



26 February 2018

Lauren.Kane@dpc.wa.gov.au

Simon.Taylor@dpc.wa.gov.au

Nicholas.Dufty@planning.wa.gov.au

Dear Lauren, Simon and Nicholas

Thank you for meeting with us on Friday 23rd February. We wish to re-emphasise the following.

1. Bush Forever

In effect, Bush Forever is 17 years of overdue, existing government business. Completion of securing **all sites** as 'A' class reserves for the purpose of nature conservation and passive recreation only must be carried out as the first priority this year. Bush Forever Areas are detailed on the MRS map and must not have reduced boundaries. All proposed additions should be added.

As we said, Bush Forever should be *fully completed before* the next draft of SAPPF is submitted. At least 10% of each Heddlu Vegetation complex should be secured for conservation in the PMR.

2. Local Biodiversity Strategies by LGAs

This is part of Bush Forever. All LGAs should be directed to complete their Local Biodiversity Strategies and Plans according to the WALGA guidelines. They should each be incorporated into their respective Town Planning Scheme – thus making them legally binding. Shire of Mundaring is a good role model.

3. MNES: Banksia woodlands TEC and its Approved Conservation Advice

We emphasise again that this Conservation Advice applies to all levels of government and the community. Protection of the TEC to prevent further loss means that clearing must be prevented. Thus we question your proposition that 18,000ha will be allowed to be cleared. How much of this is Banksia woodland (and/or Tuart Woodland)? Clearly lands which are TEC's should not be permitted to be cleared, regardless of their MRS zone. They are not developable lands.

Completion of Bush Forever as planned (Government of WA December 2000) together with the Priority Research and Conservation Actions needed for the TEC is noted in the Banksia woodlands TEC Advice as the short term surrogate for a Recovery Plan (Refer page 45).

4. Metronet and other infrastructure, MRIF

TECs and Bush Forever sites should not be regarded as available for infrastructure. For example the proposed rail extension to Yanchep as shown through Banksia woodlands TEC and other state TECs is unacceptable and should not be permitted.

We are also concerned that use of funding from the MRIF should be applied to secure and establish all Bush Forever sites as the first priority. Establishing a CAR reserve system is part of infrastructure provision for which MRIF funding is available, and this must be done *ahead of development*. Thus fund and secure Bush Forever before Metronet.

5. Urban Growth Boundary for Perth Metropolitan Region

The UBC supports an 'Urban Growth Boundary' for Perth (developed by Labor some years ago via the highly consultative and deliberative process 'Dialogue with the City, 2003) to halt unsustainable urban sprawl (eg to Yanchep) and large scale clearing of our global biodiversity hotspot. Smart redevelopment of rundown areas with consolidation and infill around public transport nodes, Transit Oriented Development (TOD) is preferred.

6. Underwood Avenue bushland (BF 119): acquire with MRIF

The state environmental approval has lapsed. The UWA housing proposal was recommended to be refused under the *EPBC Act* many years ago. The grounds for this are still valid and have indeed strengthened. It is now Banksia woodlands TEC. Clearing cannot be permitted as it includes critical habitat for Carnaby's Cockatoo and is inconsistent with the federal Recovery Plan. The site has also become critical habitat for the endangered Forest Red-tailed Black Cockatoo.

With the doubling of capacity of the Subiaco Wastewater Treatment Plant, the odour buffer zone should be extended across the whole of the Underwood Avenue bushland.

The whole of Bush Forever Area 119 should be acquired, and ceded to the Crown as an A class reserve for conservation and passive recreation only. It could best be managed by the City of Nedlands – which also manages the adjacent Shenton bushland.

7. Significant linkage: Shenton RPH redevelopment by Landcorp

Community and scientific advice along with advice from the City of Nedlands to retain and enhance the bushland linkage have all been ignored by Landcorp. *The proposal to clear most of the linkage and to construct high rise buildings in the linkage must be stopped.*

8. Swan and Canning Rivers as ecological linkages

The importance of an adequate width of healthy, local native foreshore vegetation along the Swan and Canning Rivers needs to be reflected in the securing and where possible widening of **all sites** as 'A' class reserves for the purpose of nature conservation. Areas of passive recreation need to be determined by impacts on nature conservation values and guidance of Local Biodiversity Strategies.