

# Greenkeepers Shed Replacement, Kingston and Arthurs Vale Historic Area, Norfolk Island

Application Number: **03286**

Commencement Date:  
**22/12/2025**

Status: **Locked**

---

## 1. About the project

### 1.1 Project details

#### 1.1.1 Project title \*

Greenkeepers Shed Replacement, Kingston and Arthurs Vale Historic Area, Norfolk Island

#### 1.1.2 Project industry type \*

Commonwealth Development

#### 1.1.3 Project industry sub-type

—

#### 1.1.4 Estimated start date \*

01/03/2026

#### 1.1.4 Estimated end date \*

31/12/2026

## 1.2 Proposed Action details

**1.2.1 Provide an overview of the proposed action, including all proposed activities. \***

The Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development, Communications, Sport and the Arts proposes to demolish the existing Greenkeepers Shed and replace with a new shed in the same location, located within Point Hunter Reserve, Kingston and Arthurs Vale Historic Area (KAVHA), Norfolk Island. The Greenkeeper's Shed is used by the Norfolk Island Golf Club for the maintenance of the golf course. The existing structure has been condemned by a Structural Engineer and is currently not in use (see **Attachment 1 – Condemning of Building** for Structural Engineer Report). The proposal includes the removal of the existing structure, and replacing it with a slightly larger structure, which has an additional bay to store chemicals, materials and equipment used for activities associated with the Norfolk Island Golf Club. The proposed structure will consist of a 4-bay shed with roller doors and a concrete apron. The structure will be built into the existing landscape and will not be visible from the roadside. The shed will be made of concrete, like the existing structure, but will use modern construction techniques: stand-up concrete tilt panels and a pre-cast concrete roof. The exterior of the building will be clad with timber painted Rustic Oak colour, and the roller doors will be painted Heritage Green. These colours chosen to be regressive in the landscape and not compete with the extant buildings and ruins or with the natural environment as per the Materials Palette for KAVHA 2019 prepared by Convergence Design. The project is supported by a Statement of Heritage Impact (**Attachment 2 - Statement of Heritage Impact**) and Heritage Impact Assessment (**Attachment 3 - Sapienza 2025 Greenkeeper's Shed HIA**).

**Describe your project and the proposed actions.**

The project involves two stages of construction works. During the first stage, the existing Greenkeepers Shed and concrete apron will be largely demolished, and the site will be cleared of demolition materials. The existing slab of the shed will be used as footings for the new construction. In the second stage, a new shed and concrete apron will be constructed on the site of the original. The design drawings for the replacement shed are attached as **Attachment 8 - Design Drawings Proposed Greenkeepers Shed**.

**State the purpose of the proposed action.**

The purpose of the project is to replace the existing Greenkeepers Shed – which has significant structural issues that pose serious safety risks – with a modern structure that meets current work health and safety requirements.

**State all the activities that are necessary to deliver the proposed action, including pre-construction/ pre-clearing activities; construction/ clearing/ infrastructure; ongoing maintenance/ operations; and decommissioning/ remediation works at the end of the project.**

No significant pre-construction activities are required for this project. The existing structure has been closed for 15 months and has been cleared of equipment and materials. At present, the structure is in a state ready for demolition.

Construction activities will comprise two major stages.

Stage 1 – Demolition and site preparation

The existing shed will be demolished using plant. All concrete comprising the current building, other than concrete slab, will be removed offsite and disposed of at the waste facility. The base concrete slab will be retained and used as footings for the new construction. The current concrete apron south of the shed will be removed. Minor earthworks will be required to level the site and prepare it for the new structure. One mature Norfolk Island pine (planted in the mid-1970s) will be felled due to its proximity to the shed.

Stage 2 – Construction

Following the demolition stage, the proposed shed will be built, and a new concrete apron will be laid in front of it. The shed will be connected to power and communications lines that run to the existing structure, but a new connection will be made to join the proposed structure to the Kingston sewer, which runs just

south of the existing concrete apron. Landscaping will be done to smoothly shape the embankment to the rear of the structure, and top-dressing and plantings will be made to rejuvenate the area once plant and machinery are removed.

After construction, the site will be used for the storage and maintenance of golf course-related machinery, and for storage of other equipment used in the maintenance of the golf course areas managed by the Norfolk Island Golf Club.

**Mention any additional developments that are happening as part of the proposed action, including infrastructure changes outside your project area e.g., widening an intersection or extending a wharf to enable delivery of materials to the project site.**

No additional developments will happen as part of these works.

**Give details of land tenure arrangements.**

The site is located within the Kingston and Arthurs Vale Historic Area (KAVHA) site on an unleased Commonwealth land parcel identified as Lot 14 Section 4. This land parcel has an area of 30.3 hectares, and is the third largest land parcel on Norfolk Island. Lot 14 Section 4 also forms the entire land area of a Norfolk Island reserve (Point Hunter Reserve).

The Greenkeepers Shed is located approximately 50 metres west of the Norfolk Island Golf Club House, along the northern boundary of Lot 14 Section 4. Project is within the Listed Place as depicted at **Attachment 4 - Location and Boundary Map KAVHA**.

**Outline if proposed activities will directly and/or indirectly impact on the environment.**

The demolition and construction activities have the potential to cause minor impacts to the immediately adjacent environment, though due to the small scale of the proposed works these impacts will be able to be fully managed and/or mitigated. The most likely potential impacts are:

\* Dust releases

\* Contaminated stormwater releases following rainfall

\* Noise levels during demolition and construction

**State the size of the project area, disturbance footprint, and any avoidance and/or retention areas in hectares in-text in this section. The areas stated in the text needs to be consistent with the area in the geospatial information provided in Section 2.1.**

The proposed structure will be approximately 315 m<sup>2</sup> in area (21 m x 15 m) including the concrete apron. The disturbance footprint during the construction works would be 828 m<sup>2</sup> in area (36 m x 23 m) This disturbance footprint would be used for the movement of demolition and construction plant and equipment during the works. No ground disturbance or construction works will occur in this extended area. There will be one avoidance area during the construction works, which will avoid a historic feature described on pages 8-9 of the attached Heritage Impact Assessment prepared. This feature is thought to be an agricultural field boundary from the Second British (Penal) Settlement/ There are possible footings of this boundary that are clearly shown in historic photographs (1968 / 1944 imagery). No works are to take place on or through this feature. The General project works location is shown at **Attachment 5**, Size of structure at **Attachment 6** and Disturbance Footprint at **Attachment 7**.

**1.2.2 Is the project action part of a staged development or related to other actions or proposals in the region?**

No

**1.2.6 What Commonwealth or state legislation, planning frameworks or policy documents are relevant to the proposed action, and how are they relevant? \***

**Environmental Protection and Biodiversity Act 1999** – Under Part 9 of the Act, if the proposed action caused a significant impact on matters of national environmental significance and is deemed a 'controlled action', it will be subject to a formal assessment and approval under the EPBC Act.

The EPBC Act requires actions on Commonwealth land (Section 26) and actions undertaken by a Commonwealth agency (Section 28) to be assessed if it causes a significant impact on the environment.

Section 341ZD requires a Commonwealth agency to ask for advice from the Minister prior to undertaking an action that is likely to have a significant impact on a Commonwealth heritage place. This referral fulfils these requirements.

**KAVHA Heritage Management Plan (HMP) 2016** – The KAVHA HMP is the primary statutory document guiding management of the KAVHA Site for all of the federal heritage listings (World Heritage, National Heritage, Commonwealth Heritage), and per the EPBC Act is a requirement for management of the site. The HMP contains policies and actions that guide the sustainable management of the KAVHA site, and any works within KAVHA must be in support of the HMP and the management goals for the site.

**Norfolk Island Planning Act 2002** – Under section 30 a development approval is required for development that is permissible (with consent) use or development. The development would not be considered a declared significant development therefore no environmental impact assessment or statement is required under section 45.

