</li> </ul> <p>The area, structure, integrity and heterogeneity of naturally occurring vegetation associations along with associated ecological exchanges and links will be irreversibly and negatively impacted by dramatic spatial reduction of existing bushland configuration</p> <p>- will result in simplification and isolation of remaining patches</p> <p>Pattern of clearing proposed will:</p> <p>- completely eliminate two of the seven identified vegetation associations on the site: Jarrah Woodland over <i>Allocasuarina fraseriana</i>; <i>B.Prionotes</i> Thicket with <i>b. menziesii</i> and <i>b. attenuata</i></p> <p>- substantially reduce two of three associations on the site expressing different height classes of eucalyptus species present: Jarrah Low Woodland over <i>b.attenuata</i>, <i>b.menziesii</i> and <i>Allocasuarina fraseriana</i> Low Woodland; Jarrah and Tuart Open Woodland over <i>Acacia saligna</i>, <i>a. rostellifera</i> and <i>Hakea prostrata</i></p> <p>Within northern part of bushland, there are substantial areas of two vegetation association assessed as good to very good and as very good (highest conservation rating) – these areas proposed for clearance</p> <p>Vegetation association for Jarrah/Tuart Open Woodland has far more limited expression in the bushland – not proposed for retention for conservation</p> <p>Karrakatta Central and South Vegetation Community, not well reserved (under represented in conservation targets in Bush Forever analyses)</p> <p>15% flora species present in bushland are less than well reserved in the Southern Swan Coastal Plain</p> <p>Only two other areas on Spearwood Dune vegetation which had an abundance of <i>B.Prionotes</i> comparable to</p>	<p>2.1.2</p> <p>2.1.4, 2.1.7</p> <p>2.1.5, 2.1.7, 2.2.1</p> <p>2.2.1, 2.2.2</p> <p>2.1.5, 2.1.6</p> <p>2.1.5, 2.1.7</p> <p>2.1.5, 2.1.7</p> <p>2.1.5, 2.1.7</p> <p>2.1.7</p> <p>2.1.5, 2.1.11</p> <p>2.1.6</p> <p>2.1.1, 2.1.4</p>

No	Author	Summary of submission	Response
		Underwood Bushland.	
		Avifauna require richness and diversity of vegetation species and fallen timber	2.1.11
		• Biodiversity	
		Substantial range of conservation values for biodiversity and ecological processes	2.1.11
		Reduction of Underwood Bushland by 65% may result in loss of at least 20% of flora and fauna locally	2.1.11, 3.4.2
		Scant information in ERR on much wider ecological and environmental impacts	2.1.10, 2.2.2
		• Linkage/POS	2.1.11, 2.1.11
		Crucial role in ecological connectivity and linkage Swan River and coast – sustains and enhances conservation values of other bushland reserves	
		Allows ecological exchanges and dispersals as well as species movement between Bold Park and Kings Park – regionally significant bird species, small passerines, regionally rare species (Little Eagle) and endangered species (Carnaby's Cockatoo)	2.1.11
		Local ecological interdependence – Underwood Bushland and Shenton Park Bushland mutually support conservation values	2.2.1
		• Bush Forever/Management	2.2.1, 2.1.11
		Conservation areas need to be at least 10ha and preferably 20ha to maintain avifauna richness and diversity	2.1.5, 2.2.1
		Patches of bush require low perimeter to area ratio	2.2.1
		Patches of bush require connectivity with other distant bush areas	
		Areas proposed to be cleared well below lower size threshold for sustain bird species diversity and richness	v
		Shape give rise to poor perimeter-area ratio with increased edge effects	3.4.2
		<u>Other</u>	3.4.2
		• Process	
		Requires full assessment by EPA	3.4.2

No	Author	Summary of submission	Response
		<p>Assessment should be limited to environment merits excluding planning considerations</p> <p>EPA should hold public inquiry into issue</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Social &amp; Heritage</li> </ul> <p>No information on how clearing will impact on integrity and condition of Aboriginal sites</p> <p>Significant social and community values attached to Underwood Bushland</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planning/Odour</li> </ul> <p>Scant information on planning dimensions of proposal</p> <p>No evaluation of buffer provisions or patter of clearing to preserve Aboriginal sites</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General issues</li> </ul> <p>Widespread community support to retain entire bushland</p>	<p>3.3.5</p> <p>3.3.2</p> <p>3.3.8</p> <p>3.3.5, 3.3.8</p> <p>3.3.2</p>
26.	Unknown	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Vegetation</li> </ul> <p>Planting of vegetation is not conservation</p> <p>References to rehabilitation are simplification</p> <p>Query whether 'somewhat degraded' land can be restored 'to maintain a bushland system'</p> <p>Query University's ability to rehabilitate – claims of ability to rehabilitate not supported</p> <p>University has not shown itself to be a good steward of the land</p> <p>Arguments for University's conservation ability should be closely scrutinised and discounted if not supported</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Linkage/POS</li> </ul> <p>Difficult to see how diagonal POS could be viable for Conservation, POS will probably be bisected by a path, extension of Public Access Way</p> <p>- too small to function as conservation</p> <p>POS classified as degraded – should be cleared</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bush Forever/Management</li> </ul>	<p>2.1.5, 2.2.4</p> <p>2.2.4</p> <p>2.2.4</p> <p>2.2.4</p> <p>2.2.3, 2.2.4</p> <p>2.2.3, 3.4.2</p> <p>2.2.2</p> <p>2.2.2</p> <p>2.2.2</p>



No	Author	Summary of submission	Response
		Usual policy of WAPC is to require ceding of area of land to Crown for POS. The University does not understand the proper process. Conservation areas should be ceded to Crown.	2.2.2, 3.2.1
		Rationale for proposed configuration of conservation areas and POS difficult to understand	2.1.5, 2.2.2
		There must be close correlation between areas marked 'Good' and 'Very Good' and areas to be conserved	2.1.5
		Possible leaching of adverse consequences from 'earthworked' areas to conservation areas	3.1.1, 3.4.7
		Whatever land is conserved is under threat in the future by development approved for western side	3.1.1
		Piecemeal development antagonistic to conservation and will lead to creeping loss of remaining bushland	2.1.5, 3.1.1
		<u>Other</u>	
		• Process	
		More scientific approach to listing and verifying plant and insect species, and existence of ecosystem is called for	2.1.1, 2.1.4, 2.1.5
		Proposal in its entirety is manifestly inadequate, does not descend to sufficient detail to allow EPA to make a proper informed decision	3.4.2
		• Planning/Odour	
		Proximity to SWWTP and UNIVERSITY Field Station (agricultural chemical sprays)	3.3.3
		Development on degraded land on ridge facing west is preferred but is injuriously affected by SWWTP – subdivision of east part is a compromise	3.2.2, 3.3.3
		- given large amount of public money spent by University and Water Corporation on litigation, nothing has been achieved by way of preserving the environment or conserving public monies	3.3.1, 3.3.3
		Configuration proposed non-viable [sic] and unusual	2.1.5, 2.2.1
		If proposal were for development of whole land then areas for conservation as a percentage might well be relatively less	2.1.5, 3.1.1
		• General issues	
		Intention of University was to hold entire parcel research,	2.1.5, 3.4.7

No	Author	Summary of submission	Response
		decision to dispose arose from inclusion of land in Bush Forever	
		One of Australia's wealthiest Universities	3.3.1
27.	Unknown	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fauna</li> </ul> <p>Negative impact upon native bird species: - Carnaby's Black Cockatoo, Varied Sitella, Tawny Frogmouth</p> <p>Threat to Gould's Monitor and various frog taxa</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Vegetation</li> </ul> <p>Karrakatta Central and South vegetation type not protected</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Linkage/POS</li> </ul> <p>Important linkage between Kings Park and Bold Park – native birds (Carnaby's Cockatoo, Varied Sitella and Tawny Frogmouth), Gould's Monitor, frogs.</p> <p><u>Other</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General issues</li> </ul> <p>Widespread community support to retain entire bushland</p>	<p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.7</p> <p>2.1.10, 2.2.2</p> <p>3.3.2</p>
28.	Unknown	<p><u>Other</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General issues</li> </ul> <p>Destruction of bushland as observed by latest satellite images and fieldwork should be stopped</p>	<p>2.1.5, 3.4.7</p>
29.	Unknown	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fauna</li> </ul> <p>Negative impact upon two 'endangered' species, both believed to use this bushland</p> <p>Carnaby's Black Cockatoo</p> <p>- feeding habitat – B.Prionotes woodland</p> <p>Graceful Sun Moth</p> <p>- rarity and regulatory classification of Graceful Sun moth</p> <p>- Graceful Sun Moth found nearby (in Shenton Bushland, linked to Underwood Avenue Bushland site via a bushland corridor along Bedbrook Place)</p>	<p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.4, 2.1.6</p> <p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.1</p>

No	Author	Summary of submission	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Vegetation</li> </ul> <p>Karrakatta Central and South Vegetation Community not well reserved.</p> <p>Frequent and regular controlled burning causes degradation of bushland litter and alters the plant populations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Biodiversity</li> </ul> <p>Mapping by Hopper and Gioia shows that the Perth Metropolitan area is a biodiversity hotspot within one of the world's 34 biodiversity hotspots</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Linkage/POS</li> </ul> <p>Regional connectivity between Kings Park and Bold Park critical for birds, reptiles and amphibians (significance of corridor has been recognised in EPA Bulletins on University proposals).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bush Forever/Management</li> </ul> <p>Figure for conservation area is misleading – includes POS and is divided in two discrete and spatially separated blocks</p> <p>Is a Bush Forever site – contains regionally and nationally significant vegetation</p> <p>Third largest bushland in the locality</p> <p>The advertised proposal is environmentally more damaging than the one rejected in 2001 because it has split the bushland into two smaller areas</p> <p>Significance of site is due to its large size – proposal will destroy 2/3 site and all but one of values in Bush Forever criteria</p> <p>Claim that there will be a 'net benefit to the environment' is patent nonsense</p> <p><u>Other</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Process</li> </ul> <p>Previous proposals rejected twice on grounds they failed to meet environmental requirements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planning</li> </ul>	<p>2.1.7</p> <p>2.2.3</p> <p>2.1.9</p> <p>2.1.10, 2.2.2</p> <p>2.1.5, 2.1.10, 2.2.2</p> <p>2.1.5</p> <p>2.1.5, 2.2.2</p> <p>2.1.5, 2.2.2</p> <p>2.1.5</p> <p>2.1.7</p> <p>3.4.1</p>

No	Author	Summary of submission	Response
		No promise to retain bush in perpetuity	3.1.5
		- has reserved right to develop bushland in future	3.1.5
		• General issues	
		Remnant bush at Perry Lakes soon destroyed for housing	3.3.6
		Widespread community support to retain entire bushland	3.3.2
30.	Unknown	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fauna</li> </ul> <p>Carnaby's Black Cockatoo (endangered)</p> <p>- feeding habitat – banksia, tuarts and marri</p> <p>What vertebrate studies have been done?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Vegetation</li> </ul> <p>Important area of remnant banksia woodland</p> <p>Karrakatta Central and South Vegetation Community no longer well represented on Swan Coastal Plain.</p> <p>E. decipiens occurs outside area to be protected</p> <p>Carbon emissions from clearing of bushland</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Linkage/POS</li> </ul> <p>Important green corridor.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bush Forever/Management</li> </ul> <p>Proposed area very small and would require active management</p> <p><u>Other</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Social &amp; heritage</li> </ul> <p>Bushland gives strong sense of belonging</p>	<p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.4, 2.1.6</p> <p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.5</p> <p>2.1.7</p> <p>2.1.5</p> <p>2.1.12</p> <p>2.1.10</p> <p>2.2.1, 2.2.3</p> <p>3.3.2, 3.4.7</p>
31.	Unknown	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Biodiversity</li> </ul> <p>Unique and valuable qualities of biological rarity</p> <p>Claim to internationally exceptional biodiversity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bush Forever/Management</li> </ul>	<p>2.1.11</p> <p>2.1.9, 2.1.11</p>

No	Author	Summary of submission	Response
		Reducing size will adversely affect durability of remnant  <u>Other</u>  • General  University is unworthy of its name and unfit for its proper function	2.1.5, 2.2.1      3.3.1, 3.4.7
32.	Unknown	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fauna Only nesting site for Little Eagle near a city</li> <li>Biodiversity This area is unique living heritage, irreplaceable</li> <li>Vegetation Clearing is madness at time of global warming, groundwater crisis and increasing air, water and other pollution  The 'wood' is worth far more to the community (and world standing) than millions of dollars to a very rich corporation</li> </ul> <u>Other</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Social &amp; heritage Site is subject to native title and is a sacred place</li> <li>General Should be returned to rightful owners  Many ethical scientists view the University's application with disgust and horror</li> </ul>	2.1.1   2.1.11  2.1.12, 3.4.7  3.3.1, 3.3.2   3.3.5  3.2.1, 3.3.5  3.3.1, 3.4.7
33.	Unknown	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fauna Negative impact upon two 'endangered' species, both believed to use this bushland  Carnaby's Black Cockatoo - feeding habitat – B.Prionotes woodland - roost at Perry Lakes  Graceful Sun Moth - rarity and regulatory classification of Graceful Sun</li> </ul>	2.1.1   2.1.1 2.1.6 2.1.1 2.1.1 2.1.1

No	Author	Summary of submission	Response
		moth	
		- Graceful Sun Moth found nearby (in Shenton Bushland, linked to Underwood Avenue Bushland site via a bushland corridor along Bedbrook Place)	2.1.1
		• Vegetation	
		Karrakatta Central and South Vegetation Community not well reserved.	2.1.7
		• Biodiversity	
		Mapping by Hopper and Gioia shows that the Perth Metropolitan area is a biodiversity hotspot within one of the world's 34 biodiversity hotspots	2.1.9
		• Linkage/POS	
		Regional connectivity between Kings Park and Bold Park critical (significance of corridor has been recognised in EPA Bulletins on University proposals).	2.1.10, 2.2.2
		• Bush Forever/Management	
		Figure for conservation area is misleading – includes POS and is divided in two discrete and spatially separated blocks	2.1.5, 2.1.1, 2.2.2
		Is a Bush Forever site – contains regionally and nationally significant vegetation	2.1.5
		Third largest bushland in the locality	2.1.5, 2.2.2
		The advertised proposal is environmentally more damaging than the one rejected in 2001 because it has split the bushland into two smaller areas	2.1.5, 2.2.1, 2.2.2, 3.4.1
		Significance of site is due to its large size – proposal will destroy 2/3 site and all but one of values in Bush Forever criteria	2.1.5
		<u>Other</u>	
		• Process	
		Previous proposals rejected twice on grounds they failed to meet environmental requirements	3.4.1
		• Planning	
		No promise to retain bush in perpetuity	3.2.1
			3.1.5

No	Author	Summary of submission	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- has reserved right to develop bushland in future</li> <li>• General issues</li> </ul> <p>Remnant bush at Perry Lakes soon destroyed for housing</p>	3.3.6
34.	Daniel Boase-Jelinek, Friends of Shenton Bushland Inc	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fauna</li> </ul> <p>Negative impact upon two 'endangered' species, both believed to use this bushland</p> <p>Carnaby's Black Cockatoo</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- adverse impact on feeding habits of Carnaby's Cockatoos roosting at Perry Lakes</li> <li>- significant reduction in bushland corridor used by Carnaby's Cockatoos for moving between Kings Park and Bold Park</li> <li>- necessity for high quality feeding habitat in proximity to potential nest sites in nearby Bold Park</li> <li>- significant loss of habitat, may jeopardise successful breeding</li> </ul> <p>Graceful Sun Moth</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- rarity and regulatory classification of Graceful Sun moth</li> <li>- Graceful Sun Moth found nearby (in Shenton Bushland, linked to Underwood Avenue Bushland site via a bushland corridor along Bedbrook Place)</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vegetation</li> </ul> <p>Only a small portion of the entire site protected</p> <p>Failure to protect areas that are important to maintain ecological processes in the bushland:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- It does not protect the main ridge running north-south through the bushland;</li> <li>- It does not protect the B.Prionotes woodland;</li> <li>- It only retains a small area of eucalyptus decipiens which is degraded, when there is a better area that will be destroyed; and</li> </ul> <p>Inadequacy of ATA report description of significance and values of bushland</p>	<p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.1, 2.1.4, 2.1.6</p> <p>2.1.10, 2.2.2</p> <p>2.1.4, 2.1.6</p> <p>2.1.4</p> <p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.5</p> <p>2.1.5, 2.1.10</p> <p>2.1.5</p> <p>2.1.5, 2.1.6</p> <p>2.1.5</p> <p>2.1.8</p>

No	Author	Summary of submission	Response
		Reduction in area of Good to Very Good condition bushland compared to original proposal	2.1.5
		Inadequacy of ATA bushland quality mapping.	2.1.8
		Failure of the University has failed to manage weeds following a bushfire in 2002.	2.2.3, 2.2.4
		Conservation of vegetation ranging from Degraded to Good condition but destruction of 5ha of bushland in Good/Very Good condition or better.	2.1.5
		Rarity of Underwood Avenue as Karrakatta Central and South Vegetation Community.	2.1.7
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Biodiversity</li> </ul>	
		Likely impact of the revised proposal on ecological processes within the bushland.	2.1.11
		Need to protect the biodiversity of the site by protecting best quality bushland rather than attempts to restore degraded areas of bushland and designing development to ensure sustainability of remainder in long-term.	2.1.11
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Linkage/POS</li> </ul>	
		The advertised proposal does not discuss the impacts of the proposal on ecological linkages between Kings Park and Bold Park and does not protect those linkages.	2.1.10, 2.2.2
		The Underwood Bushland is a significant component of that bushland corridor and is used by Carnaby's Cockatoos for moving between those areas.	2.1.10,
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bush Forever/Management</li> </ul>	
		The proposal reduces the area of Good to Very Good condition bushland that is conserved.	2.1.5
		The EPA is delegating responsibility for the environmental assessment to the Bush Forever office.	3.4.2, 3.4.7
		Inadequacy of ATA bushland quality mapping.	2.1.8
		University has mismanaged and neglected bushland since bushfire in January 2002	2.2.3, 2.2.4
		The conservation area includes a significant amount of vegetation ranging from Degraded to Good condition. 5ha of bushland in Good/Very Good condition or better is located in the area to be destroyed.	2.1.5
		The EPA Service Unit wants at least 12 hectares of	2.1.5, 3.4.2



