



## 1. Application details

### 1.1. Permit application details

Permit application No.: 1321/1  
 Permit type: Area Permit

### 1.2. Proponent details

Proponent's name: KoltaszSmith on behalf of Jasper Hill Resources Pty Ltd

### 1.3. Property details

Property: LOT 2 ON DIAGRAM 63170 (Lot No. 2 LUCAS ROSA GLEN 6285)  
 LOT 3633 ON PLAN 203192 (Lot No. 3633 LUCAS ROSA GLEN 6285)  
 Local Government Area: Shire Of Augusta-Margaret River  
 Colloquial name:

### 1.4. Application

| Clearing Area (ha) | No. Trees | Method of Clearing | For the purpose of:             |
|--------------------|-----------|--------------------|---------------------------------|
| 1.8                |           | Mechanical Removal | Dam construction or maintenance |

## 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 3: Medium forest; jarrah-marri (Hopkins et al. 2001, Shepherd et al. 2002).  | The proposal includes the clearing of 1.8ha of vegetation from within Lot 2 and 3633 Lucas Rd in the locality of Rosa Glen, for construction of a dam. The area to be cleared consists of a narrow corridor of vegetation comprising only Swamp Peppermint (Taxandria linearifolia), with several interspersed Marri (Corymbia calophylla) remaining on slightly higher ground. The dominant understorey species along the main creekline include Arum lily (Zantedeschia aethiopica) and Blackberry (Rubus spp.). | Degraded: Structure severely disturbed; regeneration to good condition requires intensive management (Keighery 1994) | Observed during site visit: the existing vegetation has been highly disturbed due to stock impacts over a period of time. This is clearly evidenced by the lack of native understorey and dominance of weeds, and altered hydrology due to overgrazing and trampling. |
| Mattiske vegetation complex Treeton (T and Tw): uplands (T) carrying woodland to open forest of jarrah-marri (Eucalyptus marginata subsp. marginata - Corymbia calophylla), grading into yarri-jarrah-marri (Eucalyptus patens - Eucalyptus marginata subsp. marginata - Corymbia calophylla) on valley slopes (Tw) and woodland of paperbarks on valley floors (Heddle et al. 1980). |  |  |   |

## 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 proposed clearing of 1.8 ha is of degraded to good condition (Keighery 1994), remnant riparian vegetation consisting of a narrow corridor containing Taxandria linearifolia, with an occasional Corymbia calophylla remaining on higher ground (Elscot 2005). Dominant understorey species comprise of Zantedeschia aethiopica and Rubus sp., including two isolated Baumea vaginalis clumps.

The vegetation structure of the area proposed to be cleared is severely disrupted due to stock grazing for an extended period of time (DEC 2006).

The vegetation under application is located in a semi-cleared agricultural area and is comprised of Beard vegetation association 3 (Hopkins et al. 2001) of which there is over 72% (Shepherd et al. 2001) of the pre-European extent remaining.

The high level of disturbance at this site and lack of native species density suggests the original biodiversity has been significantly compromised, thus is not likely to represent a high level of biodiversity.

Therefore, it is unlikely this proposal is at variance with this Principle.

**Methodology** DEC Site Visit Report (2006);  
Elscot (2005);  
Keighery (1994);  
Hopkins et al. (2001);  
Shepherd et al. (2001);  
GIS Databases:  
- Busselton 50cm ORTHOMOSAIC - DLI03

**(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 proposed clearing consists of a thin corridor of vegetation, encompassing a tributary of the Chapman Brook, through existing cleared farmland that connects several small patches of surrounding remnant vegetation.

The vegetation under application is in degraded condition (Keighery 1994), with a high level of disturbance due to stock impacts over many years. The effects of trampling and constant grazing (removal) of the native understorey have resulted in heavy grass and weed invasion, suggesting the original biodiversity and habitat value has been significantly compromised.

A submission received from the Shire outlines the area (Chapman Brook catchment) is known for habitat supporting the Endangered *Geocrinia alba* (white-bellied frog). Biodiversity Coordination Section, DEC (2007) advise that "the characteristics of known *G. alba* habitat, and the lack of these characteristics at this site indicate this system would have been low quality habitat at best" ... "more likely to have not been suitable habitat". In addition, the impacts of stock and "removal of understorey allowing grass invasion and changed hydrology" indicate that it is "highly unlikely the species would have been able to persist in this system, even if the species was there originally".