**Norfolk Island Plan 2002** - Sets out the strategic planning framework for the future land use, development and management of land in Norfolk Island. The Proposal is zoned Open Space in the Norfolk Island Plan 2002. The golf course, club house and supporting ancillary facilities such as the greenkeepers shed are defined as *Outdoor Sport and Recreation Facility* which is permissible with consent in the Open Space Zone.

The site is within the KAVHA therefore it is within the Heritage Overlay (Part B). Under Cl. 81(1) of the Norfolk Island Plan 2002 the proposed works would required a development approval under the Norfolk Island Planning Act 2002.

The KAVHA Development Control Plan 2020 provides practical controls to guide development within KAVHA. The proposed development is within Precinct B of the DCP and is subject to the Objectives and Controls within section 4.3.5 and section 6.1, 6.2, 6.6, 6.8, 6.14.

**Environment Act 1990 (NI)** – The Act sets out regulatory frameworks for requiring approvals for certain activities.

**Heritage Act 2002 (NI)** – A Heritage Impact Statement is required for all Development Applications within KAVHA, as required under Section 28(1) of the Heritage Act 2002 (NI).

#### Other requirements

**World Heritage Convention** - KAVHA which is part of the Australian Convict Sites properties, is listed on the *World Heritage List of the Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage* (i.e. the World Heritage Convention). The KAVHA Heritage Management Plan (GML 2016) and subsequent approved Heritage Management Plans, are the key instrument to manage activities within KAVHA. Given that the Proposal is located within KAVHA, it will be developed in accordance to the KAVHA HMP.

**KAVHA Archaeological Zoning and Management Plan (2019)** – This document, created to fulfil a high priority recommendation in the HMP, provides guidance about how archaeological resources throughout KAVHA are to be managed, particularly during construction works. Guidance in the AZMP was directly incorporated into the analyses and recommendations in the Heritage Impact Assessment.

**Building Act 2002 (NI)** - All building activity on Norfolk Island, is controlled by the *Building Act 2002* and the Norfolk Island Building Code. The Proposal would require Building Approval from the NIRC.

**Public Reserves Act 1997 (NI)** – The proposed development is within the Point Hunter Reserve which is Section Seventeen of Part B Plan of Management. The proposed development must be in accordance with the Management Objectives listed at section 17.5.

**Waste Management Act 2003 (NI)** - All construction waste generated from the Proposal shall be managed in compliance with this Act.

**Noxious Weeds Act 1916 (NI)** - The contractor shall implement best management practice to prevent and control noxious weeds declared under this Act.

**1.2.7 Describe any public consultation that has been, is being or will be undertaken regarding the project area, including with Indigenous stakeholders. Attach any completed consultation documentations, if relevant. \***

The Department has provided public information for this project via the following public media releases:

241205-departmental-media-release-greenkeepers-shed-pine-removal.pdf

29august2024-kingston-and-arthurs-vale-historic-area-advisory-committee-august-2024-meeting-communicue.pdf

In addition, the Department has provided

regular updates to the KAVHA Advisory Committee, the Norfolk Island Golf Club and the Norfolk Island Regional Council.

## 1.3.1 Identity: Referring party

### **Privacy Notice:**

Personal information means information or an opinion about an identified individual, or an individual who is reasonably identifiable.

By completing and submitting this form, you consent to the collection of all personal information contained in this form. If you are providing the personal information of other individuals in this form, please ensure you have their consent before doing so.

The Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water (the department) collects your personal information (as defined by the Privacy Act 1988) through this platform for the purposes of enabling the department to consider your submission and contact you in relation to your submission. If you fail to provide some or all of the personal information requested on this platform (name and email address), the department will be unable to contact you to seek further information (if required) and subsequently may impact the consideration given to your submission.

Personal information may be disclosed to other Australian government agencies, persons or organisations where necessary for the above purposes, provided the disclosure is consistent with relevant laws, in particular the Privacy Act 1988 (Privacy Act). Your personal information will be used and stored in accordance with the Australian Privacy Principles.

See our Privacy Policy to learn more about accessing or correcting personal information or making a complaint.

Alternatively, email us at [privacy@dcceew.gov.au](mailto:privacy@dcceew.gov.au).

**Confirm that you have read and understand this Privacy Notice \***

### **1.3.1.1 Is Referring party an organisation or business? \***

Yes

Referring party organisation details

**ABN/ACN** 86267354017

**Organisation name** DEPARTMENT OF INFRASTRUCTURE, TRANSPORT, REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT, COMMUNICATIONS, SPORT AND THE ARTS

**Organisation address** GPO Box 594, Canberra, ACT 2601

Referring party details

**Name** Heather Bruce

**Job title** KAVHA Secretariat and Governance Coordinator

**Phone** 006723 23315

**Email** heather.bruce@infrastructure.gov.au

**Address** New Military Barracks, Quality Row, Norfolk Island

## 1.3.2 Identity: Person proposing to take the action

**1.3.2.1 Are the Person proposing to take the action details the same as the Referring party details? \***

No

**1.3.2.2 Is Person proposing to take the action an organisation or business? \***

Yes

Person proposing to take the action organisation details

**ABN/ACN** 86267354017

**Organisation name** DEPARTMENT OF INFRASTRUCTURE, TRANSPORT, REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT, COMMUNICATIONS, SPORT AND THE ARTS

**Organisation address** GPO 594, Canberra, 2601 ACT

Person proposing to take the action details

**Name** Allison Rossetto

**Job title** Director Norfolk Island Operations Territories Division DITRDCA

**Phone** 0011672350724

**Email** Allison.Rossetto@infrastructure.gov.au

**Address** PO Box 201, Norfolk Island 2899

**1.3.2.14 Are you proposing the action as part of a Joint Venture? \***

No

**1.3.2.15 Are you proposing the action as part of a Trust? \***

No

**1.3.2.17 Describe the Person proposing the action's history of responsible environmental management including details of any proceedings under a Commonwealth, State or Territory law for the protection of the environment or the conservation and sustainable use of natural resources against the Person proposing to take the action. \***

There are no past or present proceedings against the person proposing the action.

**1.3.2.18 If the person proposing to take the action is a corporation, provide details of the corporation's environmental policy and planning framework**

—

### **1.3.3 Identity: Proposed designated proponent**

**1.3.3.1 Are the Proposed designated proponent details the same as the Person proposing to take the action? \***

No

**1.3.3.2 Is Proposed designated proponent an organisation or business? \***

Yes

Proposed designated proponent organisation details

**ABN/ACN** 86267354017

**Organisation name** DEPARTMENT OF INFRASTRUCTURE, TRANSPORT, REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT, COMMUNICATIONS, SPORT AND THE ARTS

**Organisation address** 2601 ACT

Proposed designated proponent details

**Name** Allison Rossetto

**Job title** Director Norfolk Island Operations Territories Division DITRDCA

**Phone** 0011672350724

**Email** allison.rossetto@infrastructure.gov.au

**Address** PO Box 201, Norfolk Island 2899

## 1.3.4 Identity: Summary of allocation

---

## ✔ Confirmed Referring party's identity

The Referring party is the person preparing the information in this referral.

---

ABN/ACN	86267354017
Organisation name	DEPARTMENT OF INFRASTRUCTURE, TRANSPORT, REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT, COMMUNICATIONS, SPORT AND THE ARTS
Organisation address	GPO Box 594, Canberra, ACT 2601
Representative's name	Heather Bruce
Representative's job title	KAVHA Secretariat and Governance Coordinator
Phone	006723 23315
Email	heather.bruce@infrastructure.gov.au
Address	New Military Barracks, Quality Row, Norfolk Island

---

## ✔ Confirmed Person proposing to take the action's identity

The Person proposing to take the action is the individual, business, government agency or trustee that will be responsible for the proposed action.

---

ABN/ACN	86267354017
Organisation name	DEPARTMENT OF INFRASTRUCTURE, TRANSPORT, REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT, COMMUNICATIONS, SPORT AND THE ARTS
Organisation address	GPO 594, Canberra, 2601 ACT
Representative's name	Allison Rossetto
Representative's job title	Director Norfolk Island Operations Territories Division DITRDCA
Phone	0011672350724
Email	Allison.Rossetto@infrastructure.gov.au
Address	PO Box 201, Norfolk Island 2899

---

## ✔ Confirmed Proposed designated proponent's identity

The Person proposing to take the action is the individual or organisation proposed to be responsible for meeting the requirements of the EPBC Act during the assessment process, if the Minister decides that this project is a controlled action.

