

CLEARING PERMIT

Granted under section 51E of the Environmental Protection Act 1986

PERMIT DETAILS

| Area Permit Number: | CPS 10422/1 |
|---------------------|-------------------------------|
| File Number: | DWERVT14068 |
| Duration of Permit: | From 24/07/2025 to 24/07/2032 |

PERMIT HOLDER

Kent Crane

LAND ON WHICH CLEARING IS TO BE DONE

Lot 2280 on Deposited Plan 203064, Osmington

AUTHORISED ACTIVITY

The permit holder must not clear more than 0.27 hectares of *native vegetation* within the area cross-hatched yellow in Figure 1 of Schedule 1.

CONDITIONS

1. Period during which clearing is authorised

The permit holder must not clear any *native vegetation* after 24 July 2027.

2. Avoid, minimise, and reduce impacts and extent of clearing

In determining the *native vegetation* authorised to be cleared under this permit, the permit holder must apply the following principles, set out in descending order of preference:

- (a) avoid the clearing of *native vegetation*;
- (b) minimise the amount of *native vegetation* to be cleared; and
- (c) reduce the impact of clearing on any environmental value.

3. Weed and dieback management

When undertaking any *clearing* authorised under this permit, the permit holder must take the following measures to minimise the risk of introduction and spread of *weeds* and *dieback*:

(a) clean earth-moving machinery of soil and vegetation prior to entering and leaving the area to be cleared;

- (b) ensure that no known *dieback* or *weed*-affected soil, *mulch*, *fill*, or other material is brought into the area to be cleared; and
- (c) restrict the movement of machines and other vehicles to the limits of the areas to be cleared.

4. Rehabilitation – Mitigation planting

Within 12 months of the commencement of *clearing* authorised under this permit, and no later than 24 July 2028, the permit holder must:

- (a) undertake deliberate *planting* of at least fifteen (15) *Corymbia calophylla* (marri) trees within the areas cross-hatched red in Figure 2 of Schedule 1.
- (b) In undertaking the *planting* required under condition 4(a) of this permit, the permit holder must:
 - (i) ensure only *local provenance* seeds and propagating material is used;
 - (ii) undertake *planting* at an *optimal time*;
 - (iii) undertake *weed* control activities and watering of *plantings* for at least three years post *planting*;
 - (iv) ensure marri trees are not *planted* within five (5) metres of fence line infrastructure.
- (c) Within 24 months of *planting* the 15 marri trees in accordance with condition 4(a) of this permit, the permit holder must engage an *environmental specialist* to make a determination as to whether the 15 marri trees will survive.
- (d) If the determination made by the *environmental specialist* under condition 5(c) is that less than 15 marri trees will survive, the permit holder must undertake additional *planting* that will result in a total of 15 marri trees persisting within the areas cross-hatched red in Figure 2 of Schedule 1.
- (e) Where additional *planting* of marri trees is undertaken in accordance with condition 4(d), the permit holder must repeat the activities required by condition 4(a), 4(b) and 4(c) of this permit.

5. Records that must be kept

The permit holder must maintain records relating to the listed relevant matters in accordance with the specifications detailed in Table 1.

| No. | Relevant matter | Specifications | | | | |
|-----|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 1. | In relation to the authorised <i>clearing</i> activities generally | (a) the species composition, structure, and density of the cleared area; (b) the location where the clearing occurred, recorded using a Global Positioning System (GPS) unit set to GDA2020, expressing the | | | | |

| Table | 1: | Records | that | must | be | kept |
|-------|----|---------|------|------|----|------|
|-------|----|---------|------|------|----|------|

OFFICIAL

| No. | Relevant matter | Specifications | | | |
|-----------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------|---|--|--|
| | | | geographical coordinates in Eastings and Northings; | | |
| | | (c) | the date that the area was cleared; | | |
| | | | the size of the area cleared (in hectares); | | |
| | | (e) | actions taken to avoid, minimise, and reduce the impacts and extent of clearing in accordance with condition 2; and | | |
| | | (f) | actions taken to minimise the risk of the introduction and spread of <i>weeds</i> and <i>dieback</i> in accordance with condition 3. | | |
| 2. | 2. In relation to <i>planting</i> | | the date(s) on which <i>planting</i> was undertaken; | | |
| pursuant to condition | | (b) | the locations of the trees <i>planted</i> , recorded using a Global Positioning System (GPS) unit set to Geocentric Datum Australia 2020 (GDA 2020), expressing the geographical coordinates in Eastings and Northings; | | |
| | | (c) | a description of the <i>planting</i> activities undertaken, including actions taken to implement <i>weed</i> control and watering; | | |
| | | (d) | a copy of the <i>environmental specialist's</i> monitoring report and determination; and | | |
| | | (e) | a description of any remedial actions undertaken pursuant to conditions 4(c), 4(d) and 4(e), where the <i>environmental specialist</i> indicated that <i>planted</i> trees will not survive. | | |

6. Reporting

The permit holder must provide to the *CEO* the records required under condition 5 of this permit when requested by the *CEO*.

