



1. Application details

1.1. Permit application details

Permit application No.: 1285/1
Permit type: Area Permit

1.2. Proponent details

Proponent's name: Omaha Nominees Pty Ltd

1.3. Property details

Property: LOT 1794 ON PLAN 116610 (MYALUP 6220)
Local Government Area: Shire Of Harvey
Colloquial name:

1.4. Application

Clearing Area (ha)	No. Trees	Method of Clearing	For the purpose of:
2.5		Mechanical Removal	Extractive Industry

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 998 - Medium woodland; tuart (Hopkins et al. 2001, Shepherd et al. 2001).	The proposal includes clearing of 2.5ha of parkland cleared tuart woodland.	Degraded: Structure severely disturbed; regeneration to good condition requires intensive management (Keighery 1994)	Observed during site visit: the majority of the area has been parkland cleared, with few remaining remnant tuarts and peppermints. The area has been used as a refuse with car bodies and other scrap metal throughout and contains little understorey, possibly due to grazing practices.
Hedde Vegetation Complex - Yoongarillup: tuart woodland with large numbers of Agonis flexuosa (peppermint) (Hedde et al. 1980).	The vegetation under application is a degraded tuart woodland dominated by Eucalyptus gomphocephala and Agonis flexuosa, with a low number of isolated shrub species. The understorey is sparse, however dominated by grasses and weeds (DEC Site Visit 2006).		

3. Assessment of application against clearing principles

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

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

The area proposed to be cleared is in Degraded condition (Keighery 1994), consisting predominantly of young tuarts (*Eucalyptus gomphocephala*) and peppermints (*Agonis flexuosa*). There are approximately three shrub species present and severe weed invasion is occurring. Walking tracks exist throughout the area and the area appears to have been used as a dumping ground for rubbish and old abandoned cars.

The proponent will be required to rehabilitate an area of 6ha, once extraction is completed, to pre-clearing extent. This revegetation will be an area larger than what is proposed for clearing, and it is hoped will create a corridor linking existing remnants within the local area.

A secondary site visit on an adjacent vegetated property has indicated that clearing the area under application will not cause any adverse impacts on this area.

Given the lack of species diversity and its degraded condition, the vegetation proposed for clearing is not considered to comprise a high level of biological diversity and is therefore not likely to be at variance to this principle.

Methodology DEC site visit (2006);
Keighery (1994);
GIS Databases:
- Hedde Vegetation Complexes - DEP 21/06/95;

(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 area proposed to be cleared is in Degraded condition (Keighery 1994) consisting predominantly of young tuarts (*Eucalyptus gomphocephala*) and peppermints (*Agonis flexuosa*). The structure is no longer intact, with no existing mid or understorey present. The area is highly disturbed, with exotic species dominating the understorey.

The vegetation may provide habitat to some bird species, however the current extractive industry operation and farming activity occurring adjacent the area under application decreases its habitat value.

A secondary site visit to an adjacent vegetated property indicates clearing the proposed area will not adversely affect the habitat values of nearby vegetated areas.

The proponent is required to revegetate an area of 6ha to pre-clearing extent as a condition of the permit once the extraction operation is complete. The area revegetated will be 3.5ha larger than the area proposed for clearing and will contain higher species diversity than currently exists. The area proposed for revegetation will enhance an existing vegetation link to allow movement of native fauna within the local area.

Given the condition of the vegetation proposed for clearing and the current surrounding landuses, it is unlikely this proposal is at variance to this Principle.

Methodology DEC site visit (2006);
Keighery (1994)

(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

Two populations of Declared Rare Flora (DRF) and 5 populations of Priority flora have been recorded within the local area (10km radius) of the proposed clearing. The closest, *Lasiopetalum membranaceum* (Priority 3), is located 6.6km north of the area under application.

The area under application is in Degraded condition (Keighery 1994), consisting of a parkland cleared tuart woodland with a dominant weed understorey.

