## WILDLIFE CORRIDOR MAP – STAKHOLDER ENGAGEMENT

Stakeholder engagement activity: Biodiversity Advisory Committee, 9 September 2021		
Attendance:		
Comment	Notes	
Progress with draft corridor map noted by		
BAC. Keen to see this project progress.		

Stakeholder engagement activity: Councillor Strategic Planning Workshop, 7 October 2021		
Attendance:		
Comment	Notes	
<ul> <li>Fire</li> <li>Concern that there might be community concern regarding the impact of planting more trees on increased bushfire hazard.</li> <li>Need to engage local bushfire mgt committee and indigenous fire managers during expert stakeholder engagement.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>RFS, F&amp;R NSW and Arakwal, TBLALC invited to participate in expert stakeholder workshop.</li> <li>Council advice needs to be clear regarding what to plant where (i.e. planting the right trees in the right habitat), and on the need to incorporate fire breaks and buffers around infrastructure into planting plans.</li> <li>Increasing trees in our environment helps cool the environment, ultimately reducing risk of future fires.</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>Stakeholder engagement</li> <li>Use clickable map with pop ups to show people what to plant where.</li> <li>Could use 'bang the table' interactive map where people can go on and add what restoration work they've done.</li> <li>Factsheets</li> <li>FAQs</li> <li>Peer review workshop with expert stakeholders.</li> <li>Naming – do we call them corridors, linkages, bio bridges?</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Interactive map developed with pop ups showing corridor key features as well as what to plant where (based on BVL planting guides).</li> <li>People can add restorations work to ALA habitat restorations archive.</li> <li>Expert stakeholder workshop planned for 26 Nov.</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>Planning Scheme Incentives for Developers</li> <li>Councillors supportive of incentives.         Suggested asking farming community what incentives would work for them, e.g. help with trees or fencing.     </li> <li>Rate rebates – e.g. rate rebate for tree planting that is stopped if people clear the trees. Or DA fee rebate for developing outside the corridor, or restoring corridor as part of a DA.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Ag cluster group advised that financial incentives are always welcome. While fencing is good, may not be best use of public money.</li> <li>Investigate practicality of rate rebates or DA fee reductions with planners.</li> </ul>	

## **Stakeholder engagement activity**: Agriculture Cluster Group, 9 November 2021

**Attendance**: Pete Boyd, Liz Caddick, Andrew Cameron, Cr. Alan Hunter, Mike Shea, Johan Kortenhurst, Lindsay Murray, Liz Gray, (Tony Flick left before start of corridor discussion)

Comment	Notes
The wildlife corridor map will help to support	Noted
grant applications for restoration and	
regenerative agriculture projects, fencing	
creeks etc.	
Coming from Council, the corridor map looks	Partnership with Hunks of Mullum local wildlife
like a policy planning tool. If we could deliver it	corridor project presents a good opportunity
in partnership with an environmental group it	for wildlife corridor map launch.
might get more support as it would look like a	
conservation tool.	
Need to be clear to landholders what the intent	Noted
of the map is. i.e. clear that Council does not	
want to force restoration/replanting of all the	
areas in the corridors.	
There is lots of cleared 'agricultural' land in the	Would be useful to know where this is, as these
shire that isn't actually used for agriculture. i.e.	may be more appropriate sites to target for
land that has been purchased by lifestylers.	revegetation.
Community engagement – on the map	Corridor species included on interactive map.
presented to the community, it would be great	
to show what species each corridor was aimed	
at conserving, as a pop up, as well as what	
plants to plant.	

## Stakeholder engagement activity: Expert stakeholder workshop, 26 November 2021

Attendance: Liz Caddick (BSC), Gene Mason (BSC), Annette McKinley (Landmark), Andrew Murray (Landmark), David Milledge (Landmark), Kate Singleton (Planners North), Ross Tregidga (Arakwal), Steve Kelly (Arakwal), Leon Kelly (Arakwal), Zofie Lahodny-Gesco (RFS), Luke Houghton, Jenny Hartigan (BVL), Andy Baker (Southern Cross Uni), Rebecca McNaught (Griffith Uni), Chris Larkin (BSC).

[Others invited: Malcom Scott, Joe Vescio (JV Urban), Karina Vikstrom (NDC), Rochelle Merdith (BVL), Leonie Walsh (Lismore Council), Andy Parks (Lismore Council), Joe Davidson.]