DEFINITIONS

In this permit, the terms in Table have the meanings defined.

| Term | Definition | | |
|----------|--|--|--|
| CEO | Chief Executive Officer of the department responsible for the administration of the clearing provisions under the <i>Environmental Protection Act 1986</i> . | | |
| clearing | has the meaning given under section 3(1) of the EP Act. | | |

Table 2: Definitions

| Term | Definition | | | |
|-----------------------------|---|--|--|--|
| condition | a condition to which this clearing permit is subject under section 51H of the EP Act. | | | |
| department | means the department established under section 35 of the <i>Public Sector</i> <i>Management Act 1994</i> (WA) and designated as responsible for the administration of the EP Act, which includes Part V Division 3. | | | |
| dieback | means the effect of Phytophthora species on native vegetation. | | | |
| environmental specialist | means a person who holds a tertiary qualification in environmental science or equivalent, and has a minimum of 2 years work experience relevant to the type of environmental advice that an environmental specialist is required to provide under this permit, or who is approved by the CEO as a suitable environmental specialist. | | | |
| EP Act | Environmental Protection Act 1986 (WA) | | | |
| fill | means material used to increase the ground level, or to fill a depression. | | | |
| local provenance | means native vegetation seeds and propagating material from natural sources within 50 kilometres and the same IBRA subregion of the area cleared. | | | |
| mulch | means the use of organic matter, wood chips or rocks to slow the movement of water across the soil surface and to reduce evaporation. | | | |
| native vegetation | has the meaning given under section $3(1)$ and section $51A$ of the EP Act. | | | |
| optimal time | means the period from May to July for undertaking planting or seeding. | | | |
| planting | means the re-establishment of vegetation by creating favourable soil conditions and establishing seedlings of the desired species. | | | |
| | means any plant – | | | |
| weeds | (a) that is a declared pest under section 22 of the <i>Biosecurity and</i> <i>Agriculture Management Act 2007</i>; or (b) published in a Department of Biodiversity, Conservation and Attractions species-led ecological impact and invasiveness ranking summary, regardless of ranking; or (c) not indigenous to the area concerned. | | | |

END OF CONDITIONS

Roberts 305 U

C Robertson 3.50PM 30.06.2025

Caron Robertson Manager NATIVE VEGETATION REGULATION

Officer delegated under Section 20 of the Environmental Protection Act 1986

30 June 2025

CPS 10422/1, 30 June 2025

SCHEDULE 1



Figure 1: Map of the boundary of the area within which clearing may occur (cross-hatched yellow)

OFFICIAL





CPS 10422/1, 30 June 2025

Page 6 of 6



Clearing Permit Decision Report

| 1 Application details and outcome | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| 1.1. Permit application | 1.1. Permit application details | | | | |
| Permit number: | CPS 10422/1 | | | | |
| Permit type: | Area permit | | | | |
| Applicant name: | Kent Crane | | | | |
| Application received: | 20 November 2023 | | | | |
| Application area: | 0.27 hectares of native vegetation | | | | |
| Purpose of clearing: | Upgrading an existing dam | | | | |
| Method of clearing: | Mechanical | | | | |
| Property: | Lot 2280 on Deposited Plan 203064 | | | | |
| Location (LGA area/s): | Shire of Augusta Margaret River | | | | |
| Localities (suburb/s): | Osmington | | | | |

1.2. Description of clearing activities

The vegetation proposed to be cleared surrounds an existing dam (see Figure 1, Section 1.5). The application is to upgrade the existing dam to provide a consistent water supply to the property. The existing dam has compromised structural integrity and does not hold stored water (SW Hydrology, 2024). The proposed works will "stabilise the dam by re-coring the wall downstream of the existing wall and constructing a stable spillway" (SW Hydrology, 2024).

The extent of proposed clearing includes vegetation likely to be impacted by inundation up to the defined maximum flood disturbance boundary based on detailed dam designs (SW Hydrology, 2024).

1.3. Decision on application

| Decision: | Granted |
|----------------|--|
| Decision date: | 30 June 2025 |
| Decision area: | 0.27 hectares of native vegetation, as depicted in Section 1.5, below. |

1.4. Reasons for decision

This clearing permit application was submitted, accepted, assessed and determined in accordance with sections 51E and 51O of the *Environmental Protection Act 1986* (EP Act). The Department of Water and Environmental Regulation (DWER) advertised the application for 21 days and no submissions were received.

In making this decision, the Delegated Officer had regard for:

- the site characteristics (see Appendix A),
- the clearing principles set out in Schedule 5 of the EP Act (see Appendix B),
- relevant datasets (see Appendix D.1.),
- the findings of flora and fauna surveys (NSA, 2024; NSA, 2025),
- the hydrology report and detailed dam designs (SW Hydrology, 2024),
- relevant planning instruments and any other matters considered relevant to the assessment (see Section 3.3).

The Delegated Officer also took into consideration the proposed clearing is to upgrade an existing dam to maintain a reliable water supply at the property.

The assessment identified the proposed clearing will result in:

- the loss of native vegetation that is suitable foraging habitat for Zanda latirostris (Carnaby's cockatoo), Zanda baudinii (Baudin's cockatoo) and Calyptorhynchus banksia naso (forest red-tailed black cockatoo),
- the potential introduction and spread of weeds into adjacent vegetation, which could impact on the quality of the adjacent vegetation and its habitat values; and
- potential short-term deterioration of surface water quality through erosion and sedimentation.

After consideration of the available information, as well as the applicant's minimisation and mitigation measures (see Section 3.1), the Delegated Officer determined impacts to the above environmental values can be appropriately managed through conditions on the clearing permit.

The Delegated Officer considered the extent of environmental impact, the necessity of clearing, and the applicant's adherence to the mitigation hierarchy, and determined it was appropriate to grant a clearing permit subject to conditions requiring the applicant to:

- undertake avoid and minimise measures to reduce the impacts and extent of clearing,
- take hygiene steps to minimise the risk of the introduction and spread of weeds and dieback,
- undertake mitigation planting of 15 *Corymbia calophylla* (marri) trees in Lot 2280 on Deposited Plan 203064, Osmington.

The Delegated Officer has consideration for mitigation measures imposed by other decision making authorities specifically the management of water erosion and sedimentation through planning approvals.



The areas crosshatched yellow indicate the areas authorised to be cleared under the granted clearing permit.



Figure 2 Map of the mitigation planting area

The areas crosshatched red indicate the areas where mitigation planting is to be undertaken.