No	Author	Summary of submission	Response
		<p>bushland to be set aside (refers to Interagency Advisory Group on Bushplan report dated March 2003).</p> <p><u>Other</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Process</li> </ul> <p>The EPA is failing to fulfil its statutory obligations</p> <p>- It is not clear what is being assessed.</p> <p>- The term Environmental Review Report has no clear meaning within the EP Act.</p> <p>- It is unclear how the EPA decided that the change in the proposal is likely to significantly increase any impact on the environment. The EPA has not given any information to support its decision.</p> <p>- The proposal must be assessed as a new proposal.</p> <p>- Planning considerations are not relevant.</p> <p>- The EPA is required to ensure that a proper environmental assessment is conducted, this has never occurred in relation to the Underwood Avenue Bushland.</p> <p>- The EPA is delegating responsibility for the environmental assessment to the Bush Forever office (quote from page 8 Bulletin 1034).</p> <p>The proposal has been presented three times to the EPA and twice to the Commonwealth Department of the Environment and Water Resources, yet there has never been an assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposal.</p> <p>The advertised proposal does not satisfy the requirements for an environmentally acceptable outcome specified by the Minister in 2004 in rejecting Bulletin 1099.</p> <p>The University suspended the assessment because it did not want the EPA to publish the results of its deliberations to the Minister.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planning/Odour</li> </ul> <p>The ERR does not reveal the full extent of the University's development plans.</p> <p>- will involve legal action to force Water Corp to close SWWTP</p> <p>This partial plan makes it difficult to assess the</p>	<p>3.4.2</p> <p>3.4.2</p> <p>3.4.2</p> <p>3.4.2</p> <p>3.4.2</p> <p>3.4.2</p> <p>3.4.2</p> <p>3.4.2</p> <p>3.4.1, 3.4.2</p> <p>3.4.1, 3.4.2</p> <p>3.4.1</p> <p>3.1.1</p> <p>3.3.3, 3.4.1</p> <p>3.4.2</p>

No	Author	Summary of submission	Response
		<p>environmental impacts of the entire proposal.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General issues</li> </ul> <p>There has been a lack of exploration of alternative proposals.</p> <p>Community consultation held in February 2007 inadequate</p> <p>Not possible for community to negotiate with University</p> <p>Not possible for community to comment on current incomplete proposal</p> <p>Proposal will bring great costs to wider community</p>	<p>3.2.1</p> <p>3.4.3</p> <p>3.4.3</p> <p>3.4.3, 3.4.7</p> <p>3.3.2</p>
35.	Friends of Allen Park Bushland Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fauna</li> </ul> <p>Bushland contains several bird species are uncommon or declining as a result of habitat loss: Carnaby's Black Cockatoo, loss of feeding habitat, feeding habitat – B.Prionotes woodland (seasonally significant), Weebill, Yellow-rumped Thornbill, Varied Sitella, Painted Button-quail, Grey Fantail, Tawny Frogmouth, Western Gerygone, Grey Butcherbird</p> <p>Migratory species such as the Rainbow Bee-eater fail to be considered in report but have been observed in the area</p> <p>Viable populations of reptile species and frogs: Gould's Monitor, Moaning Frog, Banjo Frog, Turtle Frog</p> <p>- Dependent on size of bushland, diversity of habitats and linkages</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Vegetation</li> </ul> <p>Extensive stands of B.Prionotes – substantial areas to north and eastern corner, seasonally significant for birds</p> <p>Extensive cover Jacksonia sericea and variety of native birds and grasses</p> <p>Karrakatta Central and South Vegetation Community not well reserved.</p> <p>15% flora species present in Underwood Avenue Bushland less than well reserved in the Southern Swan Coastal Plain</p> <p>Frequent and regular controlled burning causes degradation of bushland litter and alters the plant populations.</p>	<p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.4, 2.1.5, 2.1.10</p> <p>2.1.6</p> <p>2.1.5</p> <p>2.1.7</p> <p>2.1.5</p> <p>2.2.3</p>

No	Author	Summary of submission	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Biodiversity</li> </ul> <p>Reducing size of Underwood Avenue Bushland by more than 50% likely to cause loss of approximately 20% of flora and fauna species</p> <p>Any intrusion of residential development within the area will ultimately have unmanageable impacts on the biodiversity values of the bushland</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Linkage/POS</li> </ul> <p>Regional connectivity between Kings Park and Bold Park critical for birds – enhances conservation values of other reserves in the region, also allows transportation of seeds and pollen</p> <p>Conservation areas isolated by POS – more favourable to halve the POS and incorporate southern section into conservation areas</p> <p>Assuming dotted line traversing POS is a walkway, it could link to a southern entry point at Bedbrook Place, an important linkage with Shenton Bushland and a route identified as apart of the 'Bush to Beach Trails'</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bush Forever/Management</li> </ul> <p>Is a Bush Forever site – contains regionally and nationally significant vegetation</p> <p>Third largest bushland in the locality</p> <p>Significance of site is due to its large size – proposal will destroy 2/3 site and all but one of values in Bush Forever criteria</p> <p>Claim that there will be a 'net benefit to the environment' is patent nonsense</p> <p>Very little evidence of bushland management, post fire management very poorly handled allowing veldt grass and grassy weeds to establish themselves</p> <p>Site has been badly neglected</p> <p>Dissatisfied with attempts to resolve the issues regarding clearing good to very good bush</p> <p>Area favoured for development is as far away as possible from SWWTP, hence the conservation area includes 3ha degraded bush, at the exclusion of 5ha of very good bush</p> <p>Without management plan for entire site future of any</p>	<p>2.1.11</p> <p>2.1.11</p> <p>2.1.10, 2.2.2</p> <p>2.2.2</p> <p>2.2.5</p> <p>2.1.5</p> <p>2.1.5, 2.2.2</p> <p>2.1.5</p> <p>2.1.7</p> <p>2.2.3, 2.2.4</p> <p>2.2.4</p> <p>2.2.4, 3.4.7</p> <p>2.1.5, 3.3.3</p> <p>2.2.3</p>

No	Author	Summary of submission	Response
		<p>remnant remains questionable – particularly concerned about remnant opposite lots 28 to 28 [sic] (located north side, face Underwood Avenue), excellent quality and critical to ecological link with Kings Park and Bold Park</p> <p><u>Other</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Process</li> </ul> <p>Previous proposals rejected twice on grounds they failed to meet environmental requirements</p> <p>Loss of feeding habitat for Carnaby's Cockatoo is a controlled action under the EPBC Act and must be referred and considered in the environmental impact assessment process (it has not been done).</p> <p>The EPA has not assessed the degree of impact of the proposal on linkages</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planning</li> </ul> <p>Concerned about proposed development area within odour buffer zone subject to clearing for future development at the site, particularly in relation to good to very good bush - unacceptable</p> <p>Recommended setback of 5 metres as a landscape buffer is inadequate and unsustainable – this would serve as crucial corridor to very good bushland remnant opposite lot 28</p> <p>Current configuration is unimaginative and unacceptable</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General issues</li> </ul> <p>Remnant bush at Perry Lakes soon destroyed for housing</p> <p>Widespread community support to retain entire bushland</p> <p>University committed to 'unlocking capital value of this asset' – intent on capitalising on endowment regardless of environmental custodianship</p> <p>Environmental sciences, botanists [sic], conservation and zoology students could be involved with on-ground work</p> <p>Other options for more sustainable outcomes – eco-tourism, development of environmental centre or innovative sustainable development</p>	<p>3.4.1</p> <p>2.1.1</p> <p>3.4.2</p> <p>3.1.1, 3.3.3</p> <p>3.3.9</p> <p>2.1.5</p> <p>3.3.6</p> <p>3.3.2</p> <p>3.3.1</p> <p>3.3.4</p> <p>3.2.1, 3.3.4</p>
36.	Unknown	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fauna</li> </ul> <p>Bushland is habitat for large flock of Carnaby's Black</p>	<p>2.1.1</p>

No	Author	Summary of submission	Response
		<p>Cockatoos</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Biodiversity</li> </ul> <p>Underwood Avenue Bushland is a biodiversity hotspot</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Linkage/POS</li> </ul> <p>Bushland is a link between Kings Park and Bold Park</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bush Forever/Management</li> </ul> <p>Underwood Avenue Bushland is a Bush Forever site</p> <p><u>Other</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General issues</li> </ul> <p>Destruction of bushland is ethically unacceptable – bushland is a biodiversity hotspot and Bush Forever site</p> <p>Areas near Perry Lakes are to be released</p> <p>Bushland should be placed under same legislation as Kings Park and Bold Park</p>	<p>2.1.9</p> <p>2.1.10, 2.2.2</p> <p>2.1.1</p> <p>3.3.1, 2.1.5, 2.1.9</p> <p>3.3.6</p> <p>3.2.1</p>
37.	Unknown	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fauna</li> </ul> <p>Habitat for birds and reptiles</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Vegetation</li> </ul> <p>Vegetation at Underwood Avenue Bushland is unique and important for current and future generations as an example of how the area looked before white settlement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Biodiversity</li> </ul> <p>Critical that our children's children are able to appreciate the uniqueness of the Western Australian bush</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Linkage/POS</li> </ul> <p>Bushland is a link between Kings Park and Bold Park</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bush Forever/Management</li> </ul> <p>Underwood Avenue Bushland is a Bush Forever site</p> <p><u>Other</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planning</li> </ul> <p>As urban infill policies cause many existing old trees in</p>	<p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.5</p> <p>2.1.5, 2.1.11, 3.3.2</p> <p>2.1.10, 2.2.2</p> <p>2.1.5</p> <p>2.1.5, 3.3.9</p>

No	Author	Summary of submission	Response
		<p>suburban backyards to be removed, remnant bushland becomes more important in the metropolitan area</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General issues</li> </ul> <p>Underwood Avenue Bushland should be given permanent protection due to current and future biodiversity of Swan Coastal Plain</p>	3.2.1
38.	Unknown	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fauna</li> </ul> <p>Want grandchildren and future generations to see animals and hear the call of the Carnaby's Black Cockatoo</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Vegetation</li> </ul> <p>Want grandchildren and future generations to see banksia bushland with endemic plant species</p> <p>Irreplaceable piece of banksia bushland</p> <p>Very little banksia bushland left</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Linkage/POS</li> </ul> <p>Important corridor between Kings Park and Bold Park – native birds.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bush Forever/Management</li> </ul> <p>Appalled at number of dead banksias in our urban bushlands</p> <p><u>Other</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General issues</li> </ul> <p>University should show commitment to conservation and make it a bushland endowment for future generations – think of the 'big picture'</p> <p>Start the process to lock the land away so no future development can destroy the bushland</p>	<p>2.1.1, 3.3.2</p> <p>2.1.5, 2.1.6, 3.3.2</p> <p>2.1.5, 2.1.6</p> <p>2.1.7</p> <p>2.1.10, 2.2.2</p> <p>2.1.5, 2.1.6</p> <p>3.2.1, 3.3.2</p> <p>3.2.1</p>
39.	Unknown	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Biodiversity</li> </ul> <p>Whether developers aware of importance of native bushland to the maintenance of biodiversity on Swan Coastal Plain</p> <p><u>Other</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planning</li> </ul>	2.1.11

No	Author	Summary of submission	Response
		<p>Whether need for such a large quantity of bushland to be cleared for development</p> <p>Every effort should be made to preserve as much bushland as possible – consider new and innovative ways to incorporate it into any proposed development – University should conduct a study</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General issues</li> </ul> <p>Decision to clear native bushland has potential to diminish the status of the University in the eyes of the community in terms of its global responsibilities to educate, preserve and investigate</p>	<p>2.1.5</p> <p>3.2.1, 3.3.1</p> <p>3.3.1, 3.3.2</p>
40.	Unknown	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fauna</li> </ul> <p>Important site for Carnaby's Black Cockatoo</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Linkage/POS</li> </ul> <p>Important linkage site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bush Forever/Management</li> </ul> <p>Demonstrates poor regard for urban bushland</p> <p><u>Other</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General issues</li> </ul> <p>Should be retained by compensating University</p>	<p>2.2.1</p> <p>2.1.10, 2.2.2</p> <p>2.1.5</p> <p>3.2.1</p>
41.	Unknown	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fauna</li> </ul> <p>Two endangered species under threat</p> <p>Carnaby's Black Cockatoo</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- loss of feeding habitat</li> <li>- feeding habitat – B.Prionotes woodland, marri</li> </ul> <p>Graceful Sun Moth</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Graceful Sun Moth found nearby (in Shenton Bushland, linked to Underwood Avenue Bushland site via a bushland corridor along Bedbrook Place)</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Vegetation</li> </ul> <p>Karrakatta Central and South not well reserved</p>	<p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.4</p> <p>2.1.6</p> <p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.7</p>

No	Author	Summary of submission	Response
		Clearing increases carbon emissions	2.1.12
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Biodiversity</li> </ul>	
		ATA underplay environmental attributes	3.4.2, 3.4.7
		- Department of Environmental Protection staff in 2001 had concerns regarding ATA assessment	3.4.2, 3.4.7
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bush Forever/Management</li> </ul>	
		Bush Forever site	2.1.5
		Third largest remnant in western suburbs	2.1.5, 2.2.2
		University is trying to maximise profits by allocating conservation areas	2.1.5, 3.3.1
		Some of best quality bushland not included in conservation areas	2.1.5
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Linkage/POS</li> </ul>	
		Important corridor between Kings Park, Shenton Bushland and Bold Park.	2.1.10, 2.2.2
		<u>Other</u>	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Process</li> </ul>	
		EPA should fully assess environmental values of land and impacts of development	3.4.2
		Unacceptable for EPA not to set level of assessment	3.4.2
		Unacceptable for EPA not to have undertaken a standard formal assessment	3.4.2
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planning</li> </ul>	
		Alarmed that University would plan to develop area set aside unless it receives compensation from the government	3.2.1
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General issues</li> </ul>	
		University did not buy the land – is not short of funds	3.3.1
		University is not promoting a good environmental message to students	3.3.1, 3.3.4
		Bushland should be protected same as Kings Park and Bold Park	3.2.1



No	Author	Summary of submission	Response
42.	Unknown	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fauna</li> </ul> <p>Contains several species are uncommon or declining as a result of habitat loss: Carnaby's Black Cockatoo, loss of feeding habitat, feeding habitat – B.Prionotes woodland, Weebill, Yellow-rumped Thornbill, Varied Sitella, Painted Button-quail, Grey Fantail, Tawny Frogmouth, Western Gerygone, Grey Butcherbird</p> <p>Viable populations of reptile species and frogs: Gould's Monitor, Moaning Frog, Banjo Frog, Turtle Frog</p> <p>- Dependent on size of bushland, diversity of habitats and linkages</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Biodiversity</li> </ul> <p>Noted for diversity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bush Forever/Management</li> </ul> <p>One of largest patches of remnant coastal bushland, notable for its diversity and mostly good condition</p> <p>Part of regionally significant bushland, enhances conservation values of reserves in other regions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Linkage/POS</li> </ul> <p>Important corridor between Kings Park and Bold Park critical for birds and flora.</p> <p>Significant contribution to the future health and viability of the Kings Park and Bold Park Bushland</p> <p><u>Other</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Process</li> </ul> <p>Loss of feeding habitat for Carnaby's Cockatoo is a controlled action under the EPBC Act and must be referred and considered in the environmental impact assessment process (it has not been done).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General issues</li> </ul> <p>Widespread community support to retain entire bushland</p>	<p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.5, 2.1.10, 2.1.11, 2.2.2</p> <p>2.1.9, 2.1.11</p> <p>2.1.5</p> <p>2.1.5, 2.1.10, 2.2.2</p> <p>2.1.10, 2.2.2</p> <p>2.1.10, 2.2.2</p> <p>2.1.1</p> <p>3.3.2</p>
43.	Wayne Monks, Western Region Environment Network	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fauna</li> </ul> <p>Negative impact upon two 'endangered' species, both believed to use this bushland</p>	<p>2.1.1</p>

No	Author	Summary of submission	Response
		<b>Carnaby's Black Cockatoo</b>	2.1.1
		- adverse impact on feeding habits of Carnaby's Cockatoos roosting at Perry Lakes	2.1.6
		- significant reduction in bushland corridor used by Carnaby's Cockatoos and other birds for moving between Kings Park and Bold Park	2.1.10, 2.2.2
		- necessity for high quality feeding habitat – B.Prionotes woodland – near possible nesting sites at Underwood Avenue and Bold Park	2.1.6, 2.1.4, 2.1.10
		- significant loss of habitat, may jeopardise successful breeding	2.1.4
		- has not been referred as a controlled action pursuant to EPBC Act	2.1.1
		<b>Graceful Sun Moth</b>	2.1.1
		- rarity and regulatory classification of Graceful Sun moth	2.1.1
		- Graceful Sun Moth found nearby (in Shenton Bushland, linked to Underwood Avenue Bushland site via a bushland corridor along Bedbrook Place)	2.1.1
		Underwood bushland contains several bird species that are uncommon or declining on the Swan Coastal Plan as a result of habitat loss. These include the Weebill, Yellow-rumped Thornbill, Varied Sitella, Painted Grey Button-quail, Grey Fantail, Tawny Frogmouth, Western Gerygone, Grey Butcherbird, Splendid Blue Wren and Rainbow Bee-eaters.	2.1.1
		<b>Rainbow Bee-eater</b>	2.1.1
		- use as feeding habitat and nesting	2.1.1
		- threatened by foxes	2.1.1, 2.1.2
		<b>The Variegated Fairy-Wren</b>	2.1.1
		- found nearby at Shenton Bushland	2.1.1
		- movement and expansion curtailed if bush cleared	2.1.10, 2.2.2
		<b>Impact on fungi</b>	2.1.3
		Important local and migratory fauna is seldom mentioned in the ERR.	2.1.1, 3.4.1, 3.4.2

No	Author	Summary of submission	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Vegetation</li> </ul> <p>Now greater understanding of impacts of land clearing on climate change</p> <p>- clearing will increase greenhouse gas emissions</p> <p>Does not protect the B.Prionotes woodland</p> <p>Karrakatta Central and South Vegetation Community not well reserved.</p> <p>Only 2.0ha of five vegetation types are preserved.</p> <p>5ha of the good/very good bushland destroyed.</p> <p>Inadequacy of ATA bushland quality mapping</p> <p>Frequent and regular controlled burning causes degradation of bushland litter and alters the plant populations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Biodiversity</li> </ul> <p>The south-west of Western Australia is one of the world's 34 biodiversity hotspots and the only one in Australia</p> <p>Hundreds (perhaps thousands) of fauna and flora species are under threat.</p> <p>Likely impact of the revised proposal on biodiversity values, loss of species of fauna and flora.</p> <p>Banksia woodlands incredibly rich in species diversity.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Linkage/POS</li> </ul> <p>Regional connectivity between Kings Park and Bold Park critical for birds and flora.</p> <p>The advertised proposal is environmentally more damaging than the one rejected in 2001 because it has split the bushland into two smaller areas.</p> <p>- Fragmenting bushland will increase damaging impacts of fires.</p> <p>Unclear what is meant by the POS.</p> <p>- community will disturb fauna and flora and will probably resemble parkland, fauna will not occupy POS</p> <p>- POS cannot be rehabilitated</p>	<p>2.1.12</p> <p>2.1.12</p> <p>2.1.6</p> <p>2.1.7</p> <p>2.1.5</p> <p>2.1.5</p> <p>2.1.8</p> <p>2.2.3</p> <p>2.1.9</p> <p>2.1.11</p> <p>2.1.11</p> <p>2.1.5</p> <p>2.1.10, 2.2.2</p> <p>2.1.5, 2.2.1, 2.2.2</p> <p>2.2.1, 2.2.3</p> <p>2.2.2</p> <p>2.2.2</p> <p>2.2.2</p>

