



1. Application details

1.1. Permit application details

Permit application No.: 1179/1
Permit type: Area Permit

1.2. Proponent details

Proponent's name: Roger Blackett Pty Ltd

1.3. Property details

Property: LOT 1563 ON PLAN 202981 (SCOTSDALE 6333)
Local Government Area: Shire Of Denmark
Colloquial name:

1.4. Application

Clearing Area (ha)	No. Trees	Method of Clearing	For the purpose of:
	45	Cutting	Plantation

2. Site Information

2.1. Existing environment and information

2.1.1. Description of the native vegetation under application

Vegetation Description	Clearing Description	Vegetation Condition	Comment
Beard Vegetation Association 977: Low forest; tea-tree & casuarina (Hopkins et al., 2001). Mattiske Consulting (1998) described the vegetation as Keystone (Ky); Open forest of Eucalyptus marginata subsp. marginata-Corymbia calophylla-Banksia grandis on mild slopes of hills in perhumid zone and open forest to tall open forest of Eucalyptus brevistylis on slopes below outcrops in hyperhumid and perhumid zones.	Photographs submitted with the application (TRIM ref AI962) show the 45 trees covered by this application to be mostly jarrah (Eucalyptus marginata) and marri (Corymbia calophylla). As such, the Mattiske Consulting description more closely reflects the vegetation on site than the Beard description.	Degraded: Structure severely disturbed; regeneration to good condition requires intensive management (Keighery, 1994).	The paddock trees covered by this application appear to vary in age with some quite mature. All are surrounded by pasture and there are no signs of native understorey or groundcover species (TRIM ref AI962).

3. Assessment of application against clearing principles

(a) Native vegetation should not be cleared if it comprises a high level of biological diversity.

Comments	Methodology
<p>Proposal is not likely to be at variance to this Principle</p> <p>The 45 trees covered by this application are unlikely to have a high biodiversity value when compared to the local area and bioregion.</p> <p>The vegetation is in a Degraded (Keighery, 1994) condition based on the lack of structure due of the lack of native understorey and groundcover species surrounding the trees (photographs submitted with application).</p> <p>Within the local area (10km radius) there is over 50% vegetation cover with a large amount this within State Forest. Given the vegetation covered by this application is degraded and consists of paddock trees only, it is not likely to be at variance to this Principle.</p>	<p>Keighery (1994), photographs with application (TRIM ref AI962)</p> <p>GIS Database: -Denmark 1m Orthomosaic - DOLA 01</p>

(b) 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 indigenous to Western Australia.

Comments Proposal is not likely to be at variance to this Principle

The vegetation covered by this application is Degraded (Keighery, 1994) and consists of jarrah and marri paddock trees with no native understorey or groundcover (photographs submitted with application).

Some of the paddock trees covered by this application could contain hollows, which may be utilised by fauna for habitat. Significant habitat trees for Carnaby's cockatoo, Baundin's cockatoo and the forest red-tailed black cockatoo should be retained on site as defined and included in the Permit. Other than the habitat trees it is considered that the proposal is not likely to be at variance to this Principle due to almost 30% of this property remaining as native vegetation.

As such it is unlikely that this application is at variance to this Principle.

Methodology Keighery (1994), photographs with application (TRIM ref A1962)
GIS Database:
-Denmark 1m Orthomosaic - DOLA 01

(c) Native vegetation should not be cleared if it includes, or is necessary for the continued existence of, rare flora.

Comments Proposal is not likely to be at variance to this Principle

There are a number of Declared Rare Flora (DRF) and Priority flora species within a 10km radius (local area) of the area under application.

The DRF within the local area include:

- *Kennedia glabrata*,
- *Drakaea micrantha*, and
- *Laxmannia grandiflora* subsp. *brendae*.

The Priority flora within the local area include:

- *Tyrbastes glaucescens* (P4),
- *Borya longiscapa* (P2),
- *Gonocarpus simplex* (P3),
- *Verticordia endicheriana* var. *angustifolia* (P2),
- *Andersonia amabile* (P3), and
- *Andersonia virolens* (P2).