2 Legislative context

The clearing of native vegetation in Western Australia is regulated under the EP Act and the *Environmental Protection* (*Clearing of Native Vegetation*) Regulations 2004 (Clearing Regulations).

In addition to the matters considered in accordance with section 510 of the EP Act (see Section 1.4), the Delegated Officer has also had regard to the objects and principles under section 4A of the EP Act, particularly:

- the precautionary principle
- the principle of intergenerational equity
- the polluter pays principle
- the principle of the conservation of biological diversity and ecological integrity

Other legislation of relevance for this assessment include:

- Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016 (WA) (BC Act)
- Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 (Cth) (EPBC Act)
- Planning and Development Act 2005 (WA) (P&D Act)
- Rights in Water and Irrigation Act 1914 (WA) (RIWI Act)

The key guidance documents which inform this assessment are:

- A guide to the assessment of applications to clear native vegetation (DER, December 2013)
- Procedure: Native vegetation clearing permits (DWER, October 2019)
- Environmental Offsets Guidelines (August 2014)
- Technical guidance Flora and Vegetation Surveys for Environmental Impact Assessment (EPA, 2016)
- Technical guidance Terrestrial Vertebrate Fauna Surveys for Environmental Impact Assessment (EPA, 2020)

3 Detailed assessment of application

3.1. Avoidance and mitigation measures

The applicant revised the application area during the clearing permit assessment. The original application proposed to clear 0.62 hectares of native vegetation (see Figure 3, below). The applicant reduced this to the proposed clearing of 0.27 hectares of native vegetation (see Figure 1, Section 1.5). The revised application area was informed by detailed dam designs (SW Hydrology, 2024) and includes the areas of native vegetation likely to be impacted by inundation up to the defined maximum flood disturbance boundary.





The assessment identified the proposed clearing will result in the loss of 5 native trees that provide suitable foraging habitat for black cockatoos (see Section 3.2.1). The applicant committed to mitigate this impact through local revegetation planting (Crane, 2025b).

The applicant will plant 15 (fifteen) *Corymbia calophylla* (marri) trees in Lot 2280 on Deposited Plan 203064, Osmington, 300 metres from the application area (see Figure 2, Section 1.5). The planting will be undertaken in areas of bare ground. The proposed revegetation planting will provide foraging habitat for black cockatoos local to the impact site and improve the vegetation buffer of a patch of remnant native vegetation.



Figure 4. Rehabilitation planting area (cross-hatched red) in context of the authorised clearing area (cross-hatched yellow).

The adequacy of the proposed revegetation was assessed for consistency with the WA Environmental Offsets Calculator. The clearing permit contains conditions that require contingency measures for the proposed revegetation planting. Additionally, trees will not be planted within 5 metres of fence line infrastructure. This will allow maintenance of a suitable clearance area from the fence line while supporting canopy growth.

The Delegated Officer is satisfied the applicant has made a reasonable effort to avoid and minimise potential impacts of the proposed clearing on environmental values. The Delegated Officer determined the proposed revegetation appropriately mitigates significant impacts in accordance with the mitigation hierarchy to the extent that significant residual impacts do not remain and an offset is not required.

3.2. Assessment of impacts on environmental values

In assessing the application, the Delegated Officer has had regard for the site characteristics (see Appendix A) and the extent to which the impacts of the proposed clearing present a risk to biological, conservation, or land and water resource values.

The assessment against the clearing principles (see Appendix B) identified the impacts of the proposed clearing present a risk to biological values (fauna, flora) and water resources. The consideration of these impacts, and the extent to which they can be managed through conditions applied in line with sections 51H and 51I of the EP Act, is set out below.

3.2.1. Biological values (fauna) - Clearing Principles (a) and (b)

Assessment

The flora and fauna surveys (NSA, 2024; NSA, 2025) identified the application area is in Completely Degraded (Keighery, 1994) condition and consists of:

- Taxandria linearifolia shrubland over weeds,
- Corymbia calophylla (marri) open woodland over sedgeland and shrubland.

The desktop assessment identified 25 conservation significant fauna species recorded in the local area (10-kilometre radius from the centre of the application area). In determining the likelihood of each species occurring in the application area, the following was considered:

- the preferred habitat and vegetation types of the species,
- their recorded proximity to the application, and
- date of record (see Appendix A.3).

The likelihood analysis identified eight conservation significant fauna species which may occur in the application area (see Appendix A.3.). Of these, four species were considered likely to occur: *Pseudocheirus occidentalis* (western ringtail possum; CR), *Zanda latirostris* (Carnaby's cockatoo; EN), *Zanda baudinii* (Baudin's cockatoo; EN), and *Calyptorhynchus banksii naso* (forest red-tailed black cockatoo; VU).

The northeastern part of the application area is not proposed to be cleared directly, however may be cleared indirectly through flooding. See Section 3.2.2 for further details.

Western ringtail possum (WRP)

WRP are known to forage on myrtaceous species (including marri), use tree hollows as daytime resting sites and rely on canopy connectivity to avoid predation (DPAW, 2017). The application area is near the Swan Coastal Plain management zone, where critical habitat for WRP includes habitat connecting patches of remnant vegetation (DPAW, 2017).

No WRP dreys were identified in the application area during the flora and fauna surveys (NSA, 2024; NSA, 2025). The northeastern part of the application area contains five marri trees which may provide suitable foraging habitat for WRP. The southeastern part of the application area comprises Taxandria shrubland and non-native trees. This area does not provide suitable habitat for WRP. Given the extent of suitable foraging habitat surrounding the application area, the proposed clearing is unlikely to significantly impact availability of WRP foraging habitat locally.

The WRP habitat in the application area is separated from vegetation to the northeast by cleared paddock and to the southwest by the existing dam. The proposed clearing will increase the existing gap in habitat linkage to a small extent. Give the minimal suitable habitat present in the application area, and that linkage between larger remnant patches of native vegetation surrounding the application area will remain intact, the proposed clearing is unlikely to significantly impact WRP movement through the landscape.