It is considered unlikely that the DRF and priority flora species identified within the local area are present within the area under application. Therefore, it is unlikely this proposal is at variance to this Principle.

Methodology DEC site visit (2006);
Keighery (1994);
GIS databases:
- Declared Rare and Priority Flora List - CALM 13/08/03
- Bunbury 1m Orthomosaic - DLI 03

(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

There are no records of Threatened Ecological Communities or Threatened Plant Communities in the vicinity of the proposed clearing.

The nearest recorded TEC is approximately 9.5 km north of the site under application. Given the vegetation under application is degraded, and consists of parkland cleared overstorey, it is not likely to comprise a TEC.

It is therefore unlikely the proposed clearing is necessary for the maintenance of a Threatened Ecological Community, and not likely to be at variance to this Principle.

Methodology GIS databases:
- Threatened Ecological Communities - CALM 15/7/03
- Threatened Plant Communities - DEP 06/95

(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 likely to be at variance to this Principle

The vegetation proposed to be cleared is a component of Beard Vegetation Association 998 (Hopkins et al. 2001) of which there is 35.9% (Shepherd et al. 2001) of the pre-European extent remaining and therefore of 'depleted'

status for Biodiversity conservation (Department of Natural Resources and Environment 2002). The vegetation under application is also within the Swan Coastal Plain Bioregion in the Shire of Harvey of which there is, respectively, 41.8% and 60.1% of pre-European extent remaining.

The vegetation at the site is component of Mattiske Vegetation Complex Yoongarillup (Havel 2002) of which there is 45.0% of the pre-European extent remaining and therefore of 'depleted' status for Biodiversity conservation (Department of Natural Resources and Environment 2002).

The condition of the vegetation proposed for clearing is considered to be in Degraded condition (Keighery 1994; DEC site visit 2006). The proponent has agreed to revegetate an area of 6ha once the extraction operation is completed. The area will be revegetated with local endemic species. The applicant has committed to fencing this area from stock.

Aerial mapping indicates several other larger remnants of the same vegetation type to occur in the local area (10km radius) and are considered to be in better condition than the area under application.

Given the scale of the proposal and the degraded condition of the vegetation, the area under application is not considered to be a significant remnant within the local area. As the proposed revegetation area is 3.5ha larger than that of the proposed clearing, it is not considered likely the clearing proposal is at variance to this Principle.

Methodology DEC site visit (2006);
Keighery (1994);
Heddle et al. (1980);
Hopkins et al. (2001);
Department of Natural Resources and Environment (2002);
GIS databases:
- Heddle Vegetation Complexes - DEP 21/06/95;
- Interim Biogeographic Regionalisation of Australia - EM 18/10/00;
- Local Government Authorities - DLI 8/07/04;
- Pre European Vegetation - DA 01/01;
- Bunbury 1m Orthomosaic - DLI 03

(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 likely to be at variance to this Principle**
The area under application is located 800m west of the Yalgorup Lakes System. The Yalgorup Lakes System is an EPP Lake, RAMSAR, ANCA and conservation category wetland. There is no direct vegetated link between the area under application and the Yalgorup Lakes System. There are a large number of disturbances occurring between the two areas, including extractive industry and horticulture.

Given the current disturbances between the Lakes and the area under application, and the parkland cleared condition of the vegetation proposed for clearing, it is concluded it is unlikely the proposal will cause further degradation to the identified lakes.

Methodology GIS databases:
- ANCA, Wetlands - CALM 08/01
- EPP Areas - DEP 06/95
- EPP Lakes - DEP 28/07/03
- Geomorphic Wetlands (Mgt Categories) Swan Coastal Plain - DoE 15/9/04
- Hydrography Linear - DoE 1/2/04
- RAMSAR, Wetlands - CALM 21/10/02
- Bunbury 1m Orthomosaic - DLI 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**
The area under application has no known risk of Acid Sulphate Soils, a low salinity risk and a ground water salinity level of 500-1000 mg/L.