No	Author	Summary of submission	Response
		Remnant bushland at nearby Perry Lakes Reserve and AK Reserve will soon be removed. These developments will increase pressure on the bush corridor.	3.3.6
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bush Forever/Management</li> </ul>	
		Is a Bush Forever site – contains regionally and nationally significant vegetation	2.1.5
		Third largest bushland in the locality	2.1.5, 2.2.2
		No commitment made on environmental management	2.2.3
		University has mismanaged and neglected bushland	2.2.3, 2.2.4
		Proposal does not take into account issues raised by community stakeholder	3.4.3
		Should be part of 'Djandoo' concept linking river to the sea	2.1.5, 3.2.1
		Proposal to prepare environmental management plan lacks substance	2.2.3
		No promise to retain bush in perpetuity	3.1.5
		- has reserved right to develop bushland in future	3.1.5
		<u>Other</u>	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Process</li> </ul>	
		Proposal has already been rejected twice	3.4.1
		Loss of feeding habitat for Carnaby's Cockatoo is a controlled action under the EPBC Act and must be referred and considered in the EIA process (it has not been done).	2.1.1
		The EPA has not assessed the degree of impact of the proposal on Shenton Bushland	3.4.2
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planning/Odour</li> </ul>	
		The ERR does not reveal the full extent of the University's development plans – will clear additional bushland for site works	3.1.1
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General issues</li> </ul>	
		ERR prepared under wrong ISO certification	3.4.5
		University motivated to capitalise on economic values of	3.3.1

No	Author	Summary of submission	Response
		bushland  University has broader social responsibilities to wider community  Widespread community support to retain entire bushland  Community consultation held in February 2007 inadequate  University has not responded to questions  Another University, Edith Cowan University recently unnecessarily destroyed flora and fauna habitats such as that at their Churchlands site  University has not provided evidence of track record on working groups, research opportunities and schools since date of endowment  Lack of commitment to support community groups	3.3.1, 3.3.2  3.3.2  3.4.3  3.4.3  3.3.6  3.3.1, 3.3.4  3.3.4, 3.4.3
44.	Unknown	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fauna</li> </ul> Important for two endangered species:  Carnaby's Black Cockatoo  - roosts at Perry Lakes  - feeding habitat – B.Prionotes woodland  Graceful Sun Moth  - rarity and regulatory classification of Graceful Sun moth  - Graceful Sun Moth found nearby (in Shenton Bushland, linked to Underwood Avenue Bushland site via a bushland corridor along Bedbrook Place)  No fungi surveys  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Vegetation</li> </ul> B.Prionotes woodland seasonally significant– feeding habitat for Carnaby's Cockatoo  Karrakatta Central and South Vegetation Community not well reserved.  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Biodiversity</li> </ul> Fungi important to biodiversity	2.1.1  2.1.1  2.1.1  2.1.6  2.1.1  2.1.1  2.1.1  2.1.3  2.1.6  2.1.7  2.1.3

No	Author	Summary of submission	Response
		<p>Mapping by Hopper and Gioia shows that Perth Metropolitan area is biodiversity hotspot, one of the world's 34 internationally recognised biodiversity hotspots</p> <p>Biodiversity represented at Underwood Avenue bushland is precious and should be conserved</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bush Forever/Management</li> </ul> <p>Is a Bush Forever site – contains regionally and nationally significant vegetation</p> <p>Third largest bushland in the locality</p> <p>Proposal is environmentally more damaging than one previously rejected in 2001 – splits bushland into two smaller areas, and includes substantial degraded bushland while not including very good quality bushland to north-east</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Linkage/POS</li> </ul> <p>Regional connectivity between Kings Park and Bold Park critical for birds, reptiles and amphibians (significance recognised in both EPA bulletins).</p> <p>Important for maintaining biodiversity in Kings Park and Bold Park</p> <p><u>Other</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General issues</li> </ul> <p>Should be given permanent protection under same legislation as Kings Park and Bold Park</p> <p>Proposal is environmental vandalism, socially and ethically unacceptable</p>	<p>2.1.9</p> <p>2.1.11</p> <p>2.1.5</p> <p>2.1.5, 2.2.2</p> <p>2.1.5, 2.2.1, 2.2.2</p> <p>2.1.10, 2.2.2</p> <p>2.1.10, 2.2.2</p> <p>3.2.1</p> <p>3.3.1, 3.4.7</p>
45.	Unknown	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fauna</li> </ul> <p>Area holds diverse structure of reptiles and mammals with no method of escape – will be eliminated in ensuing process of clearing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Vegetation</li> </ul> <p>Practice of land clearing in such urban density is the work of those with short-term goals – complete and mindless idiots</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Biodiversity</li> </ul>	<p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.5, 3.4.7</p> <p>2.1.1, 2.1.4,</p>

No	Author	Summary of submission	Response
		Native bushland has significant value to ecology to wider community of birds, mammals and insects that use reserved area as breeding, cover and as food source	2.1.11
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bush Forever/Management</li> </ul>	
		Irreplaceable remnant of native bushland	2.1.5
		One third is a pathetic consultation	2.1.5
46.	Unknown	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General issues</li> </ul>	
		Should be given permanent protection under same legislation as Kings Park and Bold Park	3.2.1
		Proposal is environmental vandalism, socially and ethically unacceptable	3.3.1, 3.4.7
47.	Unknown	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Vegetation</li> </ul>	
		No native bushland should be cleared	2.1.5
		One and a half populations of Jacksonia sericea not even in the area covered by Bulletin 1034 proposal	2.1.5
		There are more and larger populations of Jacksonia sericea in Lot 4 than in report's Figure 3, more than half outside Conservation Area B	2.1.5
		B.Prionotes only occurs north of the Swan River, except Point Walter	2.1.6
		- not listed in Bush Forever as significant	2.1.6
		- largest stand of banksia prionotes extends further south than ATA's maps indicate	2.1.6
		- may be the largest stand in any Bush Forever site	2.1.5, 2.1.6
		- weedy and burst but is regenerating – significant locally and regionally	2.1.6
		- bushland also has two smaller stands	2.1.6
		More than 200 species of vascular plants have been recorded in total development area	2.1.5
		Contains native species not occurring in Kings Park, Bold Park or Shenton Bushland	2.1.5
		Also species present which are not also in either Kings Park, Bold Park or Shenton Bushland (not in more than one of the three)	2.1.5

No	Author	Summary of submission	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Biodiversity</li> </ul> <p>Any reduction in the size of the bushland runs the risk of leading to loss of species</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bush Forever/Management</li> </ul> <p>Size given in ERR for total development area must be in correct – difference in areas between 2001 proposal and 2007 proposal should be taken into consideration</p> <p>Area of the development has been extended westward to include population of Eucalyptus decipiens and some of the mapped populations of Jacksonia sericea – this extension constitutes approximately half of the 2ha Conservation Area B</p> <p>9ha of total conservation area, not 10ha</p> <p>Almost all bushland has conservation significance due to diversity, condition of vegetation, presence (good representations) of species and types of vegetation that are absent, poorly represented or less common in Bold Park, Kings Park, Shenton Bushland and other Bush Forever sites, and even where vegetation is degraded it has mature tuart and jarrah trees</p> <p><u>Other</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planning</li> </ul> <p>Areas shown in Figures 1 and 2 are in the eastern portion of Lot 4, contrary to the ERR which states the north-eastern portion</p>	<p>2.1.11</p> <p>3.4.1, 3.4.7</p> <p>2.1.5</p> <p>2.1.5, 3.4.7</p> <p>2.1.5</p> <p>3.4.7</p>
48.	Unknown	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fauna</li> </ul> <p>Bushland is habitat for Carnaby's Black Cockatoos</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Biodiversity</li> </ul> <p>Underwood Avenue Bushland is a biodiversity hotspot</p> <p>Fast losing the claim to be called a biodiversity hotspot</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Linkage/POS</li> </ul> <p>Bushland is a green corridor between Kings Park and Bold Park</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bush Forever/Management</li> </ul> <p>Underwood Avenue Bushland is a Bush Forever site of</p>	<p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.9</p> <p>2.1.9, 2.1.11</p> <p>2.1.10, 2.2.2</p> <p>2.1.5</p>





No	Author	Summary of submission	Response
		for future development as additional conservation areas – this is listed as 'Good to Very Good' condition and contains some good quality bushland	
		Very pleased the University is suggesting there will be a management plan for conservation areas. The University should make a commitment to work with the community groups on this important matter. Some timeline for events should be established	2.2.3
		<u>Other</u>	
		• Process	
		ERR has neglected EPA Bulletin 1099, which overtook Bulletin 1034	3.4.1
		The Department of Environment [sic] should take this opportunity to create a model subdivision, for example the proposed Alkimos and Perry Lakes developments	3.3.6
		The table on page 13 of the ERR should show the February 2003 proposal reported on by the EPA in Bulletin 1099	3.4.1
		• Planning	
		The community environment will be downgraded by the road traffic proposal for the development	3.1.6
		The buffer zones are not adequate or do not exist	3.3.9
		Advertised proposal unclear – no indication as to what is the proposed area to be cleared and left for future development	3.1.1
		Previous proposals have mentioned multistorey development with shops and motels – is this still being considered?	3.3.8
		Plan does not indicate where grouped housing is to be located	3.1.6
		What is the traffic problem that 268 dwellings will bring? The exit onto Underwood Avenue only has a left hand turn, no other exit is identified	2.1.13, 3.1.1
		Clearing of 8.5ha for future development will result in severe dust pollution problem for residents – any attempt to bring in water would be waste of a resource and noise nuisance problem	3.3.9
		Previous reports made mention of an agreement that buffer areas would be 45ha fronting Underwood Avenue –	3.3.9

No	Author	Summary of submission	Response
		<p>5m now proposed is insufficient (3m is firebreak)</p> <p>Why is there no buffer along Selby Street? Important from noise and visual aspect point of view</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Social &amp; heritage</li> </ul> <p>The Aboriginal importance of the bushland has been downgraded from the 2003 proposal</p> <p>The previous proposal (February 2003) talked of an interpretive centre being established as an opportunity for the Nyungah people to explain their culture in partnership with the University. This appears to have been reduced – suggest that it should be reintroduced</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General</li> </ul> <p>University has neglected important environmental issues</p> <p>ERR was not available to the public in an easily obtainable manner – no copies were available at local libraries until I advised ATA on Tuesday evening 7 August 2007 – not satisfactory when submissions close 13 August 2007</p> <p>Disappointing that the University has not shown leadership by making proposal environmentally friendly e.g. water reuse.</p> <p>Noise nuisance already experienced from the University grass growing trials that are situated in the adjoining area</p>	<p>3.3.9</p> <p>3.3.5</p> <p>3.3.5</p> <p>3.4.7</p> <p>3.4.4</p> <p>3.3.8</p> <p>3.3.3</p>
50.	Margaret Larke, President, Western Australian Naturalists' Club (Inc)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fauna</li> </ul> <p>Negative effect on two species of listed national conservation significance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Carnaby's Cockatoo</li> <li>- Rainbow Bee-eater</li> </ul> <p>Will also impact on Graceful Sun Moth</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Vegetation</li> </ul> <p>Further loss of Karrakatta Central and South vegetation communities (already below recommended percentage in conservation areas)</p> <p>Significant loss of bushland in Good to Very Good condition</p> <p>Proposal does not conserve all the best areas and does not</p>	<p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.7</p> <p>2.1.5</p> <p>2.1.5, 2.1.6</p>

No	Author	Summary of submission	Response
		<p>include all vegetation types (e.g. B.Prionotes woodland)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Linkage/POS</li> </ul> <p>Bushland is part of a corridor linking Kings Park and Bold Park</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bush Forever/Management</li> </ul> <p>Bushland seen as ecologically significant in Bush Forever</p> <p><u>Other</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Process</li> </ul> <p>Environmental assessment is flawed and inadequate</p> <p>EPA needs to fulfil statutory obligations and assess each proposal on its environmental merits</p> <p>EPA needs to refer the potential threats to nationally significant values to the Federal Department of Environment and ensure a proper assessment is conducted</p>	<p>2.1.5</p> <p>2.1.5</p> <p>3.4.2</p> <p>3.4.2</p> <p>2.1.1, 3.4.2</p>
51.	Unknown	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Vegetation</li> </ul> <p>Karrakatta Central and South Vegetation Community is unique and not well reserved.</p> <p>Contains a large and diverse number of orchid species (approximately 20) that are widely admired and sought after for study and photography: - <i>Caladenia arenicola</i>, - <i>C. flava</i>, <i>C. georgei</i>, <i>C. latifolia</i>, <i>C. longicauda</i>, <i>Cyanicula gemmata</i>, <i>Diuris longifolia</i>, <i>D. corymbosa</i>, <i>D. aff corymbosa</i>, <i>D. magnifica</i>, <i>Elythranthera brunonis</i>, <i>Leporella fimbriata</i>, <i>Microtis media subsp media</i>, <i>Pheladenia deformis</i>, <i>Pterostylis recurva</i>, <i>P sanguinea</i>, <i>P. vittata</i>, <i>Pyrorchis nigricans</i>, <i>Thelymitra aff holmesii</i>, <i>T. campulanata</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Biodiversity</li> </ul> <p>Mapping by Hopper and Gioia shows that the Perth Metropolitan area is a biodiversity hotspot within one of the world's 34 biodiversity hotspots</p> <p>Clearing of vegetation that is significant as a remnant of native vegetation in an area that has been extensively cleared compromises a high level of biological diversity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Linkage/POS</li> </ul> <p>Vital component of bushland corridor between Kings Park and Bold Park enabling movement of plant seed, birds,</p>	<p>2.1.7</p> <p>2.1.5</p> <p>2.1.9</p> <p>2.1.5, 2.1.11</p> <p>2.1.10, 2.2.2</p>

No	Author	Summary of submission	Response
		reptiles and amphibians (significance of corridor has been recognised in EPA Bulletins on University proposals).	
		Clearing of vegetation likely to have an impact on the environmental values of any adjacent or nearby conservation area	2.1.5, 2.1.10, 2.2.2, 3.4.2
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bush Forever/Management</li> </ul>	
		Is a Bush Forever site – contains regionally and nationally significant vegetation	2.1.5
		Third largest bushland in the locality	2.1.5, 2.2.2
		Figure for conservation area includes POS and is divided in two discrete and spatially separated blocks – value of the small area of retained bushland is further reduced	2.1.5, 2.2.1
		The advertised proposal is environmentally more damaging than the one rejected in 2001 because it has split the bushland into two smaller areas	2.1.5, 2.2.1, 2.2.2
		Significance of site is due to its large size – proposal will destroy 2/3 site and all but one of values in Bush Forever criteria	2.1.5
		Claim that there will be a 'net benefit to the environment' is totally incorrect	2.1.7
		<u>Other</u>	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Process</li> </ul>	
		Previous proposals rejected twice on grounds they failed to meet environmental requirements	3.4.1
		Proposal does not meet all the Principles of Clearing Native Vegetation in EP Act	3.4.6
		The sustainability and ethical aspects of the development have not been addressed and are now a mandatory component of development assessment in WA.	3.4.2
		If approval given for clearing, a suitable offset would need to be provided. EPA Policy on Offsets indicates offsets should be last resort with priority given to avoiding and reducing impacts to maximum extent possible – this principle has not been followed. Given the lack of other remnant vegetation in the area, the aspiration for offsets is unlikely to be achievable	3.4.2
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planning</li> </ul>	
		No promise to retain bush in perpetuity	3.1.5

No	Author	Summary of submission	Response
		<p>- has reserved right to develop bushland in future</p> <p>If approval given for clearing, there are alternative layouts of development that would better meet the conservation needs while providing adequate numbers of houses. For example, areas adjacent to the Agricultural research station appear to be degraded and more suitable for development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General issues</li> </ul> <p>Proposal is environmental vandalism, socially and ethically unacceptable</p> <p>The land was bequeathed by the State (the people of Western Australia), if the people of Western Australia decide that bushland is as valuable an asset as residences, the University should incorporate those re-evaluations into its plans</p> <p>The University is the most well-endowed and wealthiest university in Western Australia.</p> <p>The University does not need the money from selling off this land for development.</p> <p>It should be using this land to conserve and indeed study biodiversity. Why not consider turning this piece of bushland into a biodiversity research site to support the work being undertaken by the School of Plant Biology, working in Plant Conservation Biology</p>	<p>3.1.5</p> <p>3.2.1, 3.2.2</p> <p>3.4.7</p> <p>3.2.1, 3.4.7</p> <p>3.3.1</p> <p>3.3.1</p> <p>3.3.4</p>
52.	Unknown	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fauna</li> </ul> <p>Bush remnant important bird habitat – provides food source for Carnaby's Cockatoo</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Vegetation</li> </ul> <p>The vegetation of Underwood Avenue is Karrakatta complex that is inadequately represented</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Biodiversity</li> </ul> <p>Bush remnant important for plant biodiversity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bush Forever/Management</li> </ul> <p>Area is Bush Forever site</p> <p>Proposal to clear two thirds of site is unacceptable</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Linkage/POS</li> </ul>	<p>2.1.1, 2.1.4, 2.1.6</p> <p>2.1.7</p> <p>2.1.11</p> <p>2.1.5</p> <p>2.1.5</p>

No	Author	Summary of submission	Response
		<p>This area provides part of a bush corridor in the western suburbs between Bold Park and Kings Park, important to preserve adequate linkage</p> <p>Given poor condition of Kings Park and clearing of Perry Lakes, it is doubly important to preserve nearby bush remnants at other sites</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planning</li> </ul> <p>Bush should be given appropriate legal protection in perpetuity – University has reserved the right to make a profit from developing this land</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General issues</li> </ul> <p>Site should not be cleared for commercial gain by an extremely wealthy private educational corporation, that has huge financial investments and assets in terms of landholdings</p>	<p>2.1.10, 2.2.2</p> <p>2.1.10, 2.2.2</p> <p>3.2.1</p> <p>3.3.1</p>
53.	Unknown	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fauna</li> </ul> <p>Range of habitats over the varying terrain present provides significant habitat for a diverse vertebrate fauna</p> <p>At least 37 bird species, 16 reptile species and 3 amphibian species</p> <p>Significant bird species include Carnaby's Cockatoo, Weebill, Varied Sitella, and Yellow-rumped Thornbill</p> <p>Tuart provides hollows for hollow breeders and tall tree habitat for other species such as diurnal birds of prey</p> <p>There is a strong relationship between number of different species of reptiles occurring on the bushland remnants and the size of the remnant</p> <p>- presence of Gould's Goanna is considered significant</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Vegetation</li> </ul> <p>The vegetation of Underwood Avenue is an important remnant of Karrakatta complex that is inadequately represented</p> <p>80 native (and 16 weed) species have been recorded in the bushland</p> <p>The bushland contains areas of B.Prionotes Low Woodland – only two other areas in which this species is known to have comparable abundance</p>	<p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.1, 2.1.4</p> <p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.7</p> <p>2.1.5</p> <p>2.1.6</p>