Black cockatoos

The application area is in the known distribution of Carnaby's cockatoo, Baudin's cockatoo, and forest red-tailed black cockatoo (referred to as black cockatoos). According to available databases, the closest recorded confirmed breeding site is located about 10 kilometres from the application area. There are six known roost sites in the local area, the closest is about 5 kilometres from the application area.

The referral guideline for threatened black cockatoo specifies that habitat critical for the recovery of black cockatoos includes foraging habitat (including remnant patches of vegetation), night roosting habitat and nesting trees for breeding (DAWE, 2022). Suitable breeding habitat for black cockatoos includes trees with a suitable nest hollow or of a suitable diameter at breast height (DBH) to develop a nest hollow (DAWE, 2022). Night roosting sites are often located near food and water resources.

Based on the flora and fauna surveys (NSA, 2024; NSA, 2025), the application area contains five marri trees which provide suitable foraging habitat for black cockatoos. Black cockatoos are visible in photographs provided of the application area (Crane, 2023). No hollows were identified in the application area during the flora and fauna surveys (NSA, 2024; NSA 2025). Given the distance to nearby water sources, the trees proposed to be cleared may provide suitable roosting habitat for black cockatoos.

Given the distance to known black cockatoo breeding sites, the application area is considered to provide significant foraging habitat for black cockatoos within a fragmented landscape.

Margaret River burrowing crayfish

The Margaret River burrowing crayfish is associated with densely vegetated areas and deep moist soils (DEWHA, 2009; Burnham, 2014). The species has extremely limited dispersal capacity (DEWHA, 2009). The Margaret River burrowing crayfish is sensitive to disturbance from hydrological changes (Burnham, 2014). Key threats to this species include dam construction and altered hydrology impacting suitable habitat (DEWHA, 2009).

The application area has been subject to hydrological disturbance from the existing dam and historical impacts from cattle access. Given this, the hydrology of the site has already been subject to significant disturbance. Based on the above, the condition of the vegetation in the application area and the extent of clearing proposed, the Margaret River burrowing crayfish is unlikely to be present in the application area.

Other fauna

Other fauna which may be transient visitors to the application area are listed in Appendix A.3. Given the extent of clearing proposed, the degraded condition of the vegetation in the application area, and the extent of surrounding remnant vegetation, the application area is not likely to provide habitat features critical to the continuance of conservation significant fauna locally.

Ecological linkage

The application area is near the mapped South West Regional Ecological Linkage (SWREL; Molloy et al., 2009). The application area is part of a linear corridor of native vegetation which connects the SWREL to surrounding patches of remnant vegetation. The application area is part of a stepping stone connection of remnant vegetation in a fragmented landscape.

The proposed clearing will increase the gap in vegetation cover caused by the existing dam. However, the linkage between the SWREL and surrounding remnant patches of native vegetation will not be severed, given the existing vegetated corridors around the property. Given this, and the extent of clearing proposed, it is considered unlikely the proposed clearing will significantly alter the functioning of the SWREL.

Conclusion

Based on the above assessment, the application area provides significant foraging habitat for black cockatoos. Revegetation planting of 15 (fifteen) *Corymbia calophylla* (marri) trees near the application area is sufficient to counterbalance the impact of clearing in accordance with the mitigation hierarchy (see Section 3.1).

Conditions

To address the above impacts, the following management measures will be required as conditions on the clearing permit:

- undertake avoid and minimise measures to reduce the impacts and extent of clearing,
- take hygiene steps to minimise the risk of the introduction and spread of weeds and dieback,
- undertake mitigation planting of 15 *Corymbia calophylla* (marri) trees in Lot 2280 on Deposited Plan 203064, Osmington as detailed in Section 3.1.

3.2.2. Water resources - Clearing Principles (f), (i) and (j)

Assessment

Water quality

The application area intersects a mapped non-perennial minor river. If water is present at the time of clearing, the proposed clearing may impact surface water quality by mobilising sediments and silt. Potential water quality impact risk are short term. If water is present during the works, appropriate sediment and erosion control measures will be undertaken in accordance with planning approvals (SW Hydrology, 2024; see Section 3.3).

Potential water flow impacts will be managed by planning approvals from the local government (see Section 3.3).

Flooding

Given the purpose of clearing is to expand an existing dam, the final land use will increase the localised incidence and intensity of flooding. The installation of an upgraded dam wall provides a defined maximum flood disturbance boundary (SW Hydrology, 2024). In assessing the likely impacts of the proposed clearing, vegetation present up to the maximum flood disturbance boundary was considered likely to be indirectly cleared through flooding.

Conclusion

Based on the above assessment, the potential impacts of the proposed clearing on water resources are likely to be minimal and short-term. Any potential impacts can be managed through planning authority decision making authorities.

Conditions

To address the above impacts, the following management measures will be required as conditions on the clearing permit:

- undertake avoid and minimise measures to reduce the impacts and extent of clearing,
- take hygiene steps to minimise the risk of the introduction and spread of weeds and dieback.

3.3. Relevant planning instruments and other matters

The Shire granted planning approval under the *Planning and Development Act 2005* for the proposed dam on 22 January 2025 (Crane, 2025a; Shire of Augusta Margaret River, 2025). The Shire did not have any objections to the proposed clearing, provided the conditions of the planning approval are fulfilled.

Acid sulphate soil (ASS) risk will be managed under planning approval conditions, which requires an ASS assessment to be completed prior to undertaking works and an appropriate management plan implemented if ASS are identified (Crane, 2025a; Shire of Augusta Margaret River, 2025).