The area proposed to be cleared is in degraded condition (Keighery 1994), consisting of parkland cleared vegetation.

Due to the condition of the vegetation and the size of the area under application, land degradation issues are unlikely to occur.

Methodology GIS databases:

- Acid Sulphate Soil Risk Map, SCP - DoE 01/02/04
- Salinity Risk LM 25m - DOLA 00
- Groundwater Salinity, Statewide - 22/02/00

(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 likely to be at variance to this Principle

The Yalgorup National Park is located 880m west of the area under application, with no vegetated link connecting them.

The vegetation proposed for clearing is in Degraded condition (Keighery 1994) with severe weed invasion occurring.

Due to the condition of the vegetation, existing local disturbances, and the distance between the area under application and the national park, the proposed clearing is unlikely to impact on the environmental values of nearby conservation areas.

- Methodology** DEC site visit (2006)
Keighery (1994)
GIS database:
- CALM Managed Lands and Waters - CALM 1/06/04
 - Register of National Estate - EA 28/01/03
 - System 6 Conservation Reserves - DEP 06/95
 - System 1-5 and 7-12 Areas - DEP 06/95
 - Bunbury 1m Orthomosaic - DLI 03

(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 likely to be at variance to this Principle

The area under application is within the Harvey River-Coastal Hydrographic Catchment Area and the South West Coastal RIWI ground water area.

The area under application is in Degraded condition (Keighery 1994) with the vegetation being parkland cleared, with a dominant weed understorey.

Due to the condition of the vegetation, the area of the proposed clearing and the required revegetation to be placed on the permit, it is considered degradation of local water quality is unlikely to occur as a result of the proposal.

- Methodology** DEC site visit (2006);
Keighery (1994);
GIS databases:
- Hydrographic Catchments, Catchments - DoE 3/4/03
 - RIWI Act, Groundwater Areas - WRC 13/06/00

(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 proposed clearing is unlikely to exacerbate the incidence or intensity flooding due to its size and the consideration that the end land use is horticulture. The proposed clearing is therefore unlikely to impact on peak flood height or duration.

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

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

Comments

The area under application is zoned general farming under the Town Planning Scheme.

The proponent has obtained both planning approval and an Extractive Industry Licence for the proposal from the Shire of Harvey.

The Shire of Harvey have no objections to the proposed clearing, provided a 10m vegetated buffer remains on the property along Finn Road.

- Methodology** Shire of Harvey advice (2006) TRIM ref DOC228

4. Assessor's comments

Purpose	Method	Applied area (ha)/ trees	Comment
Extractive Industry	Mechanical Removal	2.5	Assessable criteria have been addressed which found none of the principles to be at variance to the clearing proposal. No objections were received regarding the proposal. It is recommended the clearing proposal be granted, with a condition requiring the revegetation of 6ha, and for this area to be fenced from stock.

5. References

- DEC site visit report (2006) TRIM ref DOC5253.
- 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.
- Hedde, E. M., Loneragan, O. W., and Havel, J. J. (1980) Vegetation Complexes of the Darling System, Western Australia. In Department of Conservation and Environment, Atlas of Natural Resources, Darling System, Western Australia.
- Hopkins, A.J.M., Beeston, G.R. and Harvey J.M. (2001) A database on the vegetation of Western Australia. Stage 1. CALMScience after J. S. Beard, late 1960's to early 1980's Vegetation Survey of Western Australia, UWA Press.
- Keighery, B.J. (1994) Bushland Plant Survey: A Guide to Plant Community Survey for the Community. Wildflower Society of WA (Inc). Nedlands, Western Australia.
- 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
BCS	Biodiversity Coordination Section of DEC
CALM	Department of Conservation and Land Management (now BCS)
DAFWA	Department of Agriculture and Food
DEC	Department of Environment and Conservation
DEP	Department of Environmental Protection (now DEC)
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 DEC)