(BVL), Leonie Waish (Lismore Council), Andy Parks (Lismore Council), Joe Davidson.		
Comment	Notes / follow up	
Planning Scheme		
Incentives, i.e. a carrot not stick approach, may be effective. Incentives need to be clearly outlined in DCP.	Incentives generally need to be considered on a case by case or site by site basis, to avoid proponents using them as loopholes. There is already some flexibility in Council's planning scheme to enable variations in development controls for good land managers — e.g. reductions in the amount of buffer planting required on sites where a landholder can demonstrate they have already done significant restoration/habitat planting prior to submitting DA. Proponents need to provide this information as part of their application.	
Incentives, or flexibility within planning scheme,	Briefing session for town planners so they can	
can also be communicated via key groups, eg. Via	disseminate information clearly to their	
town planning contractors.	clients.	

Could incentivise people who avoid impacts.	This can be accommodated within the
E.g. if development envelope is located away	existing planning scheme, where controls can
from corridor, people don't have to do further	be adjusted for good land managers.
restoration or restore such a large area.	
DCP needs to allow some flexibility, e.g. controls	Current example of site by site incentive is
required for a farmer putting in a shed vs. a large	Heritage Conservation clause 5.10, which
development or cabins.	allows a change in land use type if associated
Easier to consider each application on a case by	with restoration of heritage buildings – needs
case basis to avoid proponents using incentives in	to be considered on a case by case basis as
an inappropriate way.	each site/building has different constraints.
Town planning consultants to provide more	
comments in writing.	
Reducing development contributions would have	Noted.
knock-on effects as these funds are important in	
funding roads, parks, gardens and other	
community infrastructure. Would require	
changes to contributions plan.	
Bushfire	
Fire agencies need access, particularly to national	Information provided regarding restoration
parks etc., for fire fighting. Ideally they don't	needs to include incorporating fire breaks and
want to clear remnant vegetation to do this, so	buffers around infrastructure into planting
need to encourage people to maintain/retain	plans.
existing tracks and trails, and to plan their	BVL Climate Resilient Landscapes guide also
restoration so that they leave access trails	to be promoted as part of this – provides info
between blocks of vegetation. Trails allow for	on garden design and suitable plants for fire
access, hazard reduction burns and back burns.	prone areas.
·	•
Planting needs to consider bushfire and how	
creating an increased risk can be avoided.	
It would be helpful if Council could quickly and	Follow up with RFS. Presumably setbacks
easily advise people on appropriate asset	would be very site specific, dependant on
setbacks, e.g. using the formula in the bushfire	slope, aspect, vegetation, building materials
code.	etc.
What to plant where is important. E.g. not	Noted. NSW Trees Near Me app/website also
planting koala trees in wet/riparian habitat. The	provides useful information including pre-
interactive planting map could assist with this.	clearing species lists.
Tree spacing can also be important in fire hazard	BVL Climate Resilient Landscapes guide also
mitigation and control.	to be promoted as part of this – provides info
	on garden design and suitable plants for fire
	prone areas.
Hazard reduction burns should be supported.	Noted
However, not likely that many people will be	
doing this as it is quite an onerous process.	
Need to disseminate clear, simple fire	Liaise with RFS regarding information
management information to people from Council	required.
and other agencies (e.g. BVL). Could information	
go out with a rates notice?	
Big developments have access to good advice re	Noted
planting and fire hazard mitigation, APZs etc	
because they need to engage an ecological	
consultant and a fire planner. But people who	
23 Saltant and a me planner. Dut people will	<u> </u>

might be doing some restoration on their own are less likely to have immediate access to fire management advice. Need to get info out to these people through Council and BVL. Putting corridors predominantly on S facing Need to acknowledge that there are a range slopes unlikely to reduce fire risk as the wet of communities that present a fire risk and sclerophyll eucalyptus communities that develop that this may change as the climate dries. On here are the hardest to manage for fire a domestic scale people need to plant mitigation. Drier forests on N facing slopes can be appropriately to ensure adequate buffers burnt in cool, moist ish conditions to reduce fuel around houses and infrastructure, whilst also loads, however wet sclerophyll won't burn in acknowledging that at a landscape scale more these conditions, only under dangerous dry trees in the landscape will cool and moisten conditions, which makes it very hard to manage. the climate, reducing risk of fire. Need to incorporate this messaging into There are ways to make planted corridors 'fire planting guidance/tips. - Ref BVL Climate smart', which can be applied in both wet and Resilient Planting Guide, includes all this info. drier forest communities, including Wider tree spacing so trees crowns are discontinuous to prevent crown fires Fire breaks are integrated into corridor plantings • reduce fire spread allow suppression, including back burns application of ecological burns Corridors be setback from fire-sensitive assets Fuel management – HR burns or slashing **Aboriginal Cultural Heritage** Arakwal are developing their own mapping of Noted Aboriginal sites, and some of this info is also available to DA planners and RFS etc through AHIMS. This info doesn't need to be on a corridor map and much of it isn't publicly available to protect heritage items. Bush tucker info could also go onto interactive Cultural heritage info contained withing BVL Climate Resilient Landscapes guide. map, but this makes it more complex. Need to keep ridgelines and grassy pathways Review of corridors with hillshaded relief protected as many culturally significant features mapping shows ridges are covered, but less N and bushfoods are located in these areas. There's facing slopes than S facing, probably because a lot of momentum both regionally and nationally N facing slopes more heavily cleared. E.g. to reinvigorate these pathways for renewal of Montecollum to Myocum, Kooyum Range to both indigenous cultural practices and Mullum, and ridges in the Pocket, Middle biodiversity. By not striving to harness this Pocket, Yelgun. Corridor coverage has been momentum, this proposal is missing an important reviewed in subsequent corridor map opportunity for biodiversity conservation. Andy revisions. Baker E2022/1156 Council working with community groups to support/promote ecological cultural burning and map sites requiring reintroduction of ecological burning. **Agriculture** Can reach out to farmers through the following: Noted