---

ABN/ACN	86267354017
Organisation name	DEPARTMENT OF INFRASTRUCTURE, TRANSPORT, REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT, COMMUNICATIONS, SPORT AND THE ARTS
Organisation address	2601 ACT
Representative's name	Allison Rossetto
Representative's job title	Director Norfolk Island Operations Territories Division DITRDCA
Phone	0011672350724
Email	<a href="mailto:allison.rossetto@infrastructure.gov.au">allison.rossetto@infrastructure.gov.au</a>
Address	PO Box 201, Norfolk Island 2899

## 1.4 Payment details: Payment exemption and fee waiver

**1.4.1 Do you qualify for an exemption from fees under EPBC Regulation 5.23 (1) (a)? \***

No

**1.4.3 Have you applied for or been granted a waiver for full or partial fees under Regulation 5.21A? \***

No

**1.4.5 Are you going to apply for a waiver of full or partial fees under EPBC Regulation 5.21A?**

No

**1.4.7 Has the department issued you with a credit note? \***

No

**1.4.9 Would you like to add a purchase order number to your invoice? \***

Yes

**1.4.10 Enter purchase order number \***

CQ1155

## 1.4 Payment details: Payment allocation

**1.4.11 Who would you like to allocate as the entity responsible for payment? \***

Person proposing to take the action

## 2. Location

## 2.1 Project footprint



**Project Area: 0.66 Ha Disturbance Footprint: 0.06 Ha Avoidance Area: 0.08 Ha**

## 2.2 Footprint details

### 2.2.1 What is the address of the proposed action? \*

Golf Course, Quality Row, Norfolk Island

### 2.2.2 Where is the primary jurisdiction of the proposed action? \*

Norfolk Island

### 2.2.3 Is there a secondary jurisdiction for this proposed action? \*

No

### 2.2.5 What is the tenure of the action area relevant to the project area? \*

Unleased Crown Land

## 3. Existing environment

## 3.1 Physical description

### 3.1.1 Describe the current condition of the project area's environment.

The proposed project area is location on Norfolk Island, within the Kingston and Arthurs Vale Historic Area (KAVHA) site. The project area is located about 2.5 kilometres south-southeast of Burnt Pine, Norfolk Island's town centre. The environment immediately surrounding the project area is a maintained golf course adjacent to Quality Row, a street lined with Norfolk Pines. There is no high-quality habitat in or near the project area.

The site is within Point Hunter Reserve (a local Norfolk Island reserve under the *Reserves Act 1997 (NI)*) and under the local planning ordinances (*Norfolk Island Plan 2002* and *Planning Act 2002 (NI)*) is zoned as 'open space'. The current use of the site is consistent with zoning under the *Norfolk Island Plan 2002*, and no use changes will occur as a result of the proposed development. As a result, both current and future use of the site are consistent with local planning and zoning laws.

The existing Greenkeepers Shed was built in 1985. It is bunkered into the landscape immediately south of Quality Row. The building is of rudimentary concrete construction, and appears to have been made by pouring concrete into wooden formwork over rebar reinforcement. It has a single person-sized doorway and a larger roller door for vehicular access. The shed is painted green, presumably so that it blends into the landscape.

The existing structure is in poor condition, and an engineer has declared that it is unfit for occupation or use due to safety risks, and that it must be condemned. The manner in which the structure was originally built has meant that it is unsalvageable through repair or refurbishment, and must be fully demolished and replaced.

The project area has not suffered any effects from bushfire, flood or other major events.

### 3.1.2 Describe any existing or proposed uses for the project area.

The proposed use will be for the storage of Greenkeeper's materials and equipment in conjunction with the golf course, which is maintained by the Norfolk Island Golf Club. The proposed use is identical to the use of the existing building prior to being condemned. No changes to the use of the site are proposed. The site has been used as the Greenkeeper's Shed since its construction in 1985.

### 3.1.3 Describe any outstanding natural features and/or any other important or unique values that applies to the project area.

Because humans have occupied Kingston for hundreds of years, almost the entire landscape surrounding the project area has been culturally shaped. Although KAVHA is listed on the World, National and Commonwealth heritage lists, those listings are not based on natural heritage values. The nearest outstanding natural feature that forms part of KAVHA's listed heritage values is Cemetery Bay (450 metres to the east). Cemetery Bay is not relevant to the proposed project.

Norfolk Island is almost completely volcanic in origin, with the rocks dominantly comprising fine to medium grained olivine basaltic lavas and pyroclastic tuff (layered volcanic ash). The project area rises up from a low calcarenite ridge to approximately 10 metres above sea level and the topography has been altered through low-scale quarrying. Most of the original native vegetation was cleared during the first settlement and the site has been used over time for farming and gardens. The golf course has been progressively developed since 1927 and has been further cleared and maintained during this time. Norfolk Pine's have been planted along Quality Row, which is directly to the north of the project area.

There are no protected flora or fauna species in or near the project area.

#### **3.1.4 Describe the gradient (or depth range if action is to be taken in a marine area) relevant to the project area.**

The site is located directly to the south of Quality Row, which at its nearest location to the project area is approximately 15 metres above sea level.

The proposed structure will be bunkered into the slope south of Quality Row, and the new concrete apron will be approximately 12 metres above sea level.

The project area is located at the highest point within Point Hunter Reserve where the topography is slightly undulated across the golf course until it reaches sea level at Emily Bay to the south, and Cemetery Bay to the east.

## 3.2 Flora and fauna

### 3.2.1 Describe the flora and fauna within the affected area and attach any investigations of surveys if applicable.

The site is within Point Hunter Reserve, and is part of the Norfolk Island Golf Course. The surrounding land is vegetated with exotic pasture, i.e. Kikuyu grass (*Centrus clandestinus*) which is regularly maintained by the Greenkeeper. There are no native habitats close to the project area. The golf course fairways have a series of Norfolk Pines (*Araucaria heterophylla*) and Norfolk Island Hibiscus (*Lagunaria patersonia*), and there a series of evenly spaced Norfolk Pines have been planted along Quality Row in the vicinity of the project area.

There are no threatened ecological communities in or immediately adjacent to the project area.

A vulnerable herb (*Euphorbia obliqua*), which is included in the Norfolk Island Region Threatened Species Recovery Plan (2025), is also located within Point Hunter Reserve. However, the nearest community of *Euphorbia obliqua* is located approximately 430 metres from the project area on the Cemetery Bay beach. This species will not be impacted by any works associated with the proposed project.

### 3.2.2 Describe the vegetation (including the status of native vegetation and soil) within the project area.

Per mapping undertaken by the Invasive Species Council in 2021, there is no remnant vegetation within 300 metres of the project area.

All vegetation in and around the project area is introduced or human-planted. In the immediate vicinity of the project area, the vegetation is dominated by mown kikuyu grass. The only large vegetation in the area are the human-planted Norfolk Island pines along Quality Row, and the only other sizeable patch of vegetation is area of taller grasses 10 metres south of the existing structure.

The condition of the soil is unknown, but there has been no evidence that suggests degradation. Norfolk Island has been recognised for the richness and fertility of its soils since the 18th century, and – as long as they can handle the sub-tropical climate and airborne salinity – plants thrive on Norfolk Island.

## 3.3 Heritage

### 3.3.1 Describe any Commonwealth Heritage Places Overseas or other places recognised as having heritage values that apply to the project area.

The project area (Greenkeeper's Shed) is not individually heritage listed however, it is within the Kingston and Arthurs Vale Historic Area and is therefore included in the following statutory listings:

- UNESCO World Heritage List (as part of the Australian Convict Sites listing)
- National Heritage List
- Commonwealth Heritage List
- Norfolk Island Heritage Register

The existing Greenkeepers Shed was built in 1985. It is not a structure of heritage significance and is not a contributory attribute towards any of KAVHA's outstanding universal values or listed heritage values.