While there are many significant flora species in the local area, many of them occur on Mount Lindsay with the closest being 2.5km away. Additionally, as the vegetation covered by this application includes paddock trees only and no native understorey or groundcover species are present (photographs submitted with application), it is unlikely that this application is at variance to this Principle.

Methodology Photographs with application (TRIM ref A1962)
GIS Database:
-Declared Rare and Priority Flora List - CALM 01/07/05

(d) 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.

Comments Proposal is not likely to be at variance to this Principle

The Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA) associated with a Threatened Ecological Community (TEC) lies within 30m of the area under application. The TEC is listed as occurring near the summit of Mount Lindsay over 5.5km to the north east.

The terrain at the summit of Mount Lindsay is quite unique and different from the area under application. Additionally, this application only covers paddock trees which are unlikely to be part of a TEC.

Therefore, it is considered unlikely that this application is at variance to this Principle.

Methodology GIS Databases:
-Threatened Ecological Communities - CALM 12/4/05
-Clearing Regulations - Environmentally Sensitive Areas - DOE 30/5/05

(e) Native vegetation should not be cleared if it is significant as a remnant of native vegetation in an area that has been extensively cleared.

Comments Proposal is not at variance to this Principle

The area under application is within the Warren IBRA Bioregion and the Shire of Denmark, both of which have

above 80% vegetation representation (Shepherd et al., 2001; Hopkins et al., 2001). The Mattiske and Beard Vegetation Associations have 92.4% and 73.1% respectively (Mattiske Consulting, 1998; Shepherd et al., 2001; Hopkins et al., 2001). Which is considered to be of 'least concern' in reference to conservation status (Department of Natural Resources and Environment, 2002).

Additionally the local area has over 50% vegetation cover and the property covered by this application will still have almost 30% cover if the Permit is granted.

Given the above, it is considered that this application is not at variance to this Principle.

Methodology Department of Natural Resources and Environment (2002), Shepherd et al. (2001), Hopkins et al. (2001), Mattiske Consulting (1998)
GIS Database:
-Denmark 1m Orthomosaic - DOLA 01

(f) Native vegetation should not be cleared if it is growing in, or in association with, an environment associated with a watercourse or wetland.

Comments Proposal is not at variance to this Principle

One minor perennial watercourse runs through the property. However, it is not directly associated with the vegetation covered by this application and is unlikely to be affected by the clearing of paddock trees.

A South Coast Significant Wetland, Richmond, lies just to the south of the property covered by this application.

As this application covers only paddock trees, it is considered that it is not at variance to this Principle.

Methodology GIS Databases:
-Denmark 1m Orthomosaic - DOLA 01
-Hydrography, linear - DOE 1/2/04
-South Coast Significant Wetlands - DOE 4/8/03

(g) Native vegetation should not be cleared if the clearing of the vegetation is likely to cause appreciable land degradation.

Comments Proposal is not likely to be at variance to this Principle

Soils within the area under application comprise of leached sands, some of which have thin peaty surface horizons occurring on plains with a succession of swampy flats broken by low sandy, or ironstone gravelly, knolls and hillocks.

The area covered by this application has a very steep gradient, which would normally be of concern for erosion. However, this application covers paddock trees only and the intention is to plant the area to bluegums so the risk of erosion caused by clearing is substantially reduced.

The proposed clearing is unlikely to contribute to an increase in salinisation or waterlogging due to the small area under application.

Given the above information, it is unlikely that this proposal is at variance to this Principle.

Methodology GIS Databases:
-Soils, Statewide - DA 11/99
-Topographic Contours, Statewide - DOLA 12/09/02
-Salinity Mapping LM 25m - DOLA 00

(h) 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.

Comments Proposal is not at variance to this Principle

The benchmark of 15% representation in conservation reserves (JANIS, 1997) has not been met for Beard Association 977 (Hopkins et al., 2001) but has been met for Mattiske Complex Ky (Mattiske Consulting, 1998) with 0.3% and 84.5% respectively in reserve. As the Mattiske Consulting description is more reflective of the vegetation covered by this application, the higher value will be considered in this assessment.