Another submission received outlines that the corridor of remnant vegetation provides important ecological linkages between areas of remnant vegetation; however due to the high level of disturbance (unsuitable habitat) and abundance of surrounding remnants supporting more preferable habitat values, the proposal is unlikely to be at variance to this Principle.

**Methodology** DEC Site Visit (2006);  
Biodiversity Coordination Section, DEC (2007);  
Keighery (1994);  
GIS Database:  
- Busselton 50cm ORTHOMOSAIC - DLI03

**(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 no known records of Declared Rare Flora (DRF) within the local area (10km radius).

Three Priority 3 (P3) species occur in the local area, with the closest being 5.5km East of the area under application. One P4 species is also located 1.2km South-West; both are not within the same vegetation complex as the area under application.

Due to the scale of the proposed clearing and distance to identified species, it is unlikely the proposed clearing is at variance with this Principle.

**Methodology** GIS Database:  
- Declared Rare and Priority Flora List - CALM 13/08/03;  
- Busselton 50cm ORTHOMOSAIC - DLI03

**(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 known records of Threatened Ecological Communities (TEC) in the vicinity of the proposed clearing. The nearest is approximately 12.0km SouthEast and is not located within the same vegetation or soil type as the notified area.

Due to the degraded condition of the vegetation, it is unlikely this TEC would occur in the area under application, therefore it is unlikely that the proposed clearing is at variance to this Principle.

- Methodology** GIS Databases:
- Threatened Ecological Communities - CALM 12/04/05
  - Threatened Plant Communities - DEP 06/95
  - Environmentally Sensitive Areas - DOE 30/05/05

**(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 vegetation proposed to be cleared is a component of Beard Vegetation Association 3 (Hopkins et al. 2001) of which there is 72.1% (Shepherd et al. 2001) of the pre-European extent remaining and therefore of 'Least Concern' status for Biodiversity conservation (Department of Natural Resources and Environment 2002). The vegetation under application is also within the Augusta/Margaret River Shire of which there is 71.7% of pre-European extent remaining.

The vegetation at the site is a component of Mattiske Vegetation Complex Treeton (T) (Havel 2002) of which there is 52.7% of the pre-European extent remaining and therefore of a 'Least Concern' status for biodiversity conservation (Department of Natural Resources and Environment 2002).

The vegetation at the site is also component of Mattiske Vegetation Complex Treeton (Tw) (Havel 2002) of which there is 41.8% of the pre-European extent remaining and therefore of a 'Depleted' status for biodiversity conservation (Department of Natural Resources and Environment 2002).

A submission received outlines the area appears to be extensively cleared on a local scale, however through aerial mapping; the local area (10km radius) is approximately 45% vegetated. Therefore, the proposal is not at variance to this Principle.

In order to satisfy the Shires Town Planning Policy PE.31 Dams and Watercourses, the applicant has submitted a detailed and comprehensive rehabilitation, revegetation and foreshore plan to offset and mitigate the loss of biodiversity values.

- Methodology** Department of Natural Resources and Environment (2002);  
Havel (2002);  
Mattiske (1998);  
Hopkins et al. (2001);  
Shepherd et al. (2001);  
GIS databases:  
- Mattiske vegetation - CALM 24/3/98;  
- Local Government Authorities DLI 8/07/04;  
- Pre-European Vegetation DA 01/01;  
- Busselton 50cm ORTHOMOSAIC DLI03

**(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 at variance to this Principle**

The applicant is proposing to construct a dam and spillway on a minor perennial watercourse, a tributary of the Chapman Brook catchment.

No wetlands are located within the local area of the proposed clearing (10km radius), however the Upper Chapman Brook is located approximately 1.5km Southwest of the notified area.

The purpose of the clearing is for a dam, therefore the area under application is within an environment associated with a watercourse; therefore the proposal is at variance to this Principle.

To mitigate clearing of vegetation associated with a watercourse, revegetation addressing the Shire's Dams and Watercourses policy will be imposed as conditions of permit. The proponent has agreed to revegetate the area around the dam once construction is complete and to fence the area from stock, who currently have access to the watercourse.

- 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
- Busseton 50cm.ORTHOMOSAIC - DLI03

**(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**

DAFWA Land Degradation Assessment Report (2006) raises no potential land degradation issues for this proposal, if cleared for the intended land use.