Impacts to seasonal water flow will be managed under planning approval conditions, which requires the dam to be constructed to allow water to flow downstream during low flow periods, mitigating downstream impacts (Crane, 2025a; Shire of Augusta Margaret River, 2025).

DWER's Water Licencing branch advised a Section 17 permit to interfere with bed and banks under the RIWI Act is required (DWER, 2024a). The s17 permit is proposed to be approved subject to confirmation a clearing permit for the dam upgrades has been granted (DWER, 2025).

DWER's Water Source Protection Planning branch advised best management practices in accordance with published guidelines should be undertaken to protect the water quality for the proposed works and final land use (DWER, 2024b).

No Aboriginal sites of significance have been mapped within the application area. It is the permit holder's responsibility to comply with the *Aboriginal Heritage Act 1972* (WA) and ensure that no Aboriginal Sites of Significance are damaged through the clearing process.

End

Appendix A. Site characteristics

The information provided below describes the key characteristics of the area proposed to be cleared and is based on the best information available to DWER at the time of this assessment. This information was used to inform the assessment of the clearing against the Clearing Principles, contained in Appendix B.

| Characteristic | Details |
|------------------------|--|
| Local context | The application area is part of a vegetated linkage between multiple patches of remnant vegetation in the intensive land use zone of Western Australia. It is surrounded by areas cleared for grazing. |
| | Spatial data indicates the local area (10-kilometre radius from the centre of the application area) retains approximately 48 per cent of the original native vegetation cover. |
| Ecological linkage | The application area does not intersect a formal ecological linkage. The closest mapped ecological linkage is the South West Regional Ecological Linkage, about 600 metres from the application area. |
| Conservation areas | The application area does not intersect a mapped conservation area. The closest mapped conservation area is the North East Margaret River State Forest, about 2.5 kilometres from the application area. |
| Vegetation description | The flora and fauna surveys (NSA, 2024; NSA, 2025) identified the vegetation in the application area consists of: |
| | <i>Taxandria linearifolia</i> shrubland over weeds, <i>Corymbia calophylla</i> (Marri) open woodland over sedgeland and shrubland. |
| | This is broadly consistent with the mapped vegetation type: |
| | • Treeton (273), described as open forest of <i>Eucalyptus patens</i> - <i>Corymbia calophylla</i> - <i>Eucalyptus marginata</i> subsp. marginata on lower slopes and on floors of minor valleys in the perhumid zone. |
| | The mapped vegetation type retains approximately 34 per cent of the original extent (Government of Western Australia, 2019). |
| Vegetation condition | The flora and fauna surveys (NSA, 2024; NSA, 2025) identified the vegetation in the application area is in Completely Degraded (Keighery, 1994) condition. The full Keighery (1994) condition rating scale is provided in Appendix C. |
| Climate and landform | Available mapping indicates the application area has a mean annual rainfall of 1100 millimetres and evapotranspiration of 800 millimetres. The application area is at an altitude of 25 meters above sea level. |
| Soil description | The soil is mapped as Treeton wet valley Phase (214ThTRvw), described as broad U-shaped drainage depressions with swampy floors (DPIRD, 2019). |
| Land degradation risk | Land degradation risks are summarised in Appendix A.4. The application area has a moderate to low acid sulphate soils risk (<3m from surface). |
| Waterbodies | The desktop assessment and aerial imagery indicate a non-perennial minor river transects the application area. The application area is about 150 metres from Rosa Brook, a resource enhancement palusvale (seasonally waterlogged valley). |
| Hydrogeography | The application area falls in the Busselton-Capel Groundwater Area as proclaimed under the RIWI Act and the Margaret River Catchment Priority 3 Public Drinking Water Source Area. The groundwater salinity level (total dissolved solids) is mapped as less than 500 milligrams per litre. |
| Flora | The desktop assessment identified 19 conservation significant flora species in the local area, comprised of two threatened flora and 17 priority flora species. The nearest record is a Priority 3 species, <i>Acacia inops,</i> 700 metres from the application area. |
| Ecological communities | There are no mapped Threatened or Priority Ecological Communities in the local area. |

| Characteristic | Details |
|----------------|---|
| Fauna | The desktop assessment identified 25 conservation significant fauna species in the local area. The closest record is a <i>Nannatherina balstoni</i> (Balston's pygmy perch) about one kilometre from the application area. |
| | The application area is within Baudin's cockatoo, Carnaby's cockatoo and forest red tailed black cockatoo known distribution zones. There are six known black cockatoo roost sites in the local area, the closest recorded roost site is five kilometres from the application area. |

A.2. Vegetation extent

| Pre- European extent (ha) | Current extent (ha) | Extent remaining (%) | Current extent in all DBCA managed land (ha) | Current proportion (%) of pre- European extent in all DBCA managed land | |
|---------------------------------|--|--|---|---|--|
| IBRA bioregion* | | | | | |
| 4,506,660.25 | 2,399,838.15 | 53.25 | 1,673,614.25 | 37.14 | |
| Vegetation complex** | | | | | |
| 8,676.10 | 2,926.58 | 33.73 | 1,747.41 | 20.14 | |
| Local area | | | | | |
| 31,785.06 | 15,256.54 | 48.00 | - | - | |
| | Pre- European extent (ha) 4,506,660.25 8,676.10 31,785.06 | Pre- European extent (ha) Current extent (ha) 4,506,660.25 2,399,838.15 8,676.10 2,926.58 31,785.06 15,256.54 | Pre- European extent (ha) Current extent (ha) Extent remaining (%) 4,506,660.25 2,399,838.15 53.25 8,676.10 2,926.58 33.73 31,785.06 15,256.54 48.00 | Pre- European extent (ha) Current extent (ha) Extent remaining (%) Current extent in all DBCA managed land (ha) 4,506,660.25 2,399,838.15 53.25 1,673,614.25 8,676.10 2,926.58 33.73 1,747.41 31,785.06 15,256.54 48.00 - | |