No	Author	Summary of submission	Response
		Majority of bushland is in very good to good condition with areas in good and degraded condition	2.1.5
		Jarrah.Tuart Open Woodland ranges from good to completely degraded condition	2.1.5
		Tuarts are of mixed age – indicates this species is still able to regenerate well	2.1.5
		Condition of bushland is comparable to, and in many cases better than, other regionally significant areas on the Spearwood Dunes	2.1.5, 2.1.7
		Bushland supports four species of banksia – important for nectar feeding birds	2.1.5, 2.1.6
		Preserving significant areas of bushland is more critical as native vegetation in Perth continues to decline	2.1.5
		Average 853ha per year cleared between 1998 – 2004, rate of clearing has continued or possibly accelerated in past 3 years	2.1.5, 3.4.7
		For EPA to allow clearing is contrary to Principle 3 EP Act	3.4.6
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Biodiversity</li> </ul>	
		If bushland cleared and fragmented will clearly lose biological diversity and ecological integrity	2.1.11
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Linkage/POS</li> </ul>	
		This area provides a significant bush/wetland linkage between Kings Park, Shenton Bushland and Bold Park likely to facilitate movement of birds, some reptiles, frogs and insects.	2.1.10, 2.2.2
		Linkage with Shenton Park Bushland particularly significant – species can move in fire or can re-colonise burnt sites	2.1.10, 2.2.2
		Prominent location and high visibility of the Tuart trees on the crest of the ridge is also likely to be a significant factor in maintaining ecological linkage	2.1.5
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General issues</li> </ul>	
		EPA should urge the State Government to acquire the land and make it an A Class Reserve	3.2.1
		More housing can be created, the University can find other sources for funds	3.3.1



No	Author	Summary of submission	Response
54.	Unknown	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fauna</li> </ul> <p>Carnaby's Cockatoo will lose vital habitat</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Vegetation</li> </ul> <p>Haven't any decision-makers heard of global warming?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bush Forever/Management</li> </ul> <p>Underwood Avenue is a Bush Forever site, what does 'forever' mean?</p> <p>Must save every single Bush Forever site in its entirety</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Linkage/POS</li> </ul> <p>One of the bigger areas of bush, is part of vital corridor for native fauna</p>	<p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.12</p> <p>2.1.5</p> <p>2.1.5</p> <p>2.1.10, 2.2.2</p>
55.	Unknown	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bush Forever/Management</li> </ul> <p>Is a Bush Forever site, regional and national significance</p> <p>Due to 'edge effects' conservation areas will be much harder to manage for biodiversity retention</p> <p>Consider retaining most biodiverse section as single block of bushland</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Linkage/POS</li> </ul> <p>Important linkage between Kings Park and Bold Park</p> <p><u>Other</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General issues</li> </ul> <p>Use taxes to compensate University for loss of revenue</p>	<p>2.1.5</p> <p>2.2.1</p> <p>2.1.11</p> <p>2.1.10, 2.2.2</p> <p>3.2.1</p>
56.	Unknown	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Vegetation</li> </ul> <p>Trees and bush are the 'lungs' of the city and are nature's tools for filtering air pollutants</p> <p>Natural part of cleansing mechanism</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Linkage/POS</li> </ul> <p>POS has not kept up with increasing housing density and subdivision</p> <p>Pressure on neighbouring POS will strongly increase due</p>	<p>3.4.7</p> <p>3.4.7</p> <p>2.2.2, 3.4.7</p> <p>3.3.6, 3.4.7</p>

No	Author	Summary of submission	Response
		<p>to urban infill</p> <p><u>Other</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planning</li> </ul> <p>Trees in gardens are decreasing through construction of block filling houses and subdivisions</p> <p>Preserve bushland and integrate it with surrounding POS to create 'ribbons of green'</p>	<p>3.3.6, 3.4.7</p> <p>3.4.7</p>
57.	Unknown	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General</li> </ul> <p>Imagine George Seddon's response to this bush and act appropriately</p>	3.4.7
58.	Unknown	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fauna</li> </ul> <p>Negative impact upon two 'endangered' species, both believed to use this bushland</p> <p>Carnaby's Black Cockatoo</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- large flock, roosts Perry Lakes</li> <li>- feeding habitat – B.Prionotes woodland</li> </ul> <p>Graceful Sun Moth</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Graceful Sun Moth found nearby (in Shenton Bushland, linked to Underwood Avenue Bushland site via a bushland corridor along Bedbrook Place)</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Vegetation</li> </ul> <p>Karrakatta Central and South Vegetation Community not well reserved.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Biodiversity</li> </ul> <p>Mapping by Hopper and Gioia shows that the Perth Metropolitan area is a biodiversity hotspot within one of the world's 34 biodiversity hotspots</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Linkage/POS</li> </ul> <p>Regional connectivity between Kings Park and Bold Park critical for birds, reptiles and amphibians (significance of corridor has been recognised in EPA Bulletins on University proposals).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bush Forever/Management</li> </ul>	<p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.7</p> <p>2.1.9</p> <p>2.1.10, 2.2.2</p>

No	Author	Summary of submission	Response
		Is a Bush Forever site – contains regionally and nationally significant vegetation	2.1.5
		Third largest bushland in the locality	2.1.5, 2.2.2
		The advertised proposal is environmentally more damaging than the one rejected in 2001 because it has split the bushland into two smaller areas	2.1.5, 2.2.1
		Significance of site is due to its large size – proposal will destroy 2/3 site and all but one of values in Bush Forever criteria	2.1.5
		Claim that there will be a 'net benefit to the environment' is patent nonsense	2.1.7
		<u>Other</u>	
		• Process	
		Previous proposals rejected twice on grounds they failed to meet environmental requirements	3.4.1
		• Planning	
		No promise to retain bush in perpetuity	3.1.5
		- has reserved right to develop bushland in future	3.1.5
		• General issues	
		Remnant bush at Perry Lakes soon destroyed for housing	3.3.6
		Proposal is socially and ethically unacceptable and should be rejected	3.4.7
		Bushland should be given permanent protection under same legislation that protects Kings Park and Bold Park	3.2.1
59.	Unknown	• Fauna	
		So much habitat is being destroyed needlessly	2.1.4
		• Vegetation	
		Urbanisation contributing more to global warming than fossil fuels	2.1.12
		• Biodiversity	
		Responsibility to preserve flora and fauna	2.1.11
		• General issues	

No	Author	Summary of submission	Response
		Short sighted to raise funds with the sacrifice of important native bushland	2.1.5, 3.3.1
60.	Unknown	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fauna</li> </ul> <p>Negative impact upon two 'endangered' species, both believed to use this bushland</p> <p>Carnaby's Black Cockatoo</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- flock around 100, roosts nearby Perry Lakes</li> <li>- feeding habitat – B.Prionotes woodland</li> </ul> <p>Graceful Sun Moth</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Graceful Sun Moth found nearby (in Shenton Bushland, linked to Underwood Avenue Bushland site via a bushland corridor along Bedbrook Place)</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Vegetation</li> </ul> <p>Karrakatta Central and South Vegetation Community are unique and not well reserved.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Biodiversity</li> </ul> <p>Mapping by Hopper and Gioia shows that the Perth Metropolitan area is a biodiversity hotspot within one of the world's 34 biodiversity hotspots</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Linkage/POS</li> </ul> <p>Vital component of bushland corridor linking between Kings Park and Bold Park critical for birds, reptiles and amphibians (significance of corridor has been recognised in EPA Bulletins on University proposals).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bush Forever/Management</li> </ul> <p>Figure for conservation area includes POS and is divided in two discrete and spatially separated blocks</p> <p>Is a Bush Forever site – contains regionally and nationally significant vegetation</p> <p>Third largest bushland in the locality</p> <p>The advertised proposal is environmentally more damaging than the one rejected in 2001 because it has split the bushland into two smaller areas</p> <p>Significance of site is due to its large size – proposal will destroy 2/3 site and all but one of values in Bush Forever</p>	<p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.6</p> <p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.7</p> <p>2.1.9</p> <p>2.1.10, 2.2.2</p> <p>2.1.5, 2.2.1, 2.2.2</p> <p>2.1.5</p> <p>2.1.5, 2.2.2</p> <p>2.1.5, 2.2.1</p> <p>2.1.5</p>

No	Author	Summary of submission	Response
		<p>criteria</p> <p>Claim that there will be a 'net benefit to the environment' is patent nonsense</p> <p><u>Other</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Process</li> </ul> <p>Previous proposals rejected twice on grounds they failed to meet environmental requirements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planning</li> </ul> <p>No promise to retain bush in perpetuity</p> <p>- has reserved right to develop bushland in future</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General issues</li> </ul> <p>Remnant bush at Perry Lakes soon destroyed for housing</p> <p>Should be given permanent protection under same legislation that protects Kings Park and Bold Park</p>	<p>2.1.7</p> <p>3.4.1</p> <p>3.1.5</p> <p>3.1.5</p> <p>3.3.6</p> <p>3.2.1</p>
61.	Unknown	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fauna</li> </ul> <p>Negative impact upon two 'endangered' species, both believed to use this bushland</p> <p>Carnaby's Black Cockatoo</p> <p>- flock around 100, roosts nearby Perry Lakes</p> <p>- feeding habitat – B.Prionotes woodland</p> <p>Graceful Sun Moth</p> <p>- Graceful Sun Moth found nearby (in Shenton Bushland, linked to Underwood Avenue Bushland site via a bushland corridor along Bedbrook Place)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Vegetation</li> </ul> <p>Karrakatta Central and South Vegetation Community are unique and not well reserved.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Biodiversity</li> </ul> <p>Mapping by Hopper and Gioia shows that the Perth Metropolitan area is a biodiversity hotspot within one of the world's 34 biodiversity hotspots</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Linkage/POS</li> </ul>	<p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.6</p> <p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.7</p> <p>2.1.9</p>

No	Author	Summary of submission	Response
		<p>Important for maintaining biodiversity between Kings Park and Bold Park (significance has been recognised in EPA Bulletins on University proposals).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bush Forever/Management</li> </ul> <p>Figure for conservation area is misleading – includes POS and is divided in two discrete and spatially separated blocks</p> <p>Is a Bush Forever site – contains regionally and nationally significant vegetation</p> <p>Third largest bushland in the locality</p> <p>The advertised proposal is environmentally more damaging than the one rejected in 2001 because it has split the bushland into two smaller areas</p> <p>Significance of site is due to its large size – proposal will destroy 2/3 site and all but one of values in Bush Forever criteria</p> <p>Claim that there will be a 'net benefit to the environment' is patent nonsense</p> <p><u>Other</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Process</li> </ul> <p>Previous proposals rejected twice on grounds they failed to meet environmental requirements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planning</li> </ul> <p>No promise to retain bush in perpetuity</p> <p>- has reserved right to develop bushland in future</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General issues</li> </ul> <p>Remnant bush at Perry Lakes soon destroyed for housing</p> <p>Proposal environmentally, socially and ethically unacceptable</p> <p>Should be given permanent protection under same legislation that protects Kings Park and Bold Park</p>	<p>2.1.10, 2.2.2</p> <p>2.1.5, 2.2.1, 2.2.2</p> <p>2.1.5</p> <p>2.1.5, 2.2.2</p> <p>2.1.5, 2.2.1, 2.2.2</p> <p>2.1.5</p> <p>2.1.7</p> <p>3.4.1</p> <p>3.1.5</p> <p>3.1.5</p> <p>3.3.6</p> <p>3.4.7</p> <p>3.2.1</p>
62.	Peel Preservation Group Inc	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bush Forever/Management</li> </ul> <p>Is a Bush Forever site – contains regionally and nationally significant vegetation</p>	<p>2.1.5</p>

No	Author	Summary of submission	Response
		<p>Third largest bushland in the locality</p> <p>Significance of site is due to its large size – proposal will destroy 2/3 site and all but one of values in Bush Forever criteria</p> <p>Areas of natural bushland becoming so rare that none should be cleared – we are losing flora and fauna and their habitat at an alarming rate</p> <p><u>Other</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General issues</li> </ul> <p>Proposal environmentally, socially and ethically unacceptable</p>	<p>2.1.5, 2.2.2</p> <p>2.1.5</p> <p>2.1.5, 2.1.11</p> <p>3.4.7</p>
63.	Friends of Underwood Avenue Bushland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fauna</li> </ul> <p>Univerisity makes not attempt to address impact on fauna</p> <p>Negative impact upon two 'endangered' species, both believed to use this bushland</p> <p>Carnaby's Black Cockatoo</p> <p>- no mention of Carnaby's Cockatoos roosting at Lot 4 and Perry Lakes</p> <p>- no mention of important bushland corridor used by Carnaby's Cockatoos for moving between Kings Park and Bold Park</p> <p>- no mention of B.Prionotes woodland and importance for feeding</p> <p>- significant loss of habitat for feeding and roosting</p> <p>- no mention that the proposal is a controlled action under EPBC Act</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Vegetation</li> </ul> <p>Jarraah/banksia woodland not well represented locally – Bold Park and Kings Park (in contradiction to ERR)</p> <p>Bushland contains diversity of vegetation communities</p> <p>Vascular flora poorly reserved in Drummond Botanical District/Swan Coastal Plain IBRA region – this is a reason to preserve the entire bushland</p> <p>Vegetation in the bushland has the following attributes,</p>	<p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.10, 2.2.2</p> <p>2.1.6</p> <p>2.1.4</p> <p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.5</p> <p>2.1.5, 2.1.7</p> <p>2.1.5</p> <p>2.1.7</p>

No	Author	Summary of submission	Response
		which are reasons to preserve the bushland:	
		- Karrakatta Central and South Vegetation Complex	2.1.7
		- Located in an area largely cleared	2.1.7
		- Large stand of B.Prionotes woodland	2.1.6
		- Significant variation within Floristic Community Type 28	2.1.5
		- Some communities dominated by <i>eucalyptus gomphocephala</i> , not well represented in conservation reserves	2.1.5
		- Moderate diversity of different vegetation at the level of plant community/vegetation association	2.1.5
		• Biodiversity	
		Likely impact on conservation value of Shenton Park, Bold Park and Kings Park	3.4.2
		Will increase rate of extinction of flora and fauna in Kings Park and Bold Park	3.4.2
		• Linkage/POS	
		Remnant bushland at nearby Perry Lakes Reserve and AK Reserve will soon be removed. This impact has not been taken into account.	3.3.6
		No provision for linkage of west of Conservation Area B and Agriculture Faculty land – will negate attempt at linkage by the reconfiguration	2.1.5
		Significant contribution to regional connectivity for fauna, birds and diversity of plant communities between Kings Park/Shenton Park Bushland/Bold Park.	2.1.10, 2.2.2
		• Bush Forever/Management	
		The further 8.5 ha to be cleared and earthworked will result in environmental vandalism because if development approval not given, bush will have been cleared	3.1.1
		Using EPA's rule of thumb, remnant should be 19ha not the approx. 12ha proposed	3.4.2
		ERR falls short of providing protection for 67% average achieved for Negotiated Planning Solution – area conserved should be 21.4ha	2.1.5
		University has mismanaged and neglected bushland	2.2.4



No	Author	Summary of submission	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- ignored requests to control weeds</li> </ul>	2.2.4
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- has allowed bush to be used for 4 wheel drive training causing disturbance and increasing likelihood of dieback</li> </ul>	3.4.7
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- has allowed bush to be used for commercial beekeepers</li> </ul>	2.1.2, 3.4.7
		Conservation areas will require intensive management	2.2.3
		<u>Other</u>	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Process</li> </ul>	
		The EPA has not performed a formal assessment	3.4.2
		EPA has applied a rule of thumb to retain remnant bush, falls short of NPS.	3.4.2
		EPA has failed to request and assess the plans for the whole site	3.4.1, 3.4.2
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Planning/Odour</li> </ul>	
		The ERR does not reveal the full extent of the University's development plans.	3.1.1
		The further 8.5 ha to be cleared and earthworked is inside the odour buffer zone for the SWWTP and therefore unable to be used for residential development – plan shows future development	3.1.1, 3.3.3
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General issues</li> </ul>	
		The public interest has not been taken into account	3.4.3
		Widespread community support to retain almost entire bushland	3.3.2
		Not possible for community to comment on current incomplete proposal	3.4.3, 3.4.7
		University staff are being lobbied by the administration to have a portion of their pay directed towards environmental causes	3.4.7
64.	Unknown	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vegetation</li> </ul>	
		Vegetation complex is unique	2.1.5
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bush Forever/Management</li> </ul>	
		Bush Forever site – nationally and regionally significant	2.1.5

No	Author	Summary of submission	Response
		Third largest area of bushland in Perth's western suburbs	2.1.5, 2.2.2
65.	Unknown	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fauna</li> </ul> <p>Negative impact upon two 'endangered' species, both believed to use this bushland</p> <p>Carnaby's Black Cockatoo</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- flock around 100, roosts nearby Perry Lakes</li> <li>- feeding habitat – B.Prionotes woodland</li> </ul> <p>Graceful Sun Moth</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Graceful Sun Moth found nearby (in Shenton Bushland, linked to Underwood Avenue Bushland site via a bushland corridor along Bedbrook Place)</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Vegetation</li> </ul> <p>Karrakatta Central and South Vegetation Community are unique and not well reserved.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Linkage/POS</li> </ul> <p>Important for maintaining biodiversity between Kings Park and Bold Park</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bush Forever/Management</li> </ul> <p>Figure for conservation area is misleading – includes POS and is divided in two discrete and spatially separated blocks</p> <p>Is a Bush Forever site – contains regionally and nationally significant vegetation</p> <p>Third largest bushland in the locality</p> <p>The advertised proposal is environmentally more damaging than the one rejected in 2001 because it has split the bushland into two smaller areas</p> <p><u>Other</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planning</li> </ul> <p>No promise to retain bush in perpetuity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- has reserved right to develop bushland in future</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General issues</li> </ul>	<p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.6</p> <p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.7</p> <p>2.1.10, 2.2.2</p> <p>2.1.5</p> <p>2.1.10, 2.2.2</p> <p>2.1.5, 2.2.1, 2.2.2</p> <p>3.1.5</p> <p>3.1.5</p>