The area under application has no mapped risk of Acid Sulphate Soils (ASS), a groundwater salinity level of 500 mg/L and no known salinity risk.

Therefore, it is unlikely the proposed clearing is at variance to this principle.

**Methodology DAFWA (2006);  
GIS Databases:**

- Acid Sulphate Soil Risk Map, SCP - DOE 01/02/04;
- Salinity Mapping LM 25m - DOLA 00;
- Salinity Monitoring LM 50m - DOLA 00;
- Salinity Risk 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 likely to be at variance to this Principle**

The Bramley National Park is located approximately 3.5km North-West; an unofficial timber reserve approximately 2.8km south; and the Blackwood State Forest approximately 7.5 and 10km East and North, respectively, of the proposed clearing, none of which are ecologically linked to the area under application.

Given the small and degraded nature of the area under application and conditions imposed to revegetate the area surrounding the dam, and prevent access from stock once construction is complete, it is unlikely the proposed clearing is ecologically linked to the nearby conservation areas; therefore it is unlikely the proposal is at variance to this Principle.

**Methodology GIS Databases:**

- CALM Managed Lands and Waters - CALM 1/06/04;
- Register of National Estate - EA 28/01/03;
- System 6 Conservation Reserves - DEP 06/95

**(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 proposed to be cleared is within the Chapman Brook catchment, with a low salinity risk mapped for the area, and is not within a proclaimed RIWI Act surface water area. The area, however, is part of the Blackwood RIWI Groundwater area.

Due to the small scale of the proposed clearing, the degraded nature of the area and the proponents commitment to replant and exclude stock, degradation of local water quality is unlikely to occur.

**Methodology 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 at variance to this Principle**

Flooding impacts are unlikely to occur as a result of the proposed clearing due to its small scale. It is considered that the removal of vegetation from the site would have no impact on peak flood height or duration; therefore the proposal is not at variance to this Principle.

**Methodology DAFWA (2006);  
GIS Databases:**

- Topographic Contours, Statewide - DOLA 12/09/02

**Comments**

The Shire granted development approval on 13 March 2006 for construction of the dam, with 51 attached conditions.

No other EP Act or RIWI Act approvals are required for this proposal.

One submission has been received for this application, opposing the proposal; issues raised include:  
- possible impacts on the nearby Bramley National Park. This has been addressed under Principle (h);  
- ecological linkages and corridors for local fauna. This has been addressed under Principle (b); and  
- clearing in already extensively cleared areas, this has been addressed under Principle (e).

Advice from the Shire of Augusta-Margaret River indicated that:

- the area is a known habitat of the Endangered G.alba. This has been addressed under Principle (b);
- the relevant sections of local planning policy for Dams and Watercourses need to be addressed. This has been addressed under Principle (f); and
- retention and revegetation practices. This has been addressed under Principle (f).

**Methodology**

**4. Assessor's comments**

| Purpose                                 | Method Applied | area (ha)/ trees | Comment   |
|---|----------------|------------------|---|
| Dam construction or Removal maintenance | Mechanical     | 1.8              | Assessable criteria have been addressed and no objections were raised. The assessment of the vegetated area under application revealed the proposal is at variance to Principle (f) for areas within the environment of a watercourse.<br><br>Principle (f): although the proposed clearing is within an environment associated with a watercourse, it is evident the watercourse has historically been impacted and degraded from the impacts of stock grazing. In order to offset the loss of this vegetation a condition to revegetate an equivalent area around the constructed dam will be imposed on the permit.<br><br>The assessing officer therefore recommends that the permit be granted, subject to the three conditions, to protect the biodiversity values of the area under application. |

**5. References**

AGPS (2001) The national objective and targets for biodiversity conservation 2001-2005. Commonwealth of Australia, Canberra.

Biodiversity Coordination Section, DEC (2007). Department of Environment and Conservation, Western Australia. TRIM Ref: DOC

DEC Site visit (2006). Department of Environment and Conservation, Bunbury.

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.

Elscot, S (2005). Landscape and Foreshore Rehabilitation Plan for a proposed new dam construction on Lot 2 of Locations 3750 and 3633 Lucas Road, Rosa Glen, Green Iguana, Dunsborough.

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  |
|-------|--|
| 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)