- Farmers Association (Kim Stefan) – sits on	
BFMC.	
<ul> <li>LLS. John Nagle. Have a newsletter.</li> </ul>	
- Mullum farm coop.	
<ul> <li>Cane growers association.</li> </ul>	
- Byron Farmers Network	
Individual letters to rural landholders in corridor	Noted – to be considered depending on level
areas, with the opportunity to follow up and chat	of interest from landholders.
to Council staff, as per the E-zone community	
engagement process would help.	
Need to clearly articulate the benefits of wildlife	
corridors and habitat to agriculture.	
Community Engagement	
Need to emphasise that the corridors are	Noted
aspirational!! They are not meant to be	
restrictive, but something to inspire and aspire	
to.	
If people want to use the corridors to help	
support and direct more habitat restoration	
and/or creating connectivity on their land, that is	
great, but if you choose to keep doing what	
you're doing, that's fine too.	
Short videos can be a really effective engagement	
tool.	
Provide an info session for professionals, e.g.	Noted
town planners and bushfire consultants, so they	Hoted
can spread the word to their clients.	
Interactive map strongly supported, but also	Noted
need to engage with non computer savvy people,	110100
and those with low literacy – less words, more	
pictures.	
Interactive map things to consider:	Can't direct people to specific businesses via
- Need to provide easy pop up advice on	Council website.
bushfire, or at least where to go to get	Web links to include links to planting guides.
advice.	Climate Resilient Landscapes guide also
- Direct people to nurseries where they	includes bushfire advice.
can get plants.	
- Direct people to where they can go for	
more detail, e.g. BVL, Council's online	
native species planting guide.	
Google Earth program may help to engage people	Not used on Council systems
with corridors as a 3d landscape.	The asea on council systems
Corridor size:	Noted
The corridors, even the smaller riparian ones, are	
all quite wide. This reflects the current science	
(the theory of wildlife corridors has been around	
for a long time and is well researched), which	
emphasises that corridors need to be a particular	
width to really provide significant ecological	
function in the landscape.	
runction in the landscape.	

These widths mean that a <u>lot</u> of land in the shire	
is included in the corridors, and it is important to	
note that these widths are aspirational. If you're	
looking to restore a riparian corridor to full	
ecological functionality on your land, then the	
best course of action is to restore the whole	
width of the corridor. But not everyone has the	
will or capacity or space to do that. Even	
restoring a narrow strip of vegetation along a	
drainage line, or planting scattered trees in a	
pasture, has benefits for our fauna and flora.	
This is also why the riparian corridors are wider	
than the riparian setbacks in the DCP. The DCP	
says what you have to do, the corridors show you	
what it would be good to do.	
Rail Corridor	
The entirety of the rail corridor doesn't have any	Noted
of the features that were used to select locations	
of corridors.	
However parts of the rail corridor do have these	
significant habitat and connectivity values and do	
intersect with the corridor network.	
The corridors have also been designed specifically	
to intersect with under/over passes across the	
rail corridor, highway and other roads in the shire	
(e.g. using Councils's culvert mapping). The	
corridors also take into account specific	
important habitat features provided by the rail	
corridor, e.g. where tunnels create bat roosts.	
i.e. essentially the good bits of the rail corridor	
are already in the wildlife corridor network, e.g	
SEPP wetlands.	
RFS are concerned that the rail corridor isn't well	
maintained and could carry a fire through	
Tyagarah and Byron sections. They are talking	
with the rail track management entity and NSW	
state rail about this.	

## **Stakeholder engagement activity**: Peer review, April 2022

Landmark Ecological Services engaged two local ecologists to provide review and feedback on the draft Wildlife Corridor System report, and this feedback was incorporated into the final report.