No	Author	Summary of submission	Response
		Proposal environmentally, socially and ethically unacceptable	3.4.7
		Should be given permanent protection	3.2.1
66.	Unknown	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Linkage/POS</li> </ul> <p>EPA's view neglects the strategic importance of bushland remnants in providing wildlife corridors and habitat in highly infested urban areas, even if they are relatively degraded and weed infested</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bush Forever/Management</li> </ul> <p>By allowing incremental planning decisions to be made near bushland remnants, the EPA also runs the risk that urban remnants will progressively degrade – would the EPA consider that these sites should also be cleared for development if they no longer meet the Bushplan criteria</p> <p>It is not clear from the advertised proposal how setting aside 10ha instead of 8.5ha will protect 'high conservation' core from weed invasion and feral animals, and how there is a net environmental benefit from clearing large area of limited fauna habitat</p> <p>Commitments to manage bushland after development were only offered as a 'sweetener' to help proposal get accepted</p> <p><u>Other</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Process</li> </ul> <p>The advertised proposal has addressed all the objections previously raised by the EPA and has a good chance of being accepted</p> <p>No limit by proponents submitting development proposals at a site</p> <p>No point trying to provide details comments on the proposal</p> <p>Two issues arising from Underwood Avenue saga which should be put on public record, neither of them specifically address the advertised proposal and will not receive a response from the EIA process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Environmental leadership of the University –</li> <li>- proposal does not reflect will on a university of high standing</li> </ul>	<p>3.4.2</p> <p>3.4.2</p> <p>2.1.2, 2.2.3, 3.4.7</p> <p>2.2.3, 3.4.7</p> <p>3.4.2</p> <p>3.4.2</p> <p>3.4.2, 3.4.3, 3.4.7</p> <p>3.3.1</p> <p>3.3.1</p>

No	Author	Summary of submission	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- national university system has drive the University to the point where the institution has to sell a valuable community asset to provide funding to support important teaching and research</li> </ul>	3.3.1
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- on us collectively as a society for our lack of record for bushland because it does not have a monetary value and impedes development</li> </ul>	3.2.1, 3.3.1
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- University has an important role in providing leadership to the community on a wide range of social policy issues, including upholding the principles of ecologically sustainable development (ESD)</li> </ul>	3.3.1, 3.3.4
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Proposal does not meet the University's own ESD policy outlined in its 'Facilities Management' web page and does not accord with the objections of its Climate Change Action Group</li> </ul>	3.3.1, 3.4.7
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- If the University is willing to make the commitments to management bushland that remains after the development, why has it failed to show leadership to do this with the entire bushland</li> </ul>	3.3.1
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Commitment of the EPA in protecting bushland</li> </ul>	3.4.2
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the proposal calls into question the level of commitment of the EPA in protecting bushland in urban areas</li> </ul>	3.4.2
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the EPA practically invited the current development proposal in Bulletin 1034</li> </ul>	3.4.1, 3.4.2
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- EPA considers urban bushland only has value if it triggers assessment criteria set out in Bushplan, but otherwise if it worthless scrub, it should be cleared for development</li> </ul>	3.4.2
67.	Unknown	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Biodiversity</li> </ul> <p>South-West Australia is a biodiversity hotspot and Perth City is one of the most biodiverse cities in the world.</p> <p>The protection of remaining biodiversity through the retention and protection of the remaining bushland within the city is vitally important.</p> <p>Once bushland and its biodiversity is lost it can never be regained.</p> <p>The location and size of this remnant bushland means it is vitally important to support the remaining biodiversity in Kings Park and Bold Park</p>	<p>2.1.9</p> <p>2.1.11</p> <p>2.1.11</p> <p>2.1.10, 2.2.2</p>

No	Author	Summary of submission	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planning</li> </ul> <p>Bushland of this size and location should be protected from development in perpetuity.</p>	3.2.1
68.	Unknown	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fauna</li> </ul> <p>Carnaby's Black Cockatoo (endangered)</p> <p>- feeding habitat – B.Prionotes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Vegetation</li> </ul> <p>B.Prionotes destroyed by advertised proposal</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Biodiversity</li> </ul> <p>Research shows that Perth metropolitan area is a biodiversity hot spot within one of the world's 34 internationally recognised biodiversity hotspots</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bush Forever/Management</li> </ul> <p>Is a Bush Forever site, regionally and nationally significant</p> <p>Advertised proposal is environmentally more damaging than the one rejected in 2001 because it has split the bushland into two smaller areas and includes substantial degraded bushland while not including significant areas of very good quality bushland that were to be protected in the first proposal in July 2001</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Linkage/POS</li> </ul> <p>Vital component of bushland corridor linking Kings Park and Bold Park, enables movement of birds, reptiles and amphibians between these two large native bushland parks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General issues</li> </ul> <p>Proposal is socially and environmentally unacceptable</p>	<p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.6</p> <p>3.1.7</p> <p>2.1.5</p> <p>2.1.5, 2.2.1, 2.2.2</p> <p>2.1.10, 2.2.2</p> <p>3.4.7</p>
69.	Unknown	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fauna</li> </ul> <p>Negative impact upon two 'endangered' species, both believed to use this bushland</p> <p>Carnaby's Black Cockatoo</p> <p>- flock around 100, roosts nearby Perry Lakes</p> <p>- feeding habitat – B.Prionotes woodland</p>	<p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.6</p>

No	Author	Summary of submission	Response
		Graceful Sun Moth	2.1.1
		- Graceful Sun Moth found nearby (in Shenton Bushland, linked to Underwood Avenue Bushland site via a bushland corridor along Bedbrook Place)	2.1.1
		Contains several bird species that are uncommon or declining: Weebill, Yellow-rumped Thornbill, Varied Sitella, Painted Button-quail, Grey Fantail, Tawny Frogmouth, Western Gerygone, Grey Butcherbird	2.1.1
		Viable populations of reptile species and frogs: Gould's Monitor, Moaning Frog, Banjo Frog, Turtle Frog	2.1.1
		- Dependent on size of bushland, diversity of habitats and linkages	2.1.4, 2.1.5, 2.1.10, 2.1.11
		• Vegetation	
		Karrakatta Central and South Vegetation Community are unique and not well reserved.	2.1.7
		Frequent and regular controlled burning will cause bushland litter loss and degradation and adversely alter plant populations	2.2.3
		Fragmenting bushland will significantly increase the damaging impacts of fire	2.1.5, 2.2.3
		B.Prionotes will be destroyed – food source for Carnaby's Cockatoo	2.1.6
		• Biodiversity	
		The greater and area of undisturbed bushland, the greater diversity and size of fauna that can be supported by it	2.1.11
		Reducing the size of the bushland by more than 50% is likely to cause loss of approximately 20% of flora and fauna species. 15% of flora species are less than well reserved on Swan Coastal Plain	2.1.5, 2.1.11
		Mapping by Hopper and Gioia shows that the Perth Metropolitan area is a biodiversity hotspot within one of the world's 34 biodiversity hotspots	2.1.9
		Any intrusion of residential development within Lot 4 will ultimately reduce biodiversity values	2.1.11
		• Bush Forever/Management	
		Is a Bush Forever site – contains regionally and nationally significant vegetation	2.1.5

No	Author	Summary of submission	Response
		Significance of site is due to its large size – proposal will destroy 2/3 site and all but one of values in Bush Forever criteria	2.1.5
		Claim that there will be a 'net benefit to the environment' is unsupportable	2.1.7
		Figure for conservation area is misleading includes POS and is divided in two discrete and spatially separated blocks	2.1.5, 2.2.1, 2.2.2
		The advertised proposal is environmentally more damaging than the one rejected in 2001 because it has split the bushland into two smaller areas	2.1.5, 2.2.1
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Linkage/POS</li> </ul>	
		Vital component of bushland corridor linking between Kings Park and Bold Park critical for birds, reptiles and amphibians and transport of seeds and pollen	2.1.10, 2.2.2
		Vital component for maintaining biodiversity of Kings Park and Bold Park	2.1.10, 2.2.2
		Enhances conservation values of other reserves in the region	2.1.10, 2.2.2
		<u>Other</u>	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Process</li> </ul>	
		Previous proposals rejected twice on grounds they failed to meet environmental requirements	3.4.1
		EPA must consider degree of broken linkage between Underwood Avenue and Shenton bushlands	3.4.2
		Loss of habitat for Carnaby's Cockatoos is a controlled action and this assessment must ensure that obligations under federal legislative protection are satisfied	2.1.1
		Present proposal contains misleading and deceptive data, conclusions, statements and omissions	3.4.7
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planning</li> </ul>	
		Sustainable urban growth in inner Perth should only be on already cleared land	3.4.2
		Remaining bushland must be preserved for the well-being of present and future generations of humankind, and the	3.3.2

No	Author	Summary of submission	Response
		fauna whose home the bushland property is	
		The University and its town planners seek to progress this further destructive proposal by obfuscation and confusion	3.4.7
		No promise to retain bush in perpetuity	3.1.5
		- has reserved right to develop bushland in future	3.1.5
		Planning approvals (zoning, subdivision or development) for Lot 4 are unlawful, corrupt incompetent, unmeritorious, in breach of State planning and local government planning policies, cannot be challenged in SAT, nor is there an appeal right [author's emphasis] in the Supreme Court against any such approval decision	3.4.7
		Planning laws that might provide for protection of bushland cannot do so in absence of third party appeal rights	3.4.7
		University should be permitted high rise commercial and residential development	3.2.3, 3.3.8
		Building should be above the odour zone rather than beside it, which will diminish residential constraints from SWWTP	3.2.3, 3.3.3
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General issues</li> </ul>	
		The salami principle employed by the University to its endowment lands has seen their gradual loss to short term profit without an overall assessment of their long term value as bushland	3.3.1, 3.4.7
		Bushland must be protected by being proclaimed an A Class Nature Reserve	3.2.1
		University will not have a claim for compensation against government as long as some of the land (already cleared) is approved for development	3.2.1
		A holistic approach to development must be taken	3.3.2, 3.4.7
		Remnant bush at Perry Lakes soon destroyed for housing	3.3.6
		Widespread community support for conserving bushland	3.3.2
		University has sold many of its endowment bushland for development	3.3.1
		University will not develop this endowment bushland, they will sell it to a developer once they have the requisite approvals – undertakings provided by University will have no force nor will the University have any further	3.4.7



No	Author	Summary of submission	Response
		interest in the site	
		Compensation is not payable if part of a lot can be developed	3.2.1
		Compensation is not payable if a certain percentage of the lot is taken for a public purpose – see original endowment land grant	3.2.1
		Only University land already cleared should be developed	3.2.2
		State government agency should lead discussion about appropriate development, land swaps and bushland protection	3.2.1
		Where there is public consultation, all town planners and paid consultants should be put on one table away from all other contributors so community members can participate independent of bullying tactics that have been evinced by University representatives in the past.	3.4.3, 3.4.7
70.	Birds Australia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fauna</li> </ul> <p>Negative impact upon two 'endangered' species, both believed to use this bushland</p> <p>Carnaby's Black Cockatoo</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- We successfully argued to the Department of Environment and Water Resources (DEWR) that the proposal was flawed and inaccurate with regards to Carnaby's Cockatoos – it failed to take into account major recent studies</li> <li>- DEWR has ruled that the proposal is a controlled action</li> <li>- the revised proposal does not have a reduced impact on the Carnaby's Cockatoos</li> <li>- University failed to consult data from a number of studies which indicates there is potential for Carnaby's Cockatoo to nest in the area – reports of non-migratory pairs and pairs inspecting nest hollows</li> <li>- Hollywood area and AK Reserve important as major roost sites – support up to 676 individuals</li> <li>- necessity for high quality feeding habitat- threatened loss of feeding habitat</li> </ul> <p>The Variegated Fairy-Wren</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- bush-dependent bird species impacted by edge effects of conservation area – will experience slow decline to</li> </ul>	<p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.1, 2.1.6</p> <p>2.1.1, 2.2.1</p>

No	Author	Summary of submission	Response
		<p>split the bushland into two smaller areas</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Linkage/POS</li> </ul> <p>Vital component of bushland corridor linking between Kings Park and Bold Park critical for birds, reptiles and amphibians</p> <p>Vital component for maintaining biodiversity of Kings Park and Bold Park</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Process</li> </ul> <p>Previous proposals rejected twice on grounds they failed to meet environmental requirements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planning</li> </ul> <p>No promise to retain bush in perpetuity</p> <p>- has reserved right to develop bushland in future</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General issues</li> </ul> <p>Remnant bush at Perry Lakes soon destroyed for housing</p>	<p>2.1.10, 2.2.2</p> <p>2.1.10, 2.2.2</p> <p>3.4.1</p> <p>3.1.5</p> <p>3.1.5</p> <p>3.3.6</p>
73.	Unknown	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fauna</li> </ul> <p>Negative impact upon two 'endangered' species, both believed to use this bushland</p> <p>Carnaby's Black Cockatoo</p> <p>- flock around 100, roosts nearby Perry Lakes</p> <p>- feeding habitat – <i>B.Prionotes</i> woodland</p> <p>Graceful Sun Moth</p> <p>- Graceful Sun Moth found nearby (in Shenton Bushland, linked to Underwood Avenue Bushland site via a bushland corridor along Bedbrook Place)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Vegetation</li> </ul> <p>Karrakatta Central and South Vegetation Community are unique and not well reserved.</p> <p><i>B.Prionotes</i> will be destroyed – food source for Carnaby's Cockatoo</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Biodiversity</li> </ul> <p>Mapping by Hopper and Gioia shows that the Perth</p>	<p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.6</p> <p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.7</p> <p>2.1.6</p>

No	Author	Summary of submission	Response
		<p>Metropolitan area is a biodiversity hotspot within one of the world's 34 biodiversity hotspots</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bush Forever/Management</li> </ul> <p>Is a Bush Forever site – contains regionally and nationally significant vegetation</p> <p>Third largest are in Perth's western suburbs</p> <p>Significance of site is due to its large size – proposal will destroy 2/3 site and all but one of values in Bush Forever criteria</p> <p>Claim that there will be a 'net benefit to the environment' is patent nonsense</p> <p>Figure for conservation area is misleading includes POS and is divided in two discrete and spatially separated blocks</p> <p>The advertised proposal is environmentally more damaging than the one rejected in 2001 because it has split the bushland into two smaller areas</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Linkage/POS</li> </ul> <p>Vital component of bushland corridor linking between Kings Park and Bold Park critical for birds, reptiles and amphibians and transport of seeds and pollen</p> <p>Vital component for maintaining biodiversity of Kings Park and Bold Park (significance has been recognised in EPA Bulletins on University proposals)</p> <p><u>Other</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Process</li> </ul> <p>Previous proposals rejected twice on grounds they failed to meet environmental requirements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planning</li> </ul> <p>No promise to retain bush in perpetuity</p> <p>- has reserved right to develop bushland in future</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General issues</li> </ul> <p>Proposal is environmentally, socially and ethically unacceptable</p> <p>Should be given permanent protection under same</p>	<p>2.1.9</p> <p>2.1.5</p> <p>2.1.5, 2.2.2</p> <p>2.1.5</p> <p>2.1.7</p> <p>2.1.5, 2.2.1, 2.2.2</p> <p>2.1.5, 2.2.1</p> <p>2.1.10, 2.2.2</p> <p>2.1.10, 2.2.2</p> <p>3.4.1</p> <p>3.1.5</p> <p>3.1.5</p> <p>2.1.5, 3.1.1</p> <p>3.4.7</p>

No	Author	Summary of submission	Response
		legislation that protects Kings Park and Bold Park	3.2.1
		Remnant bush at Perry Lakes soon destroyed for housing	3.3.6
74.	Brian Moyle, Committee Member, Wildflower Society of Western Australia (Inc)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fauna</li> </ul> <p>Important to fauna</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Vegetation</li> </ul> <p>Important to flora</p> <p>Karrakatta Central and South Vegetation Communities not well reserved</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bush Forever/Management</li> </ul> <p>Is a Bush Forever site, regionally significant</p> <p>Latest proposal splits the conservation areas, does not protect the high quality bushland</p> <p><u>Other</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Process</li> </ul> <p>Should be assessed in a regional context taking into account the three major areas of remaining bushland between the Swan River and the Coast – King Park, Underwood Avenue/Shenton Bushland and Bold Park</p> <p>Minister did not accept the proposal put forward in 2001, further consideration should be given to the bushland and its values, don't believe advertised proposal meets the minister's requirements</p> <p>Report is deficient on the overall project</p> <p>Project should be submitted to EPA so a level of assessment can be set</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planning</li> </ul> <p>Proposal includes clearing bushland 'as part of subdivision works'</p>	<p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.5</p> <p>2.1.7</p> <p>2.1.5</p> <p>2.1.5, 2.2.1</p> <p>2.1.10, 2.2.2, 3.4.2</p> <p>3.4.1, 2.1.5</p> <p>3.4.7</p> <p>3.4.1, 3.4.2</p> <p>3.1.1</p>
75.	Unknown	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bush Forever/Management</li> </ul> <p>Is a Bush Forever site, should not be developed</p> <p>Advertised proposal environmentally more damaging than one rejected in 2001 because bushland split in two smaller</p>	<p>2.1.5</p> <p>2.1.5, 2.2.2</p>

No	Author	Summary of submission	Response
		<p>areas, includes substantial degraded bushland</p> <p>Significant areas of very good quality bushland that were to be protected in the proposal in July 2001 are not proposed for protection</p>	2.1.4, 2.1.5
76.	Cate Gustavsson, Team Leader, Strategic Biodiversity Planning, DPI	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fauna <p>Carnaby's Black Cockatoo</p> <p>- <i>B.Prionotes</i> woodland – associated with nesting hollows</p> <p>- has mapping of hollows occurred? All trees with hollows should be retained</p> </li> <li>Vegetation <p>Proposal embraces core of 'Good to very good' condition vegetation</p> <p>- clearing will increase greenhouse gas emissions</p> <p>Proposal should be modified to include larger portion of 'Good or better' condition vegetation</p> <p>One population of <i>Jacksonia sericea</i> is located on north west boundary of Conservation Area B – is likely to be degraded over time due to edge effects</p> <p>13m reserve adjacent to conservation area will have negative impact on stand of population of <i>Jacksonia sericea</i></p> <p>Conservation Area B should be increased in the north west to include third population of <i>Jacksonia sericea</i></p> <p>Fourth population of <i>Jacksonia sericea</i> will be lost</p> <p>Includes Karrakatta Central and South Vegetation Community, not well reserved on Swan Coastal Plain.</p> <p>Does not protect the <i>B.Prionotes</i> woodland</p> <p>Table of vegetation conditions in ERR different to that provided on 9 August 2006 – ensure correct data submitted for public comment</p> <p>Retention of many Tuart and Jarrah trees in POS and other parts of subdivision</p> </li> <li>Biodiversity <p>The south-west of Western Australia is one of the world's 34 biodiversity hotspots and the only one in Australia</p> </li> </ul>	<p>3.1.7</p> <p>3.1.7</p> <p>3.1.7</p> <p>3.1.7</p> <p>3.1.7</p> <p>3.1.7</p> <p>3.1.7</p> <p>3.1.7</p> <p>3.1.7</p> <p>3.1.7</p> <p>3.1.7</p> <p>3.1.7</p> <p>3.1.7</p> <p>3.1.7</p> <p>3.1.7</p>