The Denmark Catchment State Forest lies within 100m of the property covered by this application. However, the vegetation covered by this application is degraded and consists of paddock trees only so is unlikely to contribute to an ecological linkage to this conservation area. Particularly as there a large proportion of the local area is covered by native vegetation including almost 30% of the property in question.

Given the above information, it is considered that this application is not at variance to this Principle.

Methodology JANIS (1997), Hopkins et al. (2001), Mattiske Consulting (1998)
 GIS Databases:
 -CALM Managed Lands and Water - CALM 1/07/05
 -Denmark 1m Orthomosaic - DOLA 01

(i) 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.

Comments **Proposal is not at variance to this Principle**
 The area under application falls within the Denmark River Catchment Area. No Policy Use has been assigned to this area as yet and this application is unlikely to detrimentally impact on water quality as the clearing covers only 45 paddock trees. The local area is well vegetated including almost 30% of the property. It is therefore considered that the proposed clearing will not reduce the quality of either surface or underground water and is not at variance to this Principle.

Methodology GIS Databases:
 -Denmark 1m Orthomosaic - DOLA 01
 -Public Drinking Water Source Areas (PDWSA's) - DOE 07/02/06

(j) Native vegetation should not be cleared if clearing the vegetation is likely to cause, or exacerbate, the incidence or intensity of flooding.

Comments **Proposal is not likely to be at variance to this Principle**
 The area under application has a steep gradient. However, due to the small area proposed to be cleared, granting of this Permit is unlikely to lead to an increase in peak flood height or duration.

Methodology GIS Database:
 -Topographic Contours, Statewide - DOLA 12/09/02

Planning instrument, Native Title, Previous EPA decision or other matter.

Comments No other approvals are required by either the Department of Environment or Department of Water.

Methodology

4. Assessor's recommendations

Purpose	Method	Applied area (ha)/ trees	Decision	Comment / recommendation
Plantation	Cutting	45	Grant	This application has been assessed and has been found to be either 'not at variance' or 'not likely to be at variance' with the Clearing Principles. The assessing officer therefore recommends that the Permit be granted with the attached conditions of excluding stock from the vegetated remnants on the property and the retention of defined habitat trees.

5. References

Department of Natural Resources and Environment (2002) Biodiversity Action Planning. Action planning for native biodiversity at multiple scales; catchment bioregional, landscape, local. Department of Natural Resources and Environment, Victoria.

Hopkins, A.J.M., Beeston, G.R. and Harvey J.M. (2001) A database on the vegetation of Western Australia. Stage 1. CALM Science after J. S. Beard, late 1960's to early 1980's Vegetation Survey of Western Australia, UWA Press.

JANIS Forests Criteria (1997) Nationally agreed criteria for the establishment of a comprehensive, Adequate and Representative reserve System for Forests in Australia. A report by the Joint ANZECC/MCFFA National Forest Policy Statement Implementation Sub-committee. Regional Forests Agreement process. Commonwealth of Australia, Canberra.

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 Consulting (1998) Mapping of vegetation complexes in the South West forest region of Western Australia, CALM.

Shepherd, D.P., Beeston, G.R. and Hopkins, A.J.M. (2001) Native Vegetation in Western Australia, Extent, Type and Status. Resource Management Technical Report 249. Department of Agriculture, Western Australia.

6. Glossary

Term	Meaning
CALM	Department of Conservation and Land Management
DAWA	Department of Agriculture
DEP	Department of Environmental Protection (now DoE)
DoE	Department of Environment
DoIR	Department of Industry and Resources
DRF	Declared Rare Flora
EPP	Environmental Protection Policy
GIS	Geographical Information System
ha	Hectare (10,000 square metres)
TEC	Threatened Ecological Community
WRC	Water and Rivers Commission (now DoE)