### 3.3.2 Describe any Indigenous heritage values that apply to the project area.

Norfolk Island is not the traditional lands of any Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander groups, and has KAVHA has no Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander heritage values.

## 3.4 Hydrology

### 3.4.1 Describe the hydrology characteristics that apply to the project area and attach any hydrological investigations or surveys if applicable. \*

The project area is part of a major catchment area in which the only permanent waterways are Watermill Creek and Town Creek. Ephemeral waterways run from several valleys in the hills following major rainfall, but several years may pass between these waterways becoming active. The nearest permanent waterways are Town Creek (370 metres southwest of the project) and creek running under Bloody Bridge, by name of Music Creek (710 metres to the east).

The project area is in the eastern half of the Kingston lowlands, and there is no evidence to suggest that the area has ever had regular or even intermittent waterways. Prior to human settlement, most of the eastern side of Kingston was a massive sand flat, and rainfall would have simply soaked into and through the sand (as it does on beaches), rather than forming water channels.

The topography of the project area comprises a gentle downward slope to the south, and so water runoff at the project area naturally flows toward the golf course, and then percolate through the soils into groundwater.

The nearest ocean waters are Emily Bay (420 metres to the south) and Cemetery Bay (450 metres to the east); both of these water bodies are part of the Norfolk Marine Park. The proposed project will involve no direct releases of surface water into the ocean. No enough is known about the subsurface hydrology of Kingston to know whether groundwater from the site would drain into the ocean.

Water for the existing and proposed structure is supplied from a hilltop reservoir 290 metres north of the project area. There are no wells or bores at the project area; the nearest bore is within the walls of the Golf Club area, 60 metres to the east.

Permanent groundwater is expected to correspond closely to the sea levels in nearby Emily Bay/Slaughter Bay.

The Norfolk Island Water Quality and Sewerage Infrastructure Management Strategy 2014 suggests the alluvial soils in the Kingston lowlands are likely to have rapid vertical drainage, with less depth to unconfined water tables.

## 4. Impacts and mitigation

## 4.1 Impact details

**Potential Matters of National Environmental Significance (MNES) relevant to your proposed action area.**

<b>EPBC Act section</b>	<b>Controlling provision</b>	<b>Impacted</b>	<b>Reviewed</b>
S12	World Heritage	Yes	Yes
S15B	National Heritage	Yes	Yes
S16	Ramsar Wetland	No	Yes
S18	Threatened Species and Ecological Communities	No	Yes
S20	Migratory Species	No	Yes
S21	Nuclear	No	Yes
S23	Commonwealth Marine Area	No	Yes
S24B	Great Barrier Reef	No	Yes
S24D	Water resource in relation to large coal mining development or coal seam gas	No	Yes
S26	Commonwealth Land	Yes	Yes
S27B	Commonwealth Heritage Places Overseas	No	Yes
S28	Commonwealth or Commonwealth Agency	Yes	Yes

## 4.1.1 World Heritage

You have identified your proposed action will likely directly and/or indirectly impact the following protected matters.

A direct impact is a direct consequence of an action taken – for example, clearing of habitat for a threatened species or permanent shading on an ecological community as the result of installing solar panels.

An indirect impact is an 'indirect consequence' such as a downstream impact or a facilitated third-party action.

Direct impact	Indirect impact	World heritage
No	Yes	Australian Convict Sites - Kingston and Authurs Vale Historic Area

**4.1.1.1 Is the proposed action likely to have any direct and/or indirect impact on any of these protected matters? \***

Yes

**4.1.1.2 Briefly describe why your action has a direct and/or indirect impact on these protected matters. \***

The proposed action is located within Kingston and Arthurs Vale Historic Area (KAVHA) which is part of the Australian Convict Sites serial listing World Heritage site.

The existing Greenkeepers Shed was built in 1985. It is not a structure of heritage significance and is not a contributory attribute towards any of KAVHA's outstanding universal values or listed heritage values.

The proposed works will involve demolition, and construction works (including earthworks) within KAVHA, and thus will cause direct impacts to land within a World Heritage listed area.

**4.1.1.4 Do you consider this likely direct and/or indirect impact to be a Significant Impact?**

\*

No

**4.1.1.6 Describe why you do not consider this to be a Significant Impact. \***

The Department engaged Purcell Architecture Australia Pty Ltd to prepare a Statement of Heritage Impact for the action. Purcell has undertaken a self-assessment to determine if the Proposal is likely to have a significant impact on KAVHA's heritage values, including its Outstanding Universal Values as part of the convict sites serial listing.

In summary. Purcell is of the opinion that the Proposal would not result in the following and that significant impacts are therefore unlikely:

- permanently remove, destroy, damage, or substantially alter the fabric of a World / National Heritage place in a manner which is inconsistent with relevant values;
- extend, renovate, refurbish, or substantially alter a World Heritage property or National Heritage place in a manner which is inconsistent with relevant values;
- permanently remove, destroy, damage, or substantially disturb archaeological deposits or artefacts in a World Heritage property or National Heritage place;
- involve activities in a World Heritage property or National Heritage place with substantial and/or long-term impacts on its values;
- involve the construction of buildings or other structures within, adjacent to, or within important sight lines of, a World Heritage property or National Heritage place which are inconsistent with relevant values;
- make notable changes to the layout, spaces, form or species composition of a garden, landscape or setting of a World Heritage property or National Heritage place in a manner which is inconsistent with relevant values;
- restrict or inhibit the existing use of a World Heritage property or National Heritage place as a cultural or ceremonial site causing its values to notably diminish over time;
- permanently diminish the cultural value of a World Heritage property or National Heritage place for a community or group to which its values relate;
- permanently damage or obscure rock art or other cultural or ceremonial features with World Heritage values;
- remove, damage, or substantially disturb cultural artefacts, or ceremonial objects, in a World Heritage property;
- destroy or damage cultural or ceremonial, artefacts, features, or objects in a National Heritage place;
- notably diminish the value of a National Heritage place in demonstrating creative or technical achievement;
- alter the setting of a World Heritage property in a manner which is inconsistent with relevant values.

The KAVHA archaeologist has also undertaken a heritage impact assessment of the potential impacts of the proposed works on archaeological resources (attachment 3). It has been determined that, due to historical disturbances in the area of the existing and proposed structures, the proposed are unlikely to impact any archaeological deposits or subsurface features.

#### **4.1.1.7 Do you think your proposed action is a controlled action? \***

No

#### **4.1.1.9 Please elaborate why you do not think your proposed action is a controlled action.**

\*

The proposed works are entirely related to a structure of no heritage significance, which is not contributory to any of KAVHA's heritage values.

The works are limited in scope, comprising just the demolition of an existing structure and its replacement with a similar structure in the same place (but built to better specifications). Both the existing and proposed structures are battered into the slope south of Quality Row, and hidden from important views and vistas.

No change of use will result from the works.

**4.1.1.10 Please describe any avoidance or mitigation measures proposed for this action and attach any supporting documentation for these avoidance and mitigation measures. \***

Impacts from the proposed works have been avoided primarily through re-using the location of the existing structure. The project area was significantly impacted as a result of quarrying activities during the Second World War, and an archaeological impact assessment (appendix 3) suggests that it is very unlikely that any archaeological deposits remain.

All earthworks for the project will take place in areas that were previously impacted either in the 1940s or 1985, and it is unlikely that previously unknown archaeological deposits will be impacted as a result.

A single historical feature has been identified to the east of the proposed structure, and a buffered avoidance area has been placed around the feature to both identify it and ensure impacts are kept away from the significant portions.

The specified design and colours of the structure should enable it to blend into the surrounding landscape.

**4.1.1.11 Please describe any proposed offsets and attach any supporting documentation relevant to these measures. \***

A heritage impact statement is supplied in attachments

**4.1.2 National Heritage**

You have identified your proposed action will likely directly and/or indirectly impact the following protected matters.