No	Author	Summary of submission	Response
		Hundreds (perhaps thousands) of fauna and flora species are under threat.	3.1.7
		Likely impact of the revised proposal on biodiversity values, loss of species of fauna and flora.	3.1.7
		Banksia woodlands incredibly rich in species diversity.	3.1.7
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Linkage/POS</li> </ul>	
		Proposal promotes east-west ecological linkage, provided POS restored to 'good or better' condition'	3.1.7
		- provided POS maintained and managed for conservation and conservation and conservation compatible uses	3.1.7
		POS cannot be considered an addition to the conservation area	3.1.7
		Provides ecological linkage between Kings Park and Bold Park.	3.1.7
		No information on how grass in POS will be maintained, may result in infestation in bushland	3.1.7
		There is not enough land set aside for POS	3.1.7
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bush Forever/Management</li> </ul>	
		10ha bushland to be set aside for conservation approximately 22% increase on agreed 8.23ha NPS	3.1.7
		Previous proposal (Bulletin 1099) agreed negotiated solution for 12ha bushland for conservation and 0.7ha for POS – deemed not environmentally acceptable in terms of biodiversity and conservation outcomes	3.1.7
		Area conserved in present proposal is less than Bulletin 1099	3.1.7
		Proposal should retain 12ha of bushland for conservation areas on top of any POS	3.1.7
		Conservation Area A should be increased on northern boundary to represent better conservation outcome	3.1.7
		Conservation Area B should be increased in the north west to include third population of <i>Jacksonia sericea</i>	3.1.7
		Other criteria used to select Bush Forever sites relevant to this bushland (contrary to ERR)	3.1.7
		University has committed to managing conservation area and POS and preparing management plan but no long-	3.1.7

No	Author	Summary of submission	Response
		term security – possible disjointed management of site	
		Management plan should include:	
		- Landscape Management Plan	3.1.7
		- Bush Fire Management Plan	
		- Rehabilitation Management Program	
		- management measures specific to Carnaby's Cockatoo	
		There should be no clearing for firebreaks in the conservation areas	3.1.7
		<u>Other</u>	
		• Process	
		Bulletin 1099 proposal not mentioned in ERR - EPA comments on Bulletin 1099 should be recognised in this advertised proposal	3.1.7
		• Planning/Odour	
		R Coding and density increased as offset for providing more land for conservation purposes	3.1.7
		13m reserve adjacent to Conservation Area B will have negative impact on stand of population of <i>Jacksonia sericea</i> – is road necessary?	3.1.7
		Planning support for conservation areas could be given through statutory conservation covenant with stewardship provision	3.1.7
		University has indicated it would not support the area being reserved for Parks and Recreation and would not accept the area being reserved at no cost – this is unacceptable	3.1.7
		There should be support for Metropolitan Region Scheme amendment to reserve conservation area for Parks and Recreation following subdivision approval and legal agreement that no compensation is payable	3.1.7
		The ERR does not reveal the full extent of the University's development plans – will clear additional bushland for site works – within SWWTP area	3.1.7
		Drainage should be contained outside conservation areas	
		• General issues	3.1.7

No	Author	Summary of submission	Response
		No intrusive research activities should be carried out	3.1.7
77.	Unknown	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fauna</li> </ul> <p>Fauna is virtually ignored, despite proposal being a controlled action under EPBC Act</p> <p>For eight months of the year hundreds of Carnaby's Cockatoos are resident in western suburbs</p> <p>- diminution of total area of remnant bushland in the western suburbs is likely to adversely impact on the food resources locally available to these birds</p> <p>- no mention made of <i>B.Prionotes</i> stand, important food species</p> <p>Gould's Goanna recorded to breed in Underwood</p> <p>No mention of large Tuart trees on the crest – potential for breeding hollows</p> <p>- Carnaby's Cockatoo, Little Eagle and other birds (Black-capped Sitella) observed frequently settling in these prominent trees when flying to Underwood from Perry Lakes</p> <p>Unacceptable to clear land for earthworking and kill vertebrates (against University's Animal Ethics Committee's position on ethical treatment of vertebrates)</p> <p>- should employ trapping</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Vegetation</li> </ul> <p>Vegetation assessments outdated and possibly invalid, made prior to most recent fire in January 2003 – need new vegetation assessment</p> <p>Quality and extent of Jarrah/Tuart Open Woodland in Kings Park has diminished significantly, is poorly represented in Bold Park – Underwood Avenue contains best quality Jarrah/Tuart Open Woodland remaining in Karrakatta South and Central vegetation complex</p> <p>Much has changed in relation to effects of carbon dioxide on climate change – land clearing contributor to greenhouses gases and global warming</p> <p>Karrakatta Complex Central and South not well reserved, should be retained</p>	<p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.4</p> <p>2.1.6</p> <p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.4, 2.1.4</p> <p>2.1.1</p> <p>3.1.1, 3.4.7</p> <p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.8</p> <p>2.1.5</p> <p>2.1.12</p> <p>2.1.7</p>



No	Author	Summary of submission	Response
		Comparison of diversity has no validity because use of obsolete data	2.1.8
		Section on rarity has no validity because use of obsolete data	2.1.8
		Vegetation condition section not valid, use of obsolete data	2.1.8
		Much more active and costly program of rehabilitation is required	2.2.3, 2.2.4
		- To maintain existing diversity plants in low numbers should be propagated by cutting and seed	2.2.3, 2.2.4
		- where species known to be present but now locally extinct, should be propagated and reintroduced	2.2.3, 2.2.4
		High level of feral honey bee infestation- feral bee baiting program should be implemented	2.1.2
		Not clear whether rehabilitated area done using locally collected seed, ironically now intends to clear these sites for earthworks	2.2.3, 2.2.4
		Eradication of perennial veldt grass – will have to be carried out annually and extent beyond limits of conservation area to prevent reinfestation	2.2.3
		Perennial veldt grass associated with high risk of fire outbreak	2.2.3
		• Bush Forever/Management	2.1.5
		Provides no net benefit to the environment in comparison to Bulletin 1034 – is an inferior proposal	2.1.7, 2.1.5, 2.2.1, 2.2.2
		Environmental evaluation of the conservation and POS is deficient	2.1.5
		EPA needs to reconsider its position on the proportion of Conservation Area A that should be conserved – possible extension northward to form a single unit	2.2.3, 2.2.4
		Proposed management of bushland and public open spaces lacks credibility and is deficient – University intends to retain ownership and responsibility for management in conservation areas	2.2.4
		- past record of management is incompetent and negligent	2.2.3, 2.2.4
		- conflict of interest as a credible conservation manager as developer of Lot 4	2.1.5, 2.2.1, 2.2.2

No	Author	Summary of submission	Response
		Figure for 'bushland' is misleading, includes POS and two discrete and spatially separated blocks	2.2.1
		Fail to improve Bulletin 1034 proposal in terms of shape and area/perimeter ration	2.1.1, 2.1.5
		Conservation area A does not include area used by Little Eagle for nesting	2.1.5
		No dense areas of <i>Jacksonia sericea</i> in Conservation Area B – only conserves small patch which is degraded	2.2.3
		University is committing to management plan, should also commit to ongoing financial support	2.1.10, 2.2.2
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Linkage/POS</li> </ul>	
		Kings Park increasingly isolated. Preservation of biodiversity and composition of bird assemblages in western suburbs (including Kings Park and Bold Park) is likely only to be maintained in the long term if existing remnant bushland is preserved	2.1.10, 2.2.2
		Linkages will not be achieved	2.1.10
		Value of POS as conservation corridor is disputed	2.1.10, 3.4.7
		Stand of marri is stated to fall within POS - as far as I can determine the stand falls outside the POS area in an area designated to be cleared	
		<u>Other</u>	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planning</li> </ul>	3.2.1
		University needs to transfer ownership of conservation area to the State or covenant it for conservation to achieve credibility with regard to management	2.1.5
		Total clearing of land of native vegetation	3.3.9
		Landscaping will no doubt use exotics, little or no linkage value	3.4.7
		Will result in Subi Centro or East Perth style development, lacking any features that identify it as being environmentally West Australian	3.3.9, 3.4.7
		Urge University to consider integrated approach of housing development with existing environment	2.2.2, 3.3.9
		- this should include landscape buffers and existing vegetation in direction of Shenton Bushland and Bold	3.3.7

No	Author	Summary of submission	Response
		<p>Park</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- examples of integrated developments are Molloy Island and Mandurah Eco Park</li> <li>- Australian Institute of Management across the road retains large Jarrah trees</li> <li>• Social &amp; heritage</li> </ul> <p>Interlocking jarrah trees will be retained, misleading statement – one killed by fire and will have to be removed</p>	<p>3.3.9</p> <p>3.3.5</p>
78.	Unknown	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fauna</li> </ul> <p>Resident amphibians and reptiles could become locally extinct – would be prevented from moving out of unsustainably small territories or niches by roads, fences or other barriers</p> <p>The more retiring birds will have less vegetative cover – more risk from being ousted by aggressive species such as Australian ravens and magpies</p> <p>Vastly increased number of pets, particularly domestic cats, could decimate vertebrate fauna</p> <p>Known vertebrate fauna include 16 species of reptiles and three amphibian species – would be in imminent threat of extinction</p> <p>Frog species already severely threatened by chytrid fungus</p> <p>Carnaby's Cockatoo (endangered species) – important food sources B.Prionotes would be destroyed</p> <p>Invertebrates appear to have been completely overlooked</p> <p>Development site also possible habitat for the Graceful Sun Moth – listed endangered species</p> <p>Since existing native vegetation destroyed at nearby Perry Lakes, fauna habitat for Carnaby's Cockatoo and other birds species will be reduced by two developments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vegetation</li> </ul> <p>Much of plant community that will be resumed for development is listed as 'good' or 'very good'</p> <p>Karrakatta Central and South vegetation complex not well reserved</p>	<p>2.1.1, 2.1.10, 2.2.2</p> <p>2.1.2</p> <p>2.1.2</p> <p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.1, 2.1.3</p> <p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.3</p> <p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.1, 3.3.6</p> <p>2.1.5</p> <p>2.1.7</p>

No	Author	Summary of submission	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bush Forever/Management</li> </ul> <p>Figure of bushland is misleading, includes POS and remaining area to be divided into two separate blocks</p> <p>2ha block is so small, has no effective conservation value</p> <p>Even the larger block will be subject to 'edge effects'</p> <p>Noxious ant species such as the Argentine ant and the big-headed or coastal brown ant are widespread in Perth's western suburbs – latter found on more degraded sites in Bold Park – advantaged by construction of paths and dumping of building material or other waste</p> <p>Weeds will pose fire risk to residents</p> <p>More effort will be needed to maintain native species because of interference to currently intact bush communities</p> <p>Will need to reduce problems from littering, dumping of waste, vandalism (including lighting of fires) and growth of noxious weeds.</p> <p>If ants become established, householders will face additional nuisance and eradication costs</p>	<p>2.1.5, 2.2.1, 2.2.2</p> <p>2.2.1</p> <p>2.2.1</p> <p>2.1.2</p> <p>2.2.3</p> <p>2.2.3</p> <p>2.2.3</p> <p>2.1.2</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Linkage/POS</li> </ul> <p>Bushland forms an important corridor linking Bold Park with the Shenton Park Bushland. Were it to be removed, could mean local extinction of resident amphibians and reptiles</p> <p><u>Other</u></p>	<p>2.1.10, 2.2.2</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Process</li> </ul> <p>The site has not be subject to formal EPA process</p> <p>Likely impact of destroying or highly modifying the vegetation currently found should be assessed</p> <p>EPA should consider a proper investigation into the projected development, issuing of standard report on impact of bush clearing – will reveal desirability of retaining the intact site as Bush Forever reserve</p>	<p>3.4.1, 3.4.2</p> <p>2.1.5, 3.4.2</p> <p>3.4.2</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planning</li> </ul> <p>Reduction in amenity values for residents on or near proposed development</p>	<p>3.1.1, 3.3.7</p>

No	Author	Summary of submission	Response
		<p>July 2001, which was rejected on the grounds it did not meet environmental values</p> <p>Environmental value has increased since release of Bush Forever and ongoing loss of bush remnants (Perry Lakes development and active Kalinda Drive, City Beach development)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Linkage/POS</li> </ul> <p>Vital component of bushland corridor linking between Kings Park and Bold Park</p> <p><u>Other</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Planning</li> </ul> <p>Areas of bushland to be set aside have no security of tenure</p>	<p>2.1.5</p> <p>3.3.6</p> <p>2.1.10, 2.2.2</p> <p>2.2.3, 3.2.1</p>
82.	Stephanie Clegg, Chairman, Friends of Bold Park Bushland (Inc)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fauna</li> </ul> <p>Impact on Carnaby's Cockatoo</p> <p>- feeding habitat – B.Prionotes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vegetation</li> </ul> <p>No known similar stand of B.Prionotes in Perth metro region</p> <p>- proposal to clear and develop this thicket</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bush Forever</li> </ul> <p>Identified in Bush Forever process – recognises intrinsic conservation value and relationship with other regionally significant bushland</p> <p>- need for Negotiated Planning Solution does not reflect site's conservation significance, but rather it's monetary value</p> <p>Should be protected in its entirety</p> <p>Conserves slightly larger area than Bulletin 1034, creates continuous east-west bush linkage, incorporates stand of eucalyptus decipiens, retains some tuart on ridge</p> <p>Conserves smaller area of 'very good' quality vegetation, boundary-area ratio is worse</p> <p>Small size and configuration of bushland areas will make</p>	<p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.6</p> <p>2.1.6</p> <p>2.1.6</p> <p>2.1.5</p> <p>2.1.5</p> <p>2.1.5</p> <p>2.1.5</p> <p>2.1.5, 2.2.1</p> <p>2.2.1</p>

No	Author	Summary of submission	Response
		<p>them difficult to manage</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Linkage/POS</li> </ul> <p>Vital component of linkage between Kings Park and Bold Park</p> <p>- significance of these areas reflected in management by Botanic Gardens and Parks Authority</p> <p>- principle concern</p> <p>Maintaining link greater importance as climate becomes drier and hotter</p> <p><u>Other</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Process</li> </ul> <p>Cumulative impact on Kings Park, Bold Park, Shenton Bushland, AK Reserve and Perry Lakes has not been assessed</p> <p>EPA's response should reflect conservation significance of important site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General</li> </ul> <p>Proposal represents small degree of improvement over the Bulletin 1034 proposal</p>	<p>2.1.10, 2.2.2</p> <p>3.2.1</p> <p>2.2.3</p> <p>2.1.12</p> <p>3.3.6</p> <p>3.4.2</p> <p>2.1.5</p>
83.	Unknown	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fauna</li> </ul> <p>Valuable habitat for fauna</p> <p>Will increase boundary effects in bushland thereby reducing value as habitat for fauna</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Vegetation</li> </ul> <p>Valuable habitat for flora</p> <p>Will have impacts for vegetation complex</p> <p>Will impact on salinity and reduce natural carbon dioxide absorption</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Biodiversity</li> </ul> <p>Vegetation integral to maintaining diversity and abundance of species</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bush Forever/Management</li> </ul>	<p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.2.1</p> <p>2.1.5</p> <p>2.1.7</p> <p>2.1.12</p> <p>2.1.11</p>

No	Author	Summary of submission	Response
		Regionally significant vegetation – Bushplan	2.1.5
		Present environmental management of Kings Park could provide an example	2.1.5
		Will increase boundary effects in bushland thereby reducing value as habitat for fauna	2.2.1
		Should demonstrate best practice environmental management	2.2.3
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Linkage/POS</li> </ul>	
		Valuable habitat for flora and fauna inhabiting Bold Park and Kings Park	2.1.10, 2.2.2
		Will impact on native species in Kings Park and Bold Park	2.1.10, 2.2.2
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Process</li> </ul>	
		University needs to be aware of the Principles of Clearing of Native Vegetation EP Act. Regardless of whether clearing permit required, University should establish whether development meets clearing principles	3.4.6
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planning</li> </ul>	
		Urban zoning only allows possibility of future development, does not provide justification for EPA and Minister for Environment to allow destruction of vegetation identified as regionally significant	3.4.1, 3.2.1, 3.3.2
		Proposal to clear and earthwork 8.5ha demonstrates level of disregard for environment and inappropriate	3.1.1
		Sell areas of existing campus grounds – move towards higher density educational facilities e.g. multistorey car parking – should evaluate other development alternatives	3.2.1, 3.2.3, 3.3.8
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Social &amp; heritage</li> </ul>	
		Proposal will negatively impact on economic and social aspects of adjacent communities	3.3.2, 3.3.7
		Will damage aesthetics of the area	3.4.7
		<u>Other</u>	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General issues</li> </ul>	
		University should utilise expertise of staff and students to review proposal and find other options for raising capital	3.3.1

No	Author	Summary of submission	Response
		<p>Short-term gain of subdivision will outweigh damage to University's reputation and environmental harm suffered</p> <p>University's Environmental Policy [quotes]</p> <p>Limited opportunities for students to observe and appreciate local ecological communities (species and ecology of Karrakatta Dune Complex)</p>	<p>3.3.1</p> <p>3.4.7</p> <p>3.3.4</p>
84.	Unknown	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fauna</li> </ul> <p>Negative impact upon two 'endangered' species, both believed to use this bushland</p> <p>Carnaby's Black Cockatoo</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- flock around 100, roosts nearby Perry Lakes</li> <li>- feeding habitat – <i>B.Prionotes</i> woodland</li> </ul> <p>Graceful Sun Moth</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Graceful Sun Moth found nearby (in Shenton Bushland, linked to Underwood Avenue Bushland site via a bushland corridor along Bedbrook Place)</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Vegetation</li> </ul> <p>Karrakatta Central and South Vegetation Community are unique and not well reserved.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Biodiversity</li> </ul> <p>Mapping by Hopper and Gioia shows that the Perth Metropolitan area is a biodiversity hotspot within one of the world's 34 biodiversity hotspots</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bush Forever/Management</li> </ul> <p>Is a Bush Forever site – contains regionally and nationally significant vegetation</p> <p>Third largest area of bushland in western suburbs</p> <p>Significance of site is due to its large size – proposal will destroy 2/3 site and all but one of values in Bush Forever criteria</p> <p>Claim that there will be a 'net benefit to the environment' is patent nonsense</p> <p>Figure for conservation area is misleading includes POS</p>	<p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.6</p> <p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.7</p> <p>2.1.9</p> <p>2.1.5</p> <p>2.1.5, 2.2.2</p> <p>2.1.5</p> <p>2.1.7</p>