*Government of Western Australia (2019b)

**Government of Western Australia (2019a)

A.3. Fauna analysis table

| Species name | Conservation status | Suitable habitat features? [Y/N] | Suitable vegetation type? [Y/N] | Distance of closest record to application area (km) |
|---|------------------------|---|--|--|
| <i>Phascogale tapoatafa wambenger</i> (south-western brush-tailed phascogale) | CD | Y | Y | 1.72 |
| Notamacropus irma (western brush wallaby) | P4 | Y | Y | 1.93 |
| <i>Engaewa pseudoreducta</i> (Margaret River burrowing crayfish) | P3 | Y | Y | 2.27 |
| Isoodon fusciventer (quenda) | P4 | Y | Y | 2.39 |
| Zanda latirostris (Carnaby's cockatoo) | EN | Y | Y | 2.50 |
| <i>Calyptorhynchus banksii naso</i> (forest red-tailed black cockatoo) | VU | Y | Y | 3.01 |
| Zanda baudinii (Baudin's cockatoo) | EN | Y | Y | 3.01 |
| <i>Pseudocheirus occidentalis</i> (western ringtail possum) | CR | Y | Y | 3.97 |

CR: critically endangered; EN: endangered, VU: vulnerable, P: priority, CD: conservation dependent.

| A.4. Land degradation risk table | | |
|----------------------------------|--|--|
| Risk categories | 214ThTRvw - Treeton wet valley Phase | |
| Subsurface Acidification | H2: >70% of map unit has a high subsurface acidification risk or is presently acid | |
| Water logging | H2: >70% of map unit has a moderate to very high waterlogging risk | |
| Flood risk | M2: 30-50% of the map unit has a moderate to high flood risk | |
| Phosphorus export risk | M2: 30-50% of map unit has a high to extreme phosphorus export risk | |
| Wind erosion | M1: 10-30% of map unit has a high to extreme wind erosion risk | |
| Water erosion | M1: 10-30% of map unit has a high to extreme water erosion risk | |
| Water repellence | L2: 3-10% of map unit has a high water repellence risk | |
| Salinity | L1: <3% of map unit has a moderate to high salinity risk or is presently saline | |

Appendix B. Assessment against the clearing principles

| Assessment against the clearing principles | Variance level | Is further consideration required? |
|---|---------------------|--|
| Environmental value: biological values | | |
| <u>Principle (a):</u> "Native vegetation should not be cleared if it comprises a high level of biodiversity." | Not likely to be at | No |
| Assessment: | variance | |
| Given the size and condition of the application area, it is not likely to comprise a high level of biodiversity. No conservation significant flora species were identified in the application area during surveys (NSA, 2024; NSA 2025), however it is noted that surveys were undertaken outside of recommended timing (EPA, 2016). | | |
| A flora likelihood assessment was conducted based on habitat and soil preferences, vegetation in the application area, and known species distribution. The assessment did not identify any conservation significant flora species likely to be present in the application area, given the extent of proposed clearing and degraded condition of the vegetation. | | |
| <u>Principle (b):</u> "Native vegetation should not be cleared if it comprises the whole or a part of, or is necessary for the maintenance of, a significant habitat for fauna." | At variance | Yes Refer to Section 3.2.1. above |
| Assessment: | | |
| The application area contains habitat for conservation significant fauna. | | |
| <u>Principle (c):</u> "Native vegetation should not be cleared if it includes, or is necessary for the continued existence of, threatened flora." | Not likely to be at | No |
| Assessment: | variance | |
| A flora likelihood assessment was conducted based on habitat and soil preferences, vegetation in the application area, and known species distribution. Surveys of the application area did not identify known threatened flora or suitable habitat for threatened flora in the application area. | | |
| <u>Principle (d):</u> "Native vegetation should not be cleared if it comprises the whole or a part of, or is necessary for the maintenance of, a threatened ecological community." | Not at variance | No |
| Assessment: | | |

| Assessment against the clearing principles | Variance level | Is further consideration required? | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| According to available databases, no TECs have been recorded in the local area. Surveys of the application area did not identify assemblages indicative of a TEC. | | | | | |
| Environmental value: significant remnant vegetation and conservation are | Environmental value: significant remnant vegetation and conservation areas | | | | |
| <u>Principle (e):</u> "Native vegetation should not be cleared if it is significant as a remnant of native vegetation in an area that has been extensively cleared." | Not likely to be at | No | | | |
| Assessment: | Variance | | | | |
| The extent of the mapped vegetation type and native vegetation in the local area is consistent with the national objectives and targets for biodiversity conservation in Australia (Commonwealth of Australia, 2001). | | | | | |
| <u>Principle (h):</u> "Native vegetation should not be cleared if the clearing of the vegetation is likely to have an impact on the environmental values of any adjacent or nearby conservation area." | Not likely to be at variance | No | | | |
| Assessment: | | | | | |
| Given the distance to the nearest conservation area, small extent and degraded condition of the vegetation in the application area, the proposed clearing is not likely to have an impact on the environmental values of nearby conservation areas. | | | | | |
| Environmental value: land and water resources | | | | | |
| <u>Principle (f):</u> "Native vegetation should not be cleared if it is growing in, or in association with, an environment associated with a watercourse or wetland." | At variance | Yes Refer to Section | | | |
| Assessment: | | 3.2.2, above. | | | |
| The application area is in a mapped watercourse and contains riparian vegetation. | | | | | |
| <u>Principle (g):</u> "Native vegetation should not be cleared if the clearing of the vegetation is likely to cause appreciable land degradation." | Not likely to be at | Yes Refer to Section | | | |
| Assessment: | variance | 3.3, above. | | | |
| The mapped soils are highly susceptible to subsurface acidification. Noting the extent of proposed clearing and the land management conditions required under planning approval granted by the Shire of Augusta Margaret River, the proposed clearing is not likely to cause appreciable land degradation. | | | | | |
| <u>Principle (i):</u> "Native vegetation should not be cleared if the clearing of the vegetation is likely to cause deterioration in the quality of surface or underground water." | May be at variance | Yes Refer to Section 3.2.2. above. | | | |
| Assessment: | | - , | | | |
| Given the application area is within a mapped watercourse, the proposed clearing may cause short-term localised deterioration of surface water quality. | | | | | |
| <u>Principle (j):</u> "Native vegetation should not be cleared if the clearing of the vegetation is likely to cause, or exacerbate, the incidence or intensity of flooding." | At variance | Yes Refer to Section 3.2.2, above. | | | |
| Assessment: | | | | | |
| Given the purpose of clearing is to expand an existing dam, the final land use will increase the localised incidence and intensity of flooding. | | | | | |