A direct impact is a direct consequence of an action taken – for example, clearing of habitat for a threatened species or permanent shading on an ecological community as the result of installing solar panels.

An indirect impact is an 'indirect consequence' such as a downstream impact or a facilitated third-party action.

Direct impact	Indirect impact	National heritage
No	No	HMS Sirius Shipwreck
Yes	No	Kingston and Arthurs Vale Historic Area

**4.1.2.1 Is the proposed action likely to have any direct and/or indirect impact on any of these protected matters? \***

Yes

**4.1.2.2 Briefly describe why your action has a direct and/or indirect impact on these protected matters. \***

The Kingston and Arthurs Vale Historic Area was inscribed on the National Heritage List on 1 August 2007 as part of the inclusion of eight convict-related places in the National Heritage List (105962).

The existing Greenkeepers Shed was built in 1985. It is not a structure of heritage significance and is not a contributory attribute towards any of KAVHA's outstanding universal values or listed heritage values.

The proposed works will involve demolition, and construction works (including earthworks) within KAVHA, and thus will cause direct impacts to land within a National Heritage listed area.

**4.1.2.4 Do you consider this likely direct and/or indirect impact to be a Significant Impact?**

\*

No

**4.1.2.6 Describe why you do not consider this to be a Significant Impact. \***

The Department engaged Purcell Architecture Australia Pty Ltd to prepare a Statement of Heritage Impact for the action (see attachment 2). Purcell has undertaken a self-assessment to determine if the Proposal is likely to have a significant impact on the heritage values of the 'Kingston and Arthurs Vale Historic Area, Quality Row, Kingston' (Place ID 105962).

In summary. Purcell is of the opinion that the Proposal would not result in the following and that significant impacts are therefore unlikely:

- permanently remove, destroy, damage, or substantially alter the fabric of a World / National Heritage place in a manner which is inconsistent with relevant values;
- extend, renovate, refurbish, or substantially alter a World Heritage property or National Heritage place in a manner which is inconsistent with relevant values;
- permanently remove, destroy, damage, or substantially disturb archaeological deposits or artefacts in a World Heritage property or National Heritage place;
- involve activities in a World Heritage property or National Heritage place with substantial and/or long-term impacts on its values;
- involve the construction of buildings or other structures within, adjacent to, or within important sight lines of, a World Heritage property or National Heritage place which are inconsistent with relevant values;
- make notable changes to the layout, spaces, form or species composition of a garden, landscape or setting of a World Heritage property or National Heritage place in a manner which is inconsistent with relevant values;
- restrict or inhibit the existing use of a World Heritage property or National Heritage place as a cultural or ceremonial site causing its values to notably diminish over time;
- permanently diminish the cultural value of a World Heritage property or National Heritage place for a community or group to which its values relate;
- permanently damage or obscure rock art or other cultural or ceremonial features with World Heritage values;
- remove, damage, or substantially disturb cultural artefacts, or ceremonial objects, in a World Heritage property;
- destroy or damage cultural or ceremonial, artefacts, features, or objects in a National Heritage place;
- notably diminish the value of a National Heritage place in demonstrating creative or technical achievement;
- alter the setting of a World Heritage property in a manner which is inconsistent with relevant values.

The KAVHA archaeologist has also undertaken a heritage impact assessment of the potential impacts of the proposed works on archaeological resources (attachment 3). It has been determined that, due to historical disturbances in the area of the existing and proposed structures, the proposed are unlikely to impact any archaeological deposits or subsurface features.

#### **4.1.2.7 Do you think your proposed action is a controlled action? \***

No

#### **4.1.2.9 Please elaborate why you do not think your proposed action is a controlled action.**

\*

The proposed works are entirely related to a structure of no heritage significance, which is not contributory to any of KAVHA's heritage values.

The works are limited in scope, comprising just the demolition of an existing structure and its replacement with a similar structure in the same place (but built to better specifications). Both the existing and proposed structures are battered into the slope south of Quality Row, and hidden from important views and vistas.

No change of use will result from the works.

**4.1.2.10 Please describe any avoidance or mitigation measures proposed for this action and attach any supporting documentation for these avoidance and mitigation measures. \***

Impacts from the proposed works have been avoided primarily through re-using the location of the existing structure. The project area was significantly impacted as a result of quarrying activities during the Second World War, and an archaeological impact assessment (appendix 3) suggests that it is very unlikely that any archaeological deposits remain.

All earthworks for the project will take place in areas that were previously impacted either in the 1940s or 1985, and it is unlikely that previously unknown archaeological deposits will be impacted as a result.

A single historical feature has been identified to the east of the proposed structure, and a buffered avoidance area has been placed around the feature to both identify it and ensure impacts are kept away from the significant portions.

The specified design and colours of the structure should enable it to blend into the surrounding landscape.

**4.1.2.11 Please describe any proposed offsets and attach any supporting documentation relevant to these measures. \***

NIL Heritage Impact Assessment previously supplied in attachment section

**4.1.3 Ramsar Wetland**

You have identified your proposed action will likely directly and/or indirectly impact the following protected matters.

A direct impact is a direct consequence of an action taken – for example, clearing of habitat for a threatened species or permanent shading on an ecological community as the result of installing solar panels.

An indirect impact is an 'indirect consequence' such as a downstream impact or a facilitated third-party action.

—

**4.1.3.1 Is the proposed action likely to have any direct and/or indirect impact on any of these protected matters? \***

No

**4.1.3.3 Briefly describe why your action is unlikely to have a direct and/or indirect impact.**

\*

RAMSAR Wetland is not on Norfolk Island

**4.1.4 Threatened Species and Ecological Communities**

You have identified your proposed action will likely directly and/or indirectly impact the following protected matters.

A direct impact is a direct consequence of an action taken – for example, clearing of habitat for a threatened species or permanent shading on an ecological community as the result of installing solar panels.

An indirect impact is an 'indirect consequence' such as a downstream impact or a facilitated third-party action.

### Threatened species

Direct impact	Indirect impact	Species	Common name
Yes		<i>Abutilon julianae</i>	Norfolk Island Abutilon
Yes		<i>Achyranthes arborescens</i>	Chaff Tree, Soft-wood
Yes		<i>Advena campbellii</i>	Campbell's Keeled Glass-snail
Yes		<i>Advena grayi</i>	Gray's Glass-snail
Yes		<i>Advena suteri</i>	Suter's Striped Glass-snail
Yes		<i>Ardenna grisea</i>	Sooty Shearwater
Yes		<i>Balaenoptera borealis</i>	Sei Whale
Yes		<i>Balaenoptera musculus</i>	Blue Whale
Yes		<i>Balaenoptera physalus</i>	Fin Whale
Yes		<i>Blechnum norfolkianum</i>	Norfolk Island Water-fern
Yes		<i>Calidris acuminata</i>	Sharp-tailed Sandpiper
Yes		<i>Calidris canutus</i>	Red Knot, Knot
Yes		<i>Calystegia affinis</i>	
Yes		<i>Carcharodon carcharias</i>	White Shark, Great White Shark
Yes		<i>Caretta caretta</i>	Loggerhead Turtle
Yes		<i>Chelonia mydas</i>	Green Turtle
Yes		<i>Clematis dubia</i>	a creeper, Clematis
Yes		<i>Coprosma baueri</i>	Coastal Coprosma
Yes		<i>Cyanoramphus cookii</i>	Norfolk Island Green Parrot, Tasman Parakeet, Norfolk Island Parakeet
Yes		<i>Dermochelys coriacea</i>	Leatherback Turtle, Leathery Turtle, Luth
Yes		<i>Diomedea antipodensis</i>	Antipodean Albatross