No	Author	Summary of submission	Response
		and is divided in two discrete and spatially separated blocks	2.1.5, 2.2.1, 2.2.2
		The advertised proposal is environmentally more damaging than the one rejected in 2001 because it has split the bushland into two smaller areas	2.1.5, 2.2.1
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Linkage/POS</li> </ul>	
		Vital component of bushland corridor linking between Kings Park and Bold Park critical for birds, reptiles and amphibians and transport of seeds and pollen	2.1.10, 2.2.2
		Vital component for maintaining biodiversity of Kings Park and Bold Park	2.1.10, 2.2.2
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Process</li> </ul>	
		Previous proposals rejected twice on grounds they failed to meet environmental requirements	3.4.1
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planning</li> </ul>	
		No promise to retain bush in perpetuity	3.1.5
		- has reserved right to develop bushland in future	3.1.5
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General issues</li> </ul>	
		Proposal is environmentally, socially and ethically unacceptable	3.4.7
		Bushland should be given permanent protection under same legislation as Kings Park and Bold Park	3.2.1
		Remnant bush at Perry Lakes soon destroyed for housing	3.3.6
85.	Unknown	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fauna</li> </ul>	
		Has not described what measures taken to exclude pets from conservation area	2.1.2
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Vegetation</li> </ul>	
		Rehabilitation data does not give indication of relative levels of success of seedling establishment	2.2.4
		- Two years' data not sufficient time	2.2.4
		- University has not demonstrated that it can establish more difficult to establish species	2.2.4
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bush Forever/Management</li> </ul>	

No	Author	Summary of submission	Response
		Areas in good or better condition should be retained	2.1.5
		Conservation Area B will be surrounded by clearing giving little change of surviving in long term	2.1.5
		Does not describe who pays for upkeep	2.2.3
		Uncertainty overtime frame for rehabilitation	2.2.3
		No rehabilitation performance criteria	2.2.3
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Linkage/POS</li> </ul>	
		Relatively good quality and extent of remnant vegetation in location close to Bold Park, Shenton Bushland, Kings Park means it should be retained and rehabilitated	2.1.10, 2.2.2
		POS will have limited value given that road will dissect it	2.2.2
		<u>Other</u>	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planning</li> </ul>	
		No provision for buffer from proposed development has been made on northern and western sides of Conservation Area A	2.1.5
		Requirements for retention of trees inside development footprint not described	3.3.9
86.	Urban Bushland Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fauna</li> </ul>	
		Negative impact upon two 'endangered' species, both believed to use this bushland	2.1.1
		Carnaby's Black Cockatoo	2.1.1
		- 'rare or likely to become extinct' and 'endangered'	2.1.1
		- adverse impact on feeding habits of Carnaby's Cockatoos	2.1.1, 2.1.6
		- Underwood and Perry Lakes important for water, roosting, food and for nesting	2.1.4
		- important for hollows for nesting	2.1.4
		- necessity for high quality feeding habitat – <i>B.Prionotes</i> woodland, other banksia species, dryandra species and gum nuts of marri trees	2.1.4, 2.1.6
		- significant loss of habitat, may jeopardise species	2.1.4, 2.1.11

No	Author	Summary of submission	Response
		Graceful Sun Moth	2.1.1
		- rarity and regulatory classification of Graceful Sun moth	2.1.1
		- Graceful Sun Moth found nearby (in Shenton Bushland)	2.1.1
		- not found in Perth metropolitan area in 2007	2.1.1
		- proposal does not contribute to survival	2.1.1
		- area where it will possibly found is to be 'cleared and earthworked'	2.1.1, 3.1.1
		Underwood bushland contains several bird species that are uncommon or declining on the Swan Coastal Plan as a result of habitat loss. These include the Weebill, Yellow-rumped Thornbill, Varied Sitella, Painted Grey Button-quail, Grey Fantail, Tawny Frogmouth, Western Gerygone, Grey Butcherbird, Splendid Blue Wren and Rainbow Bee-eaters.	2.1.1
		- quails not present, foxes may have killed them	2.1.1, 2.1.2
		- conservation area inadequate for survival – not large enough for breeding	2.1.5, 2.2.1
		- 33ha bushland must be retained as bird habitat	2.1.4, 2.1.5
		Rainbow Bee-eater	2.1.1
		- regulatory classification	2.1.1
		- use Underwood Avenue after migrating from northern Australia/Papua New Guinea	2.1.1
		- use as feeding habitat and nesting	2.1.4
		- threatened by foxes	2.1.2
		- University has refused to control foxes – City of Nedlands cannot act on private land	2.1.2
		The Variegated Fairy-Wren	2.1.1
		- found nearby at Shenton Bushland	2.1.1
		Reptiles/amphibians	2.1.1
		- 12 species of reptiles identified including five baby Western Bearded Dragons	2.1.1, 2.1.3
		- fauna survey by ATA in 2003 identified 3 amphibians	

No	Author	Summary of submission	Response
		and 28 reptiles	2.1.1, 2.1.3
		- impact of development on terrestrial animals like frogs especially profound	
		- proposals to reduce area of bushland detrimental to survival of reptiles and amphibians – immediate death, genetic diversity lessened, predation increased, loss of habitat	2.1.1, 2.1.3
		Destruction of fauna Underwood Avenue, Shenton Park Bushland, Bold Park and Kings Park	2.1.1
		Birds of prey	2.1.1
		- Little Eagle, Collared Sparrowhawk, Australian Hobby and Black-shouldered Kite regularly 'seen' in Underwood Avenue Bushland	2.1.1
		- Little Eagle nests sporadically	2.1.1
		- Pair of Collared Sparrowhawks has raised young	
		• Vegetation	2.1.5
		Important area of bushland in its own right	2.1.5
		No description or assessment of site which will be cleared, nearly all which is in good or very good condition	2.1.5
		Tuart trees	2.1.5
		- important species on Swan Coastal Plain	3.4.7
		- attacked by railway link and freeway extensions	2.1.5
		- mainly within odour buffer	2.1.5
		- regrowth after 2002 fire	2.1.4, 2.1.5
		- tuart trees along ridge and important feature – provide nesting hollows	2.1.5, 3.3.6
		- old tuart trees will be destroyed on AK Reserve so Underwood Avenue Bushland important	2.1.5
		Jarraah woodlands	2.1.5
		- unusual to be so close to City	2.1.5
		- include old growth Jarraah trees	2.1.4
		- some have hollows, may be over 200 years old – such trees cannot be replaced and should not be destroyed –	3.4.7

No	Author	Summary of submission	Response
		have been marked with pink tape by ATA	
		- are in excellent condition	2.1.5
		Orchids	2.1.5
		- flora surveys have not been comprehensive	2.1.8
		- only six species of orchids identified by ATA – Friends of Underwood Avenue Bushland have identified twenty-three species of orchids	2.1.5, 2.1.8
		<i>B.Prionotes</i> has high value, will be destroyed	2.1.6
		Now greater understanding of impacts of land clearing on climate change	2.1.12
		- clearing will increase greenhouse gas emissions	2.1.12
		Interlocking Jarrah trees – one splitting	3.3.5
		Karrakatta Central and South Vegetation Community not well reserved	2.1.7
		Destruction of 66% of Underwood Avenue Bushland is net destruction – ERR does not consider this loss	2.1.5
		Great deal of floristic variability	2.1.5
		Bushland contains diversity of vegetation communities	2.1.5
		Vascular flora poorly reserved in Drummond Botanical District/Swan Coastal Plain IBRA region – this is a reason to preserve the entire bushland	2.1.5
		Representative examples not good enough to preserve core environmental values or to be environmentally acceptable	2.1.5
		Not stated when vegetation condition was assessed – ATA inadequacy of bushland mapping	2.1.8
		• Biodiversity	
		Destruction of environment	2.1.11
		Destruction of ecological integrity Bold Park, Shenton Bushland and Kings Park	2.1.10
		Has failed to grasp concept of saving biodiversity	2.1.11
		New information on genetic variation in species in Kings Park and Bold Park not recognised in ERR – gives Underwood Bushland significant scientific and	3.4.2, 3.4.7

No	Author	Summary of submission	Response
		evolutionary importance	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Linkage/POS</li> </ul>	
		Regional ecological connectivity between Kings Park and coast – important to health of Kings Park, Shenton Bushland and Bold Park – 33ha must be retained	2.1.10, 2.2.2
		Shenton Park/Mt Claremont Structure Plan Charrette did not properly map linkages from AK Reserve, Bold Park, Underwood Avenue Bushland, linking bushland between Underwood Avenue Bushland and Shenton Park Bushland and Kings Park	3.1.4
		Effective linkages need 'nodes' at regular intervals – proposal deficient because width of linkages small	2.1.8, 2.2.1, 2.2.2
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bush Forever/Management</li> </ul>	
		Important Bush Forever site, is regionally and nationally significant	2.1.5
		- most regionally significant values lost	2.1.5
		Bush Forever negotiated settlement never reached	2.1.5
		Plans do not show bushland boundaries of Bush Forever site	3.4.7
		ERR does not recognise it is a Bush Forever site	2.1.5
		33ha bushland must be retained as bird habitat	2.1.4, 2.1.5
		Botanic Gardens and Parks Authority as manager would be able to extend its work on environmental management into Underwood Avenue Bushland	2.2.3, 3.2.1
		Southern edge of Conservation Area A has been degraded – disturbed by installation of large underground lines by Western Power and heavy vehicles	3.4.7
		University has failed to rehabilitate bushland	2.2.4
		University cleared fire breaks beyond what was required, causing extensive damage at the top of the hill, could be classed as clearing and environmental harm	2.2.4
		University has mismanaged and neglected bushland	2.2.4
		- University has not controlled weeds	2.2.4
		- has found the money to carry out inappropriate measure that lead to degradation – black plastic over ground near Bedbrook Place	2.2.4

No	Author	Summary of submission	Response
		- ignored requests to control foxes	2.1.2
		- allow TAFE students to drive around bushland in 4WD, search for ore body (not dieback control, activities detrimental to bushland)	3.4.7
		- has allowed bush to be used for commercial beekeepers	2.1.2, 3.4.7
		Slightly greater size of conservation area means nothing and it is divided into two discrete areas	2.1.5, 2.2.1, 2.2.2
		Will be subject to deterioration because they are small	2.2.1
		Design of conservation areas not practical for long-term management	2.2.1
		Should be part of 'Djandoo' concept linking river to the sea	3.2.1, 3.4.7
		Statement in ATA 2003 report regarding rehabilitating Degraded area to Very Good condition unachievable and unrealistic	2.2.4
		Animal pen rehabilitated area has little diversity	2.2.4
		2005 rehabilitation - trees were removed and site 'ripped', destroying fungal mycelium – limited number of species	2.2.4
		Seed collection method used not 'best practice' (beat target bush with squash racquet so seed went in bin)	2.2.4
		<u>Other</u>	
		• Process	
		Deemed a controlled action under EPBC Act in 2004 and 2007	2.1.1
		Difficult for public to comment – complex proposals and decisions over years	3.4.3
		Document does not state that 2001 and 2003 proposals rejected by the government	3.4.1
		Objects to the process – not standard EPA process, very misleading and confusing	3.4.2
		To continue process based on six-year old partial assessment unacceptable	3.4.2
		EPA has not set level of assessment	3.4.2
		Assessment number – not clear whether this is the EPA's	3.4.2

No	Author	Summary of submission	Response
		or ATA's – has caused confusion	
		Lot 4 has never been formally assessed in standard EPA process that allows public comment before assessment	3.4.2
		Impact of clearing two thirds of the site has not been assessed by the EPA	3.4.2
		Proposal should undergo formal assessment – PER level	3.4.2
		• Planning/Odour	
		First time University has proposed clearing and 'earthworking' this area [mustard coloured area]	3.1.1.
		Litigation with Water Corporation still in Supreme Court – University will continue pursuit to get buffer reduced	3.4.1
		- Further public money being spent on assault which was already cost millions	3.4.1, 3.4.7
		ATA/Harmes Sharley misrepresented what was detailed during Shenton Park/Mt Claremont Structure Plan Charrette – linkages not mapped adequately, compromising final report to government – remains in abeyance	3.4.7
		University has refused to put covenant over site – difficult to see how any covenant to preserve conservation and POS would survive the subdivision process and be enforceable	3.1.4
		• General issues	3.2.1
		First time University has proposed clearing and 'earthworking' this area [mustard coloured area] – includes vegetation quality marked 'Good to Very Good' and 'Degraded' – in breach of section 41 EP Act	3.1.1
		University has a moral obligation to protect and manage the bushland	3.3.1, 3.4.7
		Widespread community interest	3.3.2
		No community support for housing development	3.3.2
		Community consultation held in February 2007 inadequate	3.4.3
		Aboriginal significance	3.3.5
		- scarred tree burnt down, not longer registered as site with DIA, still considered to be of spiritual and historical significance to Aboriginal groups	3.3.5



No	Author	Summary of submission	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- two camp sites recorded – camp site one will be destroyed [in area for earthworking], camp site two already disturbed by the University (reported to DIA)</li> <li>- Aboriginal Elders opposed to development</li> <li>- lack of genuine consultation with Aboriginal stakeholders</li> <li>- proposal does not describe how indigenous heritage will be acknowledged</li> <li>- Underwood Avenue Bushland is a listed site but is not a registered site</li> <li>- interpretive signage and 'other means' for acknowledging indigenous heritage is insulting</li> </ul> <p>Students from the University not able to use bushland for research</p> <p>Scientists and others denied permission to use Underwood Avenue Bushland for surveys by protracting time while consideration is being given</p> <p>Students denied access on grounds they would disturb emus</p> <p>Underwood Avenue should be protected in its entirety through acquisition or resumption of endowment lands, land swap, Government could request development application withdrawn and area retained as conservation, education and research site or handed to Botanical Parks and Gardens Authority for management as part of proposed Djandoo concept</p>	<p>3.3.5</p> <p>3.3.5</p> <p>3.3.5</p> <p>3.3.5</p> <p>3.3.7</p> <p>3.3.4</p> <p>3.3.4</p> <p>3.4.7</p> <p>3.2.1, 2.2.2</p>
87.	Unknown	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fauna</li> </ul> <p>Concerned about impact on Carnaby's Cockatoo</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bush Forever/Management</li> </ul> <p>Makes a mockery of time and money invested into Bush Forever</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Linkage/POS</li> </ul> <p>Provides link/corridor between Kings Park and Bold Park</p> <p><u>Other</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General issues</li> </ul> <p>Should be given permanent protection and managed by</p>	<p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.5</p> <p>2.1.10, 2.2.2</p>

No	Author	Summary of submission	Response
		Botanic Gardens and Parks Authority	2.2.2, 2.2.3, 3.2.1
88.	Unknown	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fauna</li> </ul> <p>Negative impact upon two 'endangered' species, both believed to use this bushland</p> <p>Carnaby's Black Cockatoo</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- flock around 100, roosts nearby Perry Lakes</li> <li>- feeding habitat – <i>B.Prionotes</i> woodland</li> </ul> <p>Graceful Sun Moth</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Graceful Sun Moth found nearby (in Shenton Bushland, linked to Underwood Avenue Bushland site via a bushland corridor along Bedbrook Place)</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Vegetation</li> </ul> <p>Karrakatta Central and South Vegetation Community are unique and not well reserved.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Biodiversity</li> </ul> <p>Mapping by Hopper and Gioia shows that the Perth Metropolitan area is a biodiversity hotspot within one of the world's 34 biodiversity hotspots</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bush Forever/Management</li> </ul> <p>Is a Bush Forever site – contains regionally and nationally significant vegetation</p> <p>Third largest area in Perth's western suburbs</p> <p>Significance of site is due to its large size – proposal will destroy 2/3 site and all but one of values in Bush Forever criteria</p> <p>Claim that there will be a 'net benefit to the environment' is patent nonsense</p> <p>Figure for conservation area is misleading includes POS and is divided in two discrete and spatially separated blocks</p> <p>The advertised proposal is environmentally more damaging than the one rejected in 2001 because it has split the bushland into two smaller areas</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Linkage/POS</li> </ul>	<p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.6</p> <p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.7</p> <p>2.1.9</p> <p>2.1.5</p> <p>2.1.5, 2.2.2</p> <p>2.1.5</p> <p>2.1.7</p> <p>2.1.5, 2.2.1, 2.2.2</p> <p>2.1.5, 2.2.1, 2.2.2</p>

No	Author	Summary of submission	Response
		Vital component of bushland corridor linking between Kings Park and Bold Park critical for birds, reptiles and amphibians and transport of seeds and pollen	2.1.10, 2.2.2
		Vital component for maintaining biodiversity of Kings Park and Bold Park	2.1.10, 2.2.2
		Other	
		• Process	
		Previous proposals rejected twice on grounds they failed to meet environmental requirements	3.4.1
		• Planning	
		No promise to retain bush in perpetuity	3.1.5
		- has reserved right to develop bushland in future	3.1.5
		• General issues	
		Remnant bush at Perry Lakes soon destroyed for housing	3.3.6
89.	Unknown	• Fauna	
		Is locally important for habitat for Carnaby's Cockatoo and Graceful Sun Moth	2.1.1
		- <i>B.prionotes</i> feeding habitat	2.1.6
		Problems of domestic cats	2.1.2
		• Vegetation	
		Is locally important for Karrakatta Complex – Central and South	2.1.7
		Loss of <i>B.Prionotes</i>	2.1.6
		Invasion of garden plants	2.2.3
		Excessive fire breaks	2.2.3
		• Bush Forever/Management	
		Management plan could be extended to whole area	2.2.3
		Would be good to see rehabilitation studies continue	2.2.3
		Conservation areas in two lots making it more vulnerable to fringe degradation	2.2.1

No	Author	Summary of submission	Response
		<p>Degraded bushland in conservation area and good bushland without</p> <p>Conservation Area B so small, hard to maintain</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Linkage/POS</li> </ul> <p>Important for links with other bushland west of Perth City</p> <p>Western side of POS cuts off Conservation Area B</p> <p>POS will be weed source</p> <p>POS will have substantial footpath/road, dog access</p> <p><u>Other</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Process</li> </ul> <p>Level of assessment is unclear</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Social &amp; heritage</li> </ul> <p>Originally land was taken from Aborigines</p> <p>Is important for aboriginal significance – acknowledged by the University</p> <p>Planning</p> <p>Better to develop western portion</p> <p>Has approval been given for areas that will be 'cleared as part of subdivision works'?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General issues</li> </ul> <p>Put area into conservation estate</p> <p>Shortage of housing could be met by using land already cleared, by in-fill and by better utilisation of land already available</p>	<p>2.1.5</p> <p>2.2.1</p> <p>2.1.10, 2.2.2</p> <p>2.2.2</p> <p>2.2.2</p> <p>2.2.2, 2.2.5</p> <p>3.4.2</p> <p>3.3.5</p> <p>3.3.5</p> <p>3.2.2</p> <p>3.1.1</p> <p>3.2.1</p> <p>3.2.1, 3.2.2</p>
90.	Unknown	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fauna</li> </ul> <p>Part of rare and rapidly diminishing habitat on Swan Coastal Plain</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Vegetation</li> </ul> <p>Part of rare and rapidly diminishing habitat on Swan Coastal Plain</p>	<p>2.1.1, 2.1.11</p> <p>2.1.1, 2.1.11</p>