Appendix C. Vegetation condition rating scale

Vegetation condition is a rating given to a defined area of vegetation to categorise and rank disturbance related to human activities. The rating refers to the degree of change in the vegetation structure, density and species present in relation to undisturbed vegetation of the same type. The degree of disturbance impacts upon the vegetation's ability to regenerate. Disturbance at a site can be a cumulative effect from a number of interacting disturbance types.

Considering its location, the scale below was used to measure the condition of the vegetation proposed to be cleared. This scale has been extracted from Keighery, B.J. (1994) *Bushland Plant Survey: A Guide to Plant Community Survey for the Community*. Wildflower Society of WA (Inc). Nedlands, Western Australia.

Measuring vegetation condition for the South West and Interzone Botanical Province (Keighery, 1994)

| Condition | Description |
|---------------------|---|
| Pristine | Pristine or nearly so, no obvious signs of disturbance. |
| Excellent | Vegetation structure intact, with disturbance affecting individual species; weeds are non-aggressive species. |
| Very good | Vegetation structure altered, with obvious signs of disturbance. For example, disturbance to vegetation structure caused by repeated fires, the presence of some more aggressive weeds, dieback, logging and/or grazing. |
| Good | Vegetation structure significantly altered by very obvious signs of multiple disturbances. Retains basic vegetation structure or ability to regenerate it. For example, disturbance to vegetation structure caused by very frequent fires, the presence of some very aggressive weeds at high density, partial clearing, dieback and/or grazing. |
| Degraded | Basic vegetation structure severely impacted by disturbance. Scope for regeneration but not to a state approaching good condition without intensive management. For example, disturbance to vegetation structure caused by very frequent fires, the presence of very aggressive weeds, partial clearing, dieback and/or grazing. |
| Completely degraded | The structure of the vegetation is no longer intact and the area is completely or almost completely without native species. These areas are often described as 'parkland cleared' with the flora comprising weed or crop species with isolated native trees or shrubs. |

Appendix D. Sources of information

D.1. GIS databases

Publicly available GIS Databases used (sourced from <u>www.data.wa.gov.au</u>):

- 10 Metre Contours (DPIRD-073)
- Aboriginal Heritage Places (DPLH-001)
- Aboriginal Heritage Places (DPLH-001)
- Cadastre (LGATE-218)
- Cadastre Address (LGATE-002)
- Contours (DPIRD-073)
- DBCA Lands of Interest (DBCA-012)
- DBCA Legislated Lands and Waters (DBCA-011)
- Directory of Important Wetlands in Australia Western Australia (DBCA-045)
- Environmentally Sensitive Areas (DWER-046)
- Flood Risk (DPIRD-007)
- Groundwater Salinity Statewide (DWER-026)
- Hydrography Inland Waters Waterlines
- Hydrological Zones of Western Australia (DPIRD-069)
- IBRA Vegetation Statistics
- Imagery
- Local Planning Scheme Zones and Reserves (DPLH-071)
- Native Title (ILUA) (LGATE-067)
- Offsets Register Offsets (DWER-078)
- Pre-European Vegetation Statistics
- Public Drinking Water Source Areas (DWER-033)
- Ramsar Sites (DBCA-010)
- Regional Parks (DBCA-026)
- Remnant Vegetation, All Areas
- RIWI Act, Groundwater Areas (DWER-034)
- RIWI Act, Surface Water Areas and Irrigation Districts (DWER-037)
- Soil Landscape Land Quality Flood Risk (DPIRD-007)
- Soil Landscape Land Quality Phosphorus Export Risk (DPIRD-010)
- Soil Landscape Land Quality Subsurface Acidification Risk (DPIRD-011)
- Soil Landscape Land Quality Water Erosion Risk (DPIRD-013)
- Soil Landscape Land Quality Water Repellence Risk (DPIRD-014)
- Soil Landscape Land Quality Waterlogging Risk (DPIRD-015)
- Soil Landscape Land Quality Wind Erosion Risk (DPIRD-016)
- Soil Landscape Mapping Best Available
- Soil Landscape Mapping Systems

Restricted GIS Databases used:

- ICMS (Incident Complaints Management System) Points and Polygons
- Threatened Flora (TPFL)
- Threatened Flora (WAHerb)
- Threatened Fauna
- Threatened Ecological Communities and Priority Ecological Communities
- Threatened Ecological Communities and Priority Ecological Communities (Buffers)

D.2. References

- Burnham, Q. (2014). Systematics and biogeography of the Australian burrowing freshwater crayfish genus Engaewa Riekk (Decapoda: Parastacidae). Edith Cowan University. Available from <u>https://ro.ecu.edu.au/theses/1278</u>.
- Commonwealth of Australia (2001) *National Objectives and Targets for Biodiversity Conservation 2001-2005*, Canberra.
- Crane, K. (2023) *Clearing permit application CPS 10422/1*, received 20 November 2023 (DWER Ref: DWERDT871466). Available from: <u>https://ftp.dwer.wa.gov.au/permit/10422/</u>.