<b>Direct impact</b>	<b>Indirect impact</b>	<b>Species</b>	<b>Common name</b>
Yes		<i>Diomedea antipodensis gibsoni</i>	Gibson's Albatross
Yes		<i>Diomedea epomophora</i>	Southern Royal Albatross
Yes		<i>Diomedea exulans</i>	Wandering Albatross
Yes		<i>Epinephelus daemeli</i>	Black Rockcod, Black Cod, Saddled Rockcod
Yes		<i>Eretmochelys imbricata</i>	Hawksbill Turtle
Yes		<i>Euphorbia norfolkiana</i>	Norfolk Island Euphorbia
Yes		<i>Euphorbia obliqua</i>	a herb
Yes		<i>Fregetta grallaria grallaria</i>	White-bellied Storm-Petrel (Tasman Sea), White-bellied Storm-Petrel (Australasian)
Yes		<i>Galeorhinus galeus</i>	School Shark, Eastern School Shark, Snapper Shark, Tope, Soupfin Shark
Yes		<i>Hoplostethus atlanticus</i>	Orange Roughy, Deep-sea Perch, Red Roughy
Yes		<i>Hypolepis dicksonioides</i>	Downy Ground-fern, Brake Fern, Ground Fern
Yes		<i>Limosa lapponica baueri</i>	Nunivak Bar-tailed Godwit, Western Alaskan Bar-tailed Godwit
Yes		<i>Macronectes giganteus</i>	Southern Giant-Petrel, Southern Giant Petrel
Yes		<i>Macronectes halli</i>	Northern Giant Petrel
Yes		<i>Melicope littoralis</i>	Shade Tree
Yes		<i>Melicytus latifolius</i>	Norfolk Island Mahoe
Yes		<i>Meryta angustifolia</i>	Narrow-leaved Meryta
Yes		<i>Meryta latifolia</i>	Shade Tree, Broad-leaved Meryta
Yes		<i>Muehlenbeckia australis</i>	Shrubby Creeper, Pohuehue
Yes		<i>Myoporum obscurum</i>	Popwood, Sandalwood
Yes		<i>Myrsine ralstoniae</i>	Beech
Yes		<i>Natator depressus</i>	Flatback Turtle
Yes		<i>Ninox novaeseelandiae undulata</i>	Norfolk Island Boobook, Norfolk Island Morepork, Southern Boobook (Norfolk Island)

<b>Direct impact</b>	<b>Indirect impact</b>	<b>Species</b>	<b>Common name</b>
Yes		<i>Numenius madagascariensis</i>	Eastern Curlew, Far Eastern Curlew
Yes		<i>Pachycephala pectoralis xanthoprocta</i>	Golden Whistler (Norfolk Island)
Yes		<i>Pennantia endlicheri</i>	Pennantia
Yes		<i>Petroica multicolor</i>	Norfolk Island Robin, Pacific Robin
Yes		<i>Pittosporum bracteolatum</i>	Oleander
Yes		<i>Plexaure limenophylax</i>	Norfolk Island Phreatia
Yes		<i>Pteris kingiana</i>	King's Brakefern
Yes		<i>Pteris zahlbruckneriana</i>	Netted Brakefern
Yes		<i>Pterodroma heraldica</i>	Herald Petrel
Yes		<i>Pterodroma leucoptera leucoptera</i>	Gould's Petrel, Australian Gould's Petrel
Yes		<i>Pterodroma neglecta neglecta</i>	Kermadec Petrel (western)
Yes		<i>Senecio australis</i>	a daisy
Yes		<i>Senecio evansianus</i>	a daisy
Yes		<i>Senecio hooglandii</i>	a daisy
Yes		<i>Sousa sahalensis</i>	Australian Humpback Dolphin
Yes		<i>Sphyrna lewini</i>	Scalloped Hammerhead
Yes		<i>Streblus pendulinus</i>	Siah's Backbone, Sia's Backbone, Isaac Wood
Yes		<i>Taeniophyllum norfolkianum</i>	Minute Orchid, Ribbon-root Orchid
Yes		<i>Thalassarche carteri</i>	Indian Yellow-nosed Albatross
Yes		<i>Thalassarche impavida</i>	Campbell Albatross, Campbell Black-browed Albatross
Yes		<i>Thalassarche melanophris</i>	Black-browed Albatross
Yes		<i>Thalassarche salvini</i>	Salvin's Albatross
Yes		<i>Thalassarche steadi</i>	White-capped Albatross
Yes		<i>Tmesipteris norfolkensis</i>	Hanging Fork-fern

Direct impact	Indirect impact	Species	Common name
Yes		<i>Ungeria floribunda</i>	Bastard Oak
Yes		<i>Wikstroemia australis</i>	Kurrajong
Yes		<i>Zehneria baueriana</i>	Native Cucumber, Giant Cucumber

## Ecological communities

—

**4.1.4.1 Is the proposed action likely to have any direct and/or indirect impact on any of these protected matters? \***

No

**4.1.4.3 Briefly describe why your action is unlikely to have a direct and/or indirect impact.**

\*

The project area or adjacent areas do not contain any threatened ecological communities or threatened species.

## 4.1.5 Migratory Species

You have identified your proposed action will likely directly and/or indirectly impact the following protected matters.

A direct impact is a direct consequence of an action taken – for example, clearing of habitat for a threatened species or permanent shading on an ecological community as the result of installing solar panels.

An indirect impact is an 'indirect consequence' such as a downstream impact or a facilitated third-party action.

<b>Direct impact</b>	<b>Indirect impact</b>	<b>Species</b>	<b>Common name</b>
Yes		<i>Actitis hypoleucos</i>	Common Sandpiper
Yes		<i>Anous stolidus</i>	Common Noddy
Yes		<i>Ardenna carneipes</i>	Flesh-footed Shearwater, Fleshy-footed Shearwater
Yes		<i>Ardenna grisea</i>	Sooty Shearwater
Yes		<i>Ardenna pacifica</i>	Wedge-tailed Shearwater
Yes		<i>Balaenoptera bonaerensis</i>	Antarctic Minke Whale, Dark-shoulder Minke Whale
Yes		<i>Balaenoptera borealis</i>	Sei Whale
Yes		<i>Balaenoptera edeni</i>	Bryde's Whale
Yes		<i>Balaenoptera musculus</i>	Blue Whale
Yes		<i>Balaenoptera physalus</i>	Fin Whale
Yes		<i>Calidris acuminata</i>	Sharp-tailed Sandpiper
Yes		<i>Calidris canutus</i>	Red Knot, Knot
Yes		<i>Calidris melanotos</i>	Pectoral Sandpiper
Yes		<i>Carcharhinus longimanus</i>	Oceanic Whitetip Shark
Yes		<i>Carcharodon carcharias</i>	White Shark, Great White Shark
Yes		<i>Caretta caretta</i>	Loggerhead Turtle
Yes		<i>Chelonia mydas</i>	Green Turtle
Yes		<i>Dermochelys coriacea</i>	Leatherback Turtle, Leathery Turtle, Luth
Yes		<i>Diomedea antipodensis</i>	Antipodean Albatross
Yes		<i>Diomedea epomophora</i>	Southern Royal Albatross
Yes		<i>Diomedea exulans</i>	Wandering Albatross
Yes		<i>Eretmochelys imbricata</i>	Hawksbill Turtle

<b>Direct impact</b>	<b>Indirect impact</b>	<b>Species</b>	<b>Common name</b>
Yes		<i>Fregata ariel</i>	Lesser Frigatebird, Least Frigatebird
Yes		<i>Fregata minor</i>	Great Frigatebird, Greater Frigatebird
Yes		<i>Lamna nasus</i>	Porbeagle, Mackerel Shark
Yes		<i>Limosa lapponica</i>	Bar-tailed Godwit
Yes		<i>Macronectes giganteus</i>	Southern Giant-Petrel, Southern Giant Petrel
Yes		<i>Macronectes halli</i>	Northern Giant Petrel
Yes		<i>Megaptera novaeangliae</i>	Humpback Whale
Yes		<i>Natator depressus</i>	Flatback Turtle
Yes		<i>Numenius madagascariensis</i>	Eastern Curlew, Far Eastern Curlew
Yes		<i>Orcinus orca</i>	Killer Whale, Orca
Yes		<i>Phaethon lepturus</i>	White-tailed Tropicbird
Yes		<i>Phaethon rubricauda</i>	Red-tailed Tropicbird
Yes		<i>Physeter macrocephalus</i>	Sperm Whale
Yes		<i>Sousa sahalensis</i>	Australian Humpback Dolphin
Yes		<i>Sula dactylatra</i>	Masked Booby
Yes		<i>Thalassarche carteri</i>	Indian Yellow-nosed Albatross
Yes		<i>Thalassarche impavida</i>	Campbell Albatross, Campbell Black-browed Albatross
Yes		<i>Thalassarche melanophris</i>	Black-browed Albatross
Yes		<i>Thalassarche salvini</i>	Salvin's Albatross
Yes		<i>Thalassarche steadi</i>	White-capped Albatross

**4.1.5.1 Is the proposed action likely to have any direct and/or indirect impact on any of these protected matters? \***

No

**4.1.5.3 Briefly describe why your action is unlikely to have a direct and/or indirect impact.**

\*

The proposed action is confined to a small construction area outside of any nesting areas for migratory species. The construction works involve the removal of existing building and construction of a replacement of building in a similar location.