No	Author	Summary of submission	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Biodiversity</li> </ul> <p>Swan Coastal Plain still well below national target for biodiversity sustainability 30%</p> <p>Opposed to diminution of natural heritage</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Linkage/POS</li> </ul> <p>Important floral and faunal linkages between other bushland e.g. Kings Park and Bold Park</p> <p><u>Other</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General</li> </ul> <p>For teaching institution to not have the common sense to preserve what little remains of incredibly rich biodiversity sets an extremely poor example</p> <p>Inspection of an aerial photograph obvious that almost all natural heritage has been lost</p>	<p>2.1.11</p> <p>2.1.11</p> <p>2.1.10, 2.2.2</p> <p>3.3.1</p> <p>3.4.7</p>
91.	Unknown	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Vegetation</li> </ul> <p>University should lead the way in preserving Karrakatta Central and South Vegetation type</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bush Forever/Management</li> </ul> <p>Latest proposal emphasises increase in bushland – however over half of Lot 4 already degraded by development</p> <p>Advertised proposal will reduce the 'protected area'</p> <p>Areas of sizeable bushland rare</p> <p>By retaining 30ha of good to very good bushland, some chance flora and fauna will remain close to current state</p> <p><u>Other</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planning</li> </ul> <p>Should consider residential area in south-west quadrant then north-west quadrant (once facilities have been moved)</p>	<p>2.1.7</p> <p>2.1.5</p> <p>2.1.5</p> <p>2.1.5</p> <p>2.1.5</p> <p>3.2.2</p>
92.	Unknown	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fauna</li> </ul> <p>Important habitat for black cockatoo, threatened species</p>	<p>2.1.1</p>

No	Author	Summary of submission	Response
		<p>Nesting site for Little Eagle</p> <p>Contains at least 3 frog species</p> <p>Cats will have access to better nesting sites</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Vegetation</li> </ul> <p>Under represented vegetation type</p> <p>Some species rare</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bush Forever/Management</li> </ul> <p>One of last unprotected sizeable bush blocks close to Perth</p> <p>Parts of bushland surrounded by housing will become unviable</p> <p>Reserve areas have been labelled 'Bush Forever' – no guarantee of protection in the past</p> <p>Pressure from residents to 'burn off' – will degrade area and encourage weeds</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Linkage/POS</li> </ul> <p>Important linkage to Bold and Kings Park</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Process</li> </ul> <p>Hope EPA will visit site with local ecosystem experts in tow</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General</li> </ul> <p>University is very wealthy</p> <p>If it must develop, should develop other biologically degraded sites</p> <p>As a learned institution has moral obligation to preserve bushland</p> <p>Would gain international kudos by retaining bushland</p> <p>Could be used as research facility</p>	<p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.1, 2.1.3</p> <p>2.1.2</p> <p>2.1.7</p> <p>2.1.5</p> <p>2.1.5, 3.3.6</p> <p>2.1.5</p> <p>2.1.5, 3.1.5</p> <p>2.2.3</p> <p>2.1.10, 2.2.2</p> <p>3.4.2</p> <p>3.3.1</p> <p>3.2.1, 3.2.2</p> <p>3.3.1, 3.4.7</p> <p>3.1.1, 3.4.7</p> <p>3.3.4</p>
93.	Mark Webb, Chief Executive Officer, Botanic Gardens and	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fauna</li> </ul> <p>Carnaby's Cockatoo poorly represented</p>	<p>2.1.1</p>

No	Author	Summary of submission	Response
	Parks Authority	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>B.Prionotes</i> important feeding habitat</li> </ul>	2.1.6
		Fails to consider importance of site to representation of species in neighbouring bushlands	2.1.1
		Strongly consider exclusion of domestic cats – prevent predatory activity	2.1.2
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vegetation</li> </ul>	
		<i>Jacksonia sericea</i> is listed as being represented in Bold Park in significant numbers, incorrect	2.1.5
		No retention of <i>B.Prionotes</i> woodland	2.1.6
		Value of rehabilitation results presented is limited	2.1.8, 2.2.4
		Rehabilitation undertaken in highly degraded area with very different approach taken compared with that amongst remnant vegetation	2.2.4
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bush Forever/Management</li> </ul>	
		Supports retention of remnant bushland in urban areas	2.1.5
		Identified in Bold Park Environmental Management Plan 2000 – 2005 and restated in 2006 – 2011	2.1.5
		Acknowledges small increase in retention of bushland	2.1.5
		Conservation Area B very small, very high perimeter to area ratio	2.2.1
		Very good bushland to north of Conservation Area B could be considered for retention	2.1.5
		- reduce perimeter to ratio	2.1.5
		- reduce overall area of good condition bushland to be cleared	2.1.5
		- preserve additional <i>Jacksonia sericea</i> population and add area of <i>B.Prionotes</i> woodland	2.1.5
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Linkage/POS</li> </ul>	
		Contributes to environmental connectivity between Bold Park and Kings Park	2.1.10, 2.2.2
		Connection of conservation areas via POS will lead to fragmentation due to different management regimes proposed, disturbance pressures, contribute to degradation – critical to <i>Jacksonia sericea</i> populations within	2.2.2

No	Author	Summary of submission	Response
		Conservation Area B Important ecological corridor	2.1.10
94.	Unknown	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fauna</li> <li>Increase pressure of Carnaby's Cockatoos</li> <li>Already pressure on Kings Park bird life</li> <li>Birds nesting</li> <li>Biodiversity</li> <li>Important for sake of public amenity</li> <li>Linkage/POS</li> <li>Green corridor between Bold Park and Kings Park</li> <li>Bush Forever/Management</li> <li>Substitutes areas of good quality to preserve area so degraded quality</li> <li>Planning</li> <li>Forms important opportunity for passive recreation</li> <li>Preserve entire area in perpetuity</li> <li>General</li> <li>Passive recreation important component of public health</li> <li>Gain for community exceed financial value to University</li> </ul>	2.1.1 2.1.1, 3.4.7 2.1.4 3.3.2 2.1.10, 2.2.2 2.1.5 2.2.2 3.1.5 2.2.2, 3.4.7 3.3.2
95.	Unknown	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Vegetation</li> <li>Has been rehabilitated</li> <li>Allowing clearing will impinge on local metropolitan bushlands</li> <li>General issues</li> <li>Has become part of local and extended community</li> </ul>	2.2.4 2.1.5 3.3.2
96.	Unknown	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fauna</li> <li>Negative impact upon two 'endangered' species, both</li> </ul>	2.1.1



No	Author	Summary of submission	Response
		believed to use this bushland	
		Carnaby's Black Cockatoo	2.1.1
		- flock around 100, roosts nearby Perry Lakes	2.1.1
		- feeding habitat – <i>B.Prionotes</i> woodland	2.1.6
		Graceful Sun Moth	2.1.1
		- Graceful Sun Moth found nearby (in Shenton Bushland, linked to Underwood Avenue Bushland site via a bushland corridor along Bedbrook Place)	2.1.1
		• Vegetation	
		Karrakatta Central and South Vegetation Community are unique and not well reserved.	2.1.7
		<i>B.Prionotes</i> will be destroyed – food source for Carnaby's Cockatoo	2.1.6
		• Biodiversity	
		Mapping by Hopper and Gioia shows that the Perth Metropolitan area is a biodiversity hotspot within one of the world's 34 biodiversity hotspots	2.1.9
		• Bush Forever/Management	
		Is a Bush Forever site – contains regionally and nationally significant vegetation	2.1.5
		Third largest area in western suburbs	2.1.5, 2.2.2
		Significance of site is due to its large size – proposal will destroy 2/3 site and all but one of values in Bush Forever criteria	2.1.5
		Claim that there will be a 'net benefit to the environment' is patent nonsense	2.1.7
		Figure for conservation area is misleading includes POS and is divided in two discrete and spatially separated blocks	2.1.5, 2.2.1, 2.2.2
		The advertised proposal is environmentally more damaging than the one rejected in 2001 because it has split the bushland into two smaller areas	2.1.5, 2.2.1, 2.2.2
		• Linkage/POS	
		Vital component of bushland corridor linking between Kings Park and Bold Park critical for birds, reptiles and	2.1.10, 2.2.2

No	Author	Summary of submission	Response
		<p>underrepresented</p> <p>ATA negligent in its mapping</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Biodiversity</li> </ul> <p>Vital University acknowledge importance of conserving biodiversity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bush Forever/Management</li> </ul> <p>Shape and broken-up areas result in more direct contact with housing, run-off and pets</p> <p>Remaining bushland succumb to degradation and loss</p> <p>Conservation Area B unviable -- short distance to roads and housing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Linkage/POS</li> </ul> <p>Green corridor from ocean to river</p> <p><u>Other</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General issues</li> </ul> <p>Alternative sites -- brown-site areas near Crawley campus</p> <p>Ample funds and opportunity to continue to build its fortunes</p>	<p>2.1.8</p> <p>2.1.11</p> <p>2.1.2, 2.2.1, 2.2.2</p> <p>2.2.3</p> <p>2.1.5, 2.2.1</p> <p>2.1.10, 2.2.2</p> <p>3.2.1</p> <p>3.3.1</p>
100	Unknown	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Biodiversity</li> </ul> <p>Residents will rue the day if University is allowed to urbanise all of Lot 4</p> <p>Devastating effect on plant and animal life</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bush Forever/Management</li> </ul> <p>Term Bush Forever is a misnomer</p> <p>Falls short of current understanding bushland viability</p> <p>- reduces already small block</p> <p>Smaller area surrounded by residential development and roads</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Linkage/POS</li> </ul> <p>Undisturbed bushland between Bold Park and Kings Park</p>	<p>3.3.2</p> <p>3.3.2</p> <p>2.1.5</p> <p>2.1.5</p> <p>2.1.5</p> <p>2.2.1</p> <p>2.1.10, 2.2.2</p>

No	Author	Summary of submission	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- link</li> <li>- if those parks damage, will play role in repopulating bush and providing refuge</li> </ul> <p><u>Other</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General</li> </ul> <p>University should come to its senses</p> <p>What example is University giving when it sacrifices nature for monetary gain?</p>	<p>2.1.10, 2.2.2</p> <p>2.1.10, 2.2.2</p> <p>3.4.7</p> <p>3.3.1</p>
101	Unknown	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fauna</li> </ul> <p>Haven for wildlife</p> <p>Many bird species – will continue to decline rapidly</p> <p>Some species which tolerate human activity forced out due to urban infill</p> <p><i>B.Prionotes</i> important for cockatoos and honey eaters</p> <p>Frogs important – several species</p> <p>- reduction in habitat put pressure on ability to survive</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vegetation</li> </ul> <p>Much in very good condition</p> <p>Some not very well represented locally – e.g. <i>B.Prionotes</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Biodiversity</li> </ul> <p>Too precious a biological resources to consider as residential resource</p> <p><u>Other</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General issues</li> </ul> <p>University should sell off degraded sites, such as western part of Lot 4 or parts of McGillvray Oval area</p>	<p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.6</p> <p>2.1.1, 2.1.3</p> <p>2.1.1, 2.1.3</p> <p>2.1.5</p> <p>2.1.6, 2.1.7</p> <p>2.1.11</p> <p>3.2.1, 3.2.2</p>
102	Unknown	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fauna</li> </ul> <p>Local habitat for species of local fauna</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Biodiversity</li> </ul>	<p>2.1.4</p> <p>2.1.11</p>

No	Author	Summary of submission	Response
		<p>Has great value as an area of biological diversity</p> <p>Does not contain necessary areas needed for viable bird and animal life</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bush Forever/Management</li> </ul> <p>2ha site soon be surrounded by houses, gardens and fertiliser run-off</p> <p>Important area Perth urban bushland</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Linkage/POS</li> </ul> <p>Corridor for bird life Bold Park to Kings Park</p>	<p>2.1.5, 2.1.11</p> <p>2.3.3</p> <p>2.1.5</p> <p>2.1.10, 2.2.2</p>
103	Unknown	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Vegetation</li> </ul> <p>Concerned about disappearance of native and non-native vegetation due to development</p> <p>Plays vital role in soil and climate</p> <p>Role of climate change and salinity</p> <p><u>Other</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Process</li> </ul> <p>Community expects matters of this kind to be dealt with in such a manner to bring an end to further speculation about acceptability of environmentally destructive proposals</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General issues</li> </ul> <p>Petition for Protection of Mature Trees on Public Land in Urban Areas – investigated by Legislative Council Standing Committee on Environment and Public Affairs</p> <p>Our managers should better educate some of their own about fundamental principles connecting climate to vegetation</p> <p>Attitude of University anachronistic – has not broadened debate about proper use of endowment land</p> <p>Clifton Street campus and main campus steadily reduced open space with bricks, mortar, bitumen</p>	<p>2.1.5</p> <p>2.1.5, 2.1.12, 3.4.7 2.1.12</p> <p>3.2.1, 3.4.2</p> <p>3.4.7</p> <p>3.4.7</p> <p>3.3.1</p> <p>3.4.7</p>
104	Unknown	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fauna</li> </ul> <p>Creatures life and depend on bushland for food and shelter</p> <p>University does not care about endangered species –</p>	<p>2.1.1</p>

No	Author	Summary of submission	Response
		<p>Carnaby's Cockatoo</p> <p>- struggling to thrive</p> <p>- will be destroyed as soon as bulldozers move in -- clearfelling and removal of top soil</p> <p>Every creature cannot be seen so easily</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Linkage/POS</li> </ul> <p>Important corridor between Bold Park and Kings Park</p> <p><u>Other</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Process</li> </ul> <p>Twice refused by EPA Bulletins</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General issues</li> </ul> <p>University as main teaching university going to throw ethical standards to the wind?</p> <p>Should be leaders to young students doing environmental studies</p> <p>Public want land saved</p> <p>Make gift of land to the people</p>	<p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.10, 2.2.2</p> <p>3.4.1</p> <p>3.3.1</p> <p>3.3.4</p> <p>3.3.2, 3.2.1</p>
105	Unknown	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Vegetation</li> </ul> <p>Rare example of 'old growth' Jarrah Woodland</p> <p>Large population of <i>B.Prionotes</i> woodland</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Biodiversity</li> </ul> <p>Protect flora, fauna and fungi for future generations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Linkage/POS</li> </ul> <p>Important linkage in greenway of Bold Park, Shenton Bushland and Kings Park</p>	<p>2.1.5</p> <p>2.1.6</p> <p>2.1.1, 2.1.3</p> <p>2.1.10, 2.2.2</p>
106	Unknown	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Biodiversity</li> </ul> <p>Too much senseless destruction of beautiful bushland and precious and rare creatures</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Linkage/POS</li> </ul> <p>Whole area must be preserved so creates have corridor to</p>	<p>2.1.1, 2.1.11</p> <p>2.1.10, 2.2.2</p>

No	Author	Summary of submission	Response
		<p>Bold Park</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General issues</li> </ul> <p>University should set good example in environmental matters</p>	3.3.1
107	Unknown	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fauna</li> </ul> <p>Variety of birds has declined</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Biodiversity</li> </ul> <p>Stem further decline in flora and fauna</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Linkage/POS</li> </ul> <p>Critical to keep corridor for birdlife</p> <p><u>Other</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General issues</li> </ul> <p>Perhaps more government funding to University for important tertiary education and research work to deflect need for bushland clearance proposals</p>	<p>2.1.1, 2.1.11</p> <p>2.1.11</p> <p>2.1.10, 2.2.2</p> <p>3.2.1, 3.3.1</p>
108	Ms Carlie Elridge, Director of Development Services, City of Nedlands	<p><u>Other</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planning</li> </ul> <p>City requires following conditions of approval:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>removal of existing vegetation outside the approved conservation and public open space areas cannot be undertaken until: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>an Outline Development Plan for whole of Lot 4 has been approved by the City; and</li> </ul> </li> <li>subdivision clearance has been given by the City</li> <li>conservation areas be protected through restriction of entry points and designated walking trail</li> <li>continuous landscape buffer along Underwood and Selby Streets to a minimum of 5 metre width in accordance with relevant policies</li> </ul> <p>City does not approve or endorse proposal as part of this process</p> <p>City seeks State Government support for sufficient bushland protection on adjoining lots to the south of Lot 4</p>	<p>3.1.3</p> <p>3.1.3</p> <p>2.2.5</p> <p>3.3.9</p> <p>3.4.7</p> <p>2.2.2</p>

No	Author	Summary of submission	Response
		to provided permanent bush corridor to Shenton Bushland	
109	Neil Foley, Acting Executive Director, Urban Innovation, Department of Planning and Infrastructure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Linkage/POS</li> </ul> <p>Proposed to increase the amount of vegetation on the POS which is also proposed to have passive recreation function</p> <p>In order for credit to be given towards 10% POS requirements, local open space function needs to be maintained. This means significant proportion needs to be available for passive recreation</p> <p><u>Other</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planning</li> </ul> <p>From general planning viewpoint, no objection to proposal</p> <p>No planning objection to configuration and location of conservation areas</p> <p>If maintained in University ownership, expected that public access easements be granted to allow public pedestrian/cycle access – identified in Shenton Park Structure Plan</p> <p>Understood that Shenton Bushland has paths for access</p>	<p>2.2.2</p> <p>2.2.2</p> <p>3.4.7</p> <p>2.1.5, 2.2.1</p> <p>2.2.5</p> <p>2.2.5</p>
110	Bill Vincent, Hackett Civic Association (Inc)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bush Forever/Management</li> </ul> <p>Concerned about fringe effects in Conservation Area B on <i>Jacksonia sericea</i></p> <p>- how many of these species identified on site?</p> <p>- what is proposed buffer between Conservation Area B and land to be cleared for development to the north of it?</p> <p><u>Other</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planning/odour</li> </ul> <p>University prepare a quality visual plan for what is being proposed at earliest suitable time – contributes to meaningful discussion</p> <p>Concerned as to what odour issues could arise if SWWTP suffers any power or mechanical failures – safeguards built into process?</p> <p>Group housing sites</p>	<p>2.2.1</p> <p>2.1.5</p> <p>2.1.5, 3.1.1</p> <p>3.4.7</p> <p>3.3.3</p> <p>3.3.8</p>

No	Author	Summary of submission	Response
		- height?	3.3.8
		- how far from site boundary?	3.3.8
		- high rise would create negative feedback from existing residents – close proximity to roadway and lack of buffer zone	3.3.8
		8.5ha set aside for future development	3.1.1
		- residents concerns about 'commercial use'	3.1.1
		- what are future plans for development, legal right to use land?	3.1.1
		- will land be cleared at initial clearing stage? If so, problems with wind erosion	3.1.1
		Roads within subdivision – planned width?	3.1.6
		Setbacks – 5m landscape buffer on Underwood Ave	3.3.9
		- earlier plans had buffer as wide as 40m	3.3.9
		- strongly advocate wide buffer	3.3.9
		- factors behind reduction?	3.3.9
		- not allocated green belt in plan?	3.3.9
		- what form will landscape take	3.3.9
		Seek further information on:	
		- traffic management	3.1.6
		- residents and visitors parking	3.3.8
		- water conservation and usage	3.3.8
		- local shop and homestore	3.3.8