- Crane, K. (2025a) *Planning approval received for dam construction at 453 (Lot 2280) Bramley River Road, Osmington,* received 23 January 2025 (DWER Ref: DWERDT1065933).
- Crane, K. (2025b) Confirmation of rehabilitation action and location, received 21 February 2025 (DWER Ref: DWERDT1080766).
- Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment (DAWE) (2022) *Referral guideline for 3 WA threatened black cockatoo species: Carnaby's Cockatoo, Baudin's Cockatoo and the Forest Red-tailed Black cockatoo.* Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment, Canberra.
- Department of Environment Regulation (DER) (2013) A guide to the assessment of applications to clear native vegetation. Perth. Available from: <u>https://www.der.wa.gov.au/images/documents/your-environment/native-vegetation/Guidelines/Guide2 assessment native veg.pdf</u>.
- Department of the Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts (DEWHA) (2009). *Approved Conservation Advice for* Engaewa pseudoreducta (*Margaret River Burrowing Crayfish*). Canberra: Department of the Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts. Available from: <u>http://www.environment.gov.au/biodiversity/threatened/species/pubs/82674-conservation-advice.pdf</u>.
- Department of Parks and Wildlife (DPAW, 2017) *Western Ringtail Possum (Pseudocheirus occidentalis) Recovery Plan.* Available from: <u>http://www.environment.gov.au/biodiversity/threatened/publications/recovery/westernringtail-</u> possumrecovery-plan
- Department of Primary Industries and Regional Development (DPIRD) (2019) *NRInfo Digital Mapping. Department of Primary Industries and Regional Development.* Government of Western Australia. URL: https://maps.agric.wa.gov.au/nrm-info/ (accessed February 2025).
- Department of Water and Environmental Regulation (DWER) (2019) *Procedure: Native vegetation clearing permits*. Joondalup. Available from: <u>https://dwer.wa.gov.au/sites/default/files/Procedure Native vegetation clearing permits v1.PDF</u>.
- Department of Water and Environmental Regulation (DWER) (2024a) *Rights in Water and Irrigation Act 1914 advice for clearing permit application CPS 10422/1*, received 18 January 2024 (DWER Ref: DWERDT896960 and DWERDT896979).
- Department of Water and Environmental Regulation (DWER) (2024b) *Water Source Protection Planning advice for clearing permit application CPS 10422/1,* received 24 January 2024 (DWER Ref: DWERDT896982).
- Department of Water and Environmental Regulation (DWER) (2025) *Confirmation s17 permit to interfere with bed and banks likely to be granted,* received 15 April 2025 (DWER Ref: DWERDT1119164).
- Environmental Protection Authority (EPA) (2016) *Technical Guidance Flora and Vegetation Surveys for Environmental Impact Assessment*. Available from: <u>http://www.epa.wa.gov.au/sites/default/files/Policies_and_Guidance/EPA%20Technical%20Guidance%20-</u> <u>%20Flora%20and%20Vegetation%20survey_Dec13.pdf</u>.
- Environmental Protection Authority (EPA) (2020). Technical Guidance Terrestrial Vertebrate Fauna Surveys for Environmental Impact Assessment. Available from: <u>https://www.epa.wa.gov.au/policies-guidance/technical-guidance-terrestrial-vertebrate-fauna-surveys-environmental-impact</u>.
- Government of Western Australia (2019a) 2018 South West Vegetation Complex Statistics. Current as of March 2019. WA Department of Biodiversity, Conservation and Attractions, Perth, https://catalogue.data.wa.gov.au/dataset/dbca
- Government of Western Australia (2019b) 2018 Statewide Vegetation Statistics incorporating the CAR Reserve Analysis (Full Report). Current as of March 2019. WA Department of Biodiversity, Conservation and Attractions. <u>https://catalogue.data.wa.gov.au/dataset/dbca-statewide-vegetation-statistics</u>
- Keighery, B.J. (1994) *Bushland Plant Survey: A Guide to Plant Community Survey for the Community*. Wildflower Society of WA (Inc). Nedlands, Western Australia.

- Mattiske, E.M. and Havel, J.J. (1998) Vegetation Complexes of the South-west Forest Region of Western Australia. Maps and report prepared as part of the Regional Forest Agreement, Western Australia for the Department of Conservation and Land Management and Environment Australia.
- Molloy, S., Wood, J., Hall, S., Wallrodt, S. and Whisson, G. (2009) *South West Regional Ecological Linkages Technical Report*, Western Australian Local Government Association and Department of Environment and Conservation, Perth.
- Nicole Siemon and Associates Pty Ltd (NSA) (2024) *Flora and fauna assessment* (DWER Ref: DWERDT1047163). Available from: <u>https://ftp.dwer.wa.gov.au/permit/10422/</u>.
- Nicole Siemon and Associates Pty Ltd (NSA) (2025) *Updated survey information: (Lot 2280) 453 Bramley River Rd, Osmington* (DWER Ref: DWERDT1073854). Available from: <u>https://ftp.dwer.wa.gov.au/permit/10422/</u>.
- Shire of Augusta Margaret River (2025) *Advice for clearing permit application CPS 10422/1*, received 18 February 2025 (DWER Ref: DWERDT1078504).
- SW Hydrology (2024) *Proposed Dam Development Lot 2280 Bramley River Rd, Osmington* (DWER Ref: DWERDT1064286). Available from: <u>https://ftp.dwer.wa.gov.au/permit/10422/</u>.
- Western Australian Herbarium (1998-) *FloraBase the Western Australian Flora*. Department of Biodiversity, Conservation and Attractions, Western Australia. <u>https://florabase.dpaw.wa.gov.au/</u>.