#### **4.1.6 Nuclear**

##### **4.1.6.1 Is the proposed action likely to have any direct and/or indirect impact on this protected matter? \***

No

##### **4.1.6.3 Briefly describe why your action is unlikely to have a direct and/or indirect impact.**

\*

The area is a small construction area which is replacing an existing structure. any current impact such as chemical use will be improved with this project

#### **4.1.7 Commonwealth Marine Area**

You have identified your proposed action will likely directly and/or indirectly impact the following protected matters.

A direct impact is a direct consequence of an action taken – for example, clearing of habitat for a threatened species or permanent shading on an ecological community as the result of installing solar panels.

An indirect impact is an 'indirect consequence' such as a downstream impact or a facilitated third-party action.

—

##### **4.1.7.1 Is the proposed action likely to have any direct and/or indirect impact on any of these protected matters? \***

No

##### **4.1.7.3 Briefly describe why your action is unlikely to have a direct and/or indirect impact.**

\*

this project does not impact a marine area

#### **4.1.8 Great Barrier Reef**

**4.1.8.1 Is the proposed action likely to have any direct and/or indirect impact on this protected matter? \***

No

**4.1.8.3 Briefly describe why your action is unlikely to have a direct and/or indirect impact.**

\*

this project is on Norfolk Island

**4.1.9 Water resource in relation to large coal mining development or coal seam gas**

**4.1.9.1 Is the proposed action likely to have any direct and/or indirect impact on this protected matter? \***

No

**4.1.9.3 Briefly describe why your action is unlikely to have a direct and/or indirect impact.**

\*

not in the vicinity - no impact

**4.1.10 Commonwealth Land**

You have identified your proposed action will likely directly and/or indirectly impact the following protected matters.

A direct impact is a direct consequence of an action taken – for example, clearing of habitat for a threatened species or permanent shading on an ecological community as the result of installing solar panels.

An indirect impact is an 'indirect consequence' such as a downstream impact or a facilitated third-party action.

—

**4.1.10.1 Is the proposed action likely to have any direct and/or indirect impact on any of these protected matters? \***

Yes

**4.1.10.2 Briefly describe why your action has a direct and/or indirect impact on these protected matters. \***

The proposed development is located on Commonwealth Land therefore the works may have an direct or indirect impact to the Commonwealth land.

The proposed works will involve demolition and construction works (including earthworks) on Commonwealth land, and thus will cause direct impacts to such land.

**4.1.10.4 Do you consider this likely direct and/or indirect impact to be a Significant Impact? \***

No

**4.1.10.6 Describe why you do not consider this to be a Significant Impact. \***

The Department engaged Purcell Architecture Australia Pty Ltd to prepare a Statement of Heritage Impact for the action (See attachment 2). Purcell has undertaken a self-assessment to determine if the Proposal is likely to have a significant impact on KAVHA's heritage values, including its Outstanding Universal Values as part of the convict sites serial listing.

In summary. Purcell is of the opinion that the Proposal would not result in the following and that significant impacts are therefore unlikely:

- permanently remove, destroy, damage, or substantially alter the fabric of a World / National Heritage place in a manner which is inconsistent with relevant values;
- extend, renovate, refurbish, or substantially alter a World Heritage property or National Heritage place in a manner which is inconsistent with relevant values;
- permanently remove, destroy, damage, or substantially disturb archaeological deposits or artefacts in a World Heritage property or National Heritage place;
- involve activities in a World Heritage property or National Heritage place with substantial and/or long-term impacts on its values;
- involve the construction of buildings or other structures within, adjacent to, or within important sight lines of, a World Heritage property or National Heritage place which are inconsistent with relevant values;
- make notable changes to the layout, spaces, form or species composition of a garden, landscape or setting of a World Heritage property or National Heritage place in a manner which is inconsistent with relevant values;
- restrict or inhibit the existing use of a World Heritage property or National Heritage place as a cultural or ceremonial site causing its values to notably diminish over time;
- permanently diminish the cultural value of a World Heritage property or National Heritage place for a community or group to which its values relate;
- permanently damage or obscure rock art or other cultural or ceremonial features with World Heritage values;
- remove, damage, or substantially disturb cultural artefacts, or ceremonial objects, in a World Heritage property;
- destroy or damage cultural or ceremonial, artefacts, features, or objects in a National Heritage place;
- notably diminish the value of a National Heritage place in demonstrating creative or technical achievement;
- alter the setting of a World Heritage property in a manner which is inconsistent with relevant values.

The KAVHA archaeologist has also undertaken a heritage impact assessment of the potential impacts of the proposed works on archaeological resources (attachment 3). It has been determined that, due to historical disturbances in the area of the existing and proposed structures, the proposed are unlikely to impact any archaeological deposits or subsurface features.

**4.1.10.7 Do you think your proposed action is a controlled action? \***

No

**4.1.10.9 Please elaborate why you do not think your proposed action is a controlled action. \***

Impacts from the proposed works have been avoided primarily through re-using the location of the existing structure. The project area was significantly impacted as a result of quarrying activities during the Second World War, and an archaeological impact assessment (appendix 3) suggests that it is very unlikely that any archaeological deposits remain.

All earthworks for the project will take place in areas that were previously impacted either in the 1940s or 1985, and it is unlikely that previously unknown archaeological deposits will be impacted as a result.

A single historical feature has been identified to the east of the proposed structure, and a buffered avoidance area has been placed around the feature to both identify it and ensure impacts are kept away from the significant portions.

The specified design and colours of the structure should enable it to blend into the surrounding landscape.

**4.1.10.10 Please describe any avoidance or mitigation measures proposed for this action and attach any supporting documentation for these avoidance and mitigation measures. \***

Impacts from the proposed works have been avoided primarily through re-using the location of the existing structure. The project area was significantly impacted as a result of quarrying activities during the Second World War, and an archaeological impact assessment (appendix 3) suggests that it is very unlikely that any archaeological deposits remain.

All earthworks for the project will take place in areas that were previously impacted either in the 1940s or 1985, and it is unlikely that previously unknown archaeological deposits will be impacted as a result.

A single historical feature has been identified to the east of the proposed structure, and a buffered avoidance area has been placed around the feature to both identify it and ensure impacts are kept away from the significant portions.

The specified design and colours of the structure should enable it to blend into the surrounding landscape.

**4.1.10.11 Please describe any proposed offsets and attach any supporting documentation relevant to these measures. \***

No offsets does not apply

**4.1.11 Commonwealth Heritage Places Overseas**

You have identified your proposed action will likely directly and/or indirectly impact the following protected matters.

A direct impact is a direct consequence of an action taken – for example, clearing of habitat for a threatened species or permanent shading on an ecological community as the result of installing solar panels.

An indirect impact is an 'indirect consequence' such as a downstream impact or a facilitated third-party action.

—

**4.1.11.1 Is the proposed action likely to have any direct and/or indirect impact on any of these protected matters? \***

No

**4.1.11.3 Briefly describe why your action is unlikely to have a direct and/or indirect impact.**

\*

this Commonwealth Heritage place is on Norfolk island

**4.1.12 Commonwealth or Commonwealth Agency**

**4.1.12.1 Is the proposed action to be taken by the Commonwealth or a Commonwealth Agency? \***

Yes

**4.1.12.2 Briefly describe the nature and extent of the likely impact on the whole of the environment. \***

The proposed development will be delivered by the Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development, Communications, Sport and the Arts.

The existing Greenkeepers Shed was built in 1985. It is not a structure of heritage significance and is not a contributory attribute towards any of KAVHA's outstanding universal values or listed heritage values.

1. The proposed works will involve demolition and construction works (including earthworks) within KAVHA, and thus will cause direct impacts to land on the World Heritage, National Heritage and Commonwealth Heritage lists.
2. The impacts from the proposed action will be wholly limited to an area of 315m<sup>2</sup>. This area has already been heavily disturbed by impacts from the 1940s and 1985. An assessment by the KAVHA archaeologist suggests that it is unlikely that the proposed works will cause any impacts to unknown archaeological resources.

## 4.2 Impact summary

### Conclusion on the likelihood of significant impacts

You have indicated that the proposed action will likely have a significant impact on the following Matters of National Environmental Significance:

*None*

### Conclusion on the likelihood of unlikely significant impacts

You have indicated that the proposed action will unlikely have a significant impact on the following Matters of National Environmental Significance:

- World Heritage (S12)
- National Heritage (S15B)
- Ramsar Wetland (S16)
- Threatened Species and Ecological Communities (S18)
- Migratory Species (S20)
- Nuclear (S21)
- Commonwealth Marine Area (S23)
- Great Barrier Reef (S24B)
- Water resource in relation to large coal mining development or coal seam gas (S24D)
- Commonwealth Land (S26)
- Commonwealth Heritage Places Overseas (S27B)
- Commonwealth or Commonwealth Agency (S28)

## 4.3 Alternatives

### 4.3.1 Do you have any possible alternatives for your proposed action to be considered as part of your referral? \*

No

### 4.3.8 Describe why alternatives for your proposed action were not possible. \*

The existing Greenkeepers Shed has been condemned by a structural engineer as it poses a serious risk to safety for anyone that enters it. The poor construction method used to build the shed in 1985 has rendered it impossible to repair; demolition and replacement is the only possible remediation for the building.

There is no alternative storage area for the materials and equipment for the use of the Norfolk Island Golf Club. Most critically, there is no secure storage facility in which the golf club can store the necessary chemicals required for proper maintenance of the grounds.

Development restrictions in KAVHA prohibit the erection of entirely new structures in the vicinity of the golf course, but do not prohibit replacement of a dangerous building with a safe replacement. Re-use of the existing structure's site also means that the impacts from construction are minimised to areas that have already been highly disturbed.

## 5. Lodgement

## 5.1 Attachments

### 1.2.1 Overview of the proposed action

	Type	Name	Date	Sensitivity	Confidence
#1.	Document	Attachment 1 - Condemning of Building.pdf Structural Engineer's assessment of condition of existing building	20/06/2024	No	High
#2.	Document	Attachment 2 - Statement of Heritage Impact.pdf Statement of Heritage Impact - Greenkeepers Shed - Purcell	06/10/2024	No	High
#3.	Document	Attachment 3 - Sapienza 2025 Greenkeeper's shed HIA.pdf Archeological Heritage Impact Assessment - Greenkeepers Shed, Sapienza	10/04/2025	No	High
#4.	Document	Attachment 4 - location&BoundaryMapKAVHA.pdf Indicative location of Greenkeepers Shed within National Heritage Listed Plan	22/03/2025	No	High
#5.	Document	Attachment 5 - referral 01 general works location.jpg Proposed works area over aerial view of the site	05/11/2025	No	High
#6.	Document	Attachment 6 - referral 02 size of structure.jpg Measurements of proposed project over aerial image	05/11/2025	No	High
#7.	Document	Attachment 7 - referral 03 all impact areas.jpg Project footprint including disturbance area during construction	05/11/2025	No	High
#8.	Document	Attachment 8 - Design Drawing Proposed Greenkeepers Shed.pdf Design Drawings - Replacement of Greenkeepers Shed, Norfolk Island	29/04/2025	No	High

## 5.2 Declarations

---

## ✔ Completed Referring party's declaration

The Referring party is the person preparing the information in this referral.

---

ABN/ACN	86267354017
Organisation name	DEPARTMENT OF INFRASTRUCTURE, TRANSPORT, REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT, COMMUNICATIONS, SPORT AND THE ARTS
Organisation address	GPO Box 594, Canberra, ACT 2601
Representative's name	Heather Bruce
Representative's job title	KAVHA Secretariat and Governance Coordinator
Phone	006723 23315
Email	heather.bruce@infrastructure.gov.au
Address	New Military Barracks, Quality Row, Norfolk Island

Check this box to indicate you have read the referral form. \*

Check this box to confirm these are the correct identification details. \*

By checking this box, I, **Heather Bruce of DEPARTMENT OF INFRASTRUCTURE, TRANSPORT, REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT, COMMUNICATIONS, SPORT AND THE ARTS**, declare that to the best of my knowledge the information I have given on, or attached to this EPBC Act Referral is complete, current and correct. I understand that giving false or misleading information is a serious offence. \*

You may receive automated notifications that aim to assist you in tracking the progress of your project. You can opt out of these notifications by updating your communication preferences on your profile.

---

## ✔ Completed Person proposing to take the action's declaration

The Person proposing to take the action is the individual, business, government agency or trustee that will be responsible for the proposed action.

---

ABN/ACN	86267354017
Organisation name	DEPARTMENT OF INFRASTRUCTURE, TRANSPORT, REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT, COMMUNICATIONS, SPORT AND THE ARTS

Organisation address	GPO 594, Canberra, 2601 ACT
Representative's name	Allison Rossetto
Representative's job title	Director Norfolk Island Operations Territories Division DITRDCA
Phone	0011672350724
Email	Allison.Rossetto@infrastructure.gov.au
Address	PO Box 201, Norfolk Island 2899

Check this box to indicate you have read the referral form. \*

Check this box to confirm these are the correct identification details. \*

I, **Allison Rossetto of DEPARTMENT OF INFRASTRUCTURE, TRANSPORT, REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT, COMMUNICATIONS, SPORT AND THE ARTS**, declare that to the best of my knowledge the information I have given on, or attached to the EPBC Act Referral is complete, current and correct. I understand that giving false or misleading information is a serious offence. I declare that I am not taking the action on behalf or for the benefit of any other person or entity. \*

You may receive automated notifications that aim to assist you in tracking the progress of your project. You can opt out of these notifications by updating your communication preferences on your profile.

---

## Completed Proposed designated proponent's declaration

The Proposed designated proponent is the individual or organisation proposed to be responsible for meeting the requirements of the EPBC Act during the assessment process, if the Minister decides that this project is a controlled action.

---

ABN/ACN	86267354017
Organisation name	DEPARTMENT OF INFRASTRUCTURE, TRANSPORT, REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT, COMMUNICATIONS, SPORT AND THE ARTS
Organisation address	2601 ACT
Representative's name	Allison Rossetto
Representative's job title	Director Norfolk Island Operations Territories Division DITRDCA
Phone	0011672350724
Email	allison.rossetto@infrastructure.gov.au

Address

PO Box 201, Norfolk Island 2899

- Check this box to indicate you have read the referral form. \*
- Check this box to confirm these are the correct identification details. \*
- I, **Allison Rossetto of DEPARTMENT OF INFRASTRUCTURE, TRANSPORT, REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT, COMMUNICATIONS, SPORT AND THE ARTS**, the Proposed designated proponent, consent to the designation of myself as the Proposed designated proponent for the purposes of the action described in this EPBC Act Referral. \*

You may receive automated notifications that aim to assist you in tracking the progress of your project. You can opt out of these notifications by updating your communication preferences on your profile.