

## **Clearing Permit Decision Report**

## . Application details

1.1. Permit application details

Permit application No.:

1373/1

Permit type:

Area Permit

1.2. Proponent details

Proponent's name:

Integrated Tree Cropping Limited

1.3. Property details

Property:

LOT 2033 ON PLAN 206474 ( ROCKY GULLY 6397)

Local Government Area:

Shire Of Plantagenet

Colloquial name:

1.4. Application

No. Trees

Method of Clearing

For the purpose of:

Clearing Area (ha)

80

Burning

Hazard reduction or fire control

## 2. Site Information

## 2.1. Existing environment and information

#### 2.1.1. Description of the native vegetation under application

The proposal includes clearing of 80 isolated

approximately 400 ha. The

paddock is used for grazing

paddock trees on

and pasture.

#### **Vegetation Description**

Beard Vegetation Association 3:

Medium forest; jarrahmarri.

Mattiske Vegetation Complex FH2:

Woodland of Eucalyptus wandoo-Corymbia calophylla with some Eucalyptus marginata subsp. marginata on slopes of low undulating hills in subhumid and semiarid zones.

Mattiske Vegetation Complex FH5:

Mosaic of low open woodland of Melaleuca cuticularis, tall shrubland of Melaleuca densa with occasional Eucalyptus rudis on valley floors in humid to semiarid zones.

Mattiske Vegetation Complex Mm:

Open forest of Eucalyptus marginata subsp. marginata-Corymbia calophylla-Banksia grandis on undulating low rises in subhumid and semiarid zones.

## Clearing Description Vegetation Condition

Completely Degraded: No longer intact; completely/almost completely without native species (Keighery 1994)

#### Comment

Observed from satellite images (GIS Database-Pemberton 1.4m Orthomosaic):

The area proposed to be cleared has been used for cattle grazing, and is lacking ground cover, understory and almost all overstory. Of all the remaining isolated trees, the 80 trees proposed to be cleared are in a degraded state from constant grazing pressures.

## 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 biodiversity value of the area under application is limited, as the vegetation is Completely Degraded (Keighery 1994).

The area proposed to be cleared consists of 80 trees, predominantly Eucalyptus species, over an area of approximately 400ha. No native ground cover, understorey or overstorey species are present, and the land is currently used for pasture and cattle grazing.

It is unlikely that the area proposed to be cleared holds a high level of biological diversity due to the minimal variety of native species and lack of native understorey.

#### Methodology

Keighery (1994).

GIS Database: Pemberton 1.4m Orthomosaic - DOLA 01.

## (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

Aerial photographs show that the area is sparsely vegetated and is Completely Degraded (Keighery 1994). Due to the absence of mid, lower and understorey vegetation the habitat value of the area is limited. In addition the continued impact of livestock on the proposed area is likely to significantly compromise the long term survival of the remaining vegetation.

Therefore the proposal is unlikely to be at variance to this Principle.

Additionally, the proponent has proposed to revegetate an area of approximately 3ha located on the same property to mitigate the potential impacts that the proposed clearing may have on habitat values and ensure the long term retention of habitat values on the property.

#### Methodology

Keighery (1994).

GIS Database: Pemberton 1.4m 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

Two Declared Rare Flora (DRF) species are found within a 10km radius of the proposed clearing. The closest is Calandenia christineae, located 9.9km south-east of the proposed area.

Due to the Completely Degraded (Keighery 1994) condition of the vegetation and the lack of direct vegetation corridors between any DRF populations and the area under application, it is unlikely that the proposed clearing would be at variance to this Principle.

#### Methodology

GIS Databases:

Declared Rare and Priority Flora List - CALM - 01/07/2005.

Pemberton 1.4m Orthomosaic - DOLA 01.

## (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 Threatened Ecological Communities (TEC) in the vicinity of the proposed clearing. The closest TEC is found 40km south west. There is no vegetation link between the area proposed to be cleared and the TEC.

It is therefore unlikely that the proposed clearing is at variance to this Principle.

## Methodology

**GIS Database** 

Threatened Ecological Communities - CALM - 12/04/2005.

# (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 National Objective and Targets for Biodiversity Conservation 2001-2005 (AGPS 2001) recognises that the retention of 30% or more of the pre-clearing extent of each ecological community is the target.

|                       | Pre-European<br>area (ha) | Current extent (ha) | Remaining<br>%* | Conservation status** |
|-----------------------|---------------------------|---------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|
| IBRA Bioregion -      |                           |                     |                 |                       |
| Jarrah Forest         | 4,544,335                 | 2,665,480           | 58.7            | Least Concern         |
| Shire - Plantagenet   | 485,073                   | 231,912             | 47.8            | Depleted              |
| Beard Veg Type 3      | 3,046,385                 | 2,197,837           | 72.1            | Least Concern         |
| Mattiske Veg Type FH5 | 214,498                   | 125,315             | 58.4            | Least Concern         |
| Mattiske Veg Type FH2 | 469,231                   | 215,378             | 45.9            | Vulnerable            |
| Mattiske Veg Type Mm  | 71,443                    | 15,480              | 21.7            | Least Concern         |

<sup>\*(</sup>Shepherd et al. 2001) & (Mattiske Consulting 1998)

As the proposed clearing is completely degraded and consists of isolated paddock trees, it is not representative of vegetation complexes in the area. Therefore the proposed clearing is not at variance to this Principle.

Additionally, the applicant has advised that they will revegetate approximately 3ha of the property (within wetland) with various native species of seed, sourced from the property, to mitigate any long term loss of vegetation.

#### Methodology

Mattiske Consulting (1998)

Shepherd et al. (2001)

Department of Natural Resources and Environment (2002)

GIS Databases:

Pre-European vegetation - DA 01/01.

Mattiske Vegetation - CALM 98.

Interim Biogeographic Regionalisation of Australia - EA 18/10/2000.

## (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 Frankland River is located 6.5kms south-west of the proposed area. There are two 'Conservation Class' South Coast Significant Wetlands located within 15kms of the area proposed to be cleared.

There is no direct vegetation link between the area under application and the South Coast Significant Wetlands or the Frankland River. The proposed clearing will not impact these watercourses or wetlands, due to the small scale clearing and the location of the proposal.

A minor perennial watercourse runs directly through the property, but the trees proposed to be cleared are not associated with riparian vegetation.

It is therefore unlikely that the proposal is at variance to this principle.

#### Methodology

GIS Databases:

South Coast Significant Wetlands - DOE - 04/08/2003.

Rivers 250K - GA.

Pemberton 1.4m Orthomosaic - DOLA 01.

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

#### Comments

#### Proposal is not at variance to this Principle

The area proposed to be cleared has no known risk of Acid Sulphite Soils, low salinity risk and the ground water salinity is mapped at 3000-7000mg/L.

Due to the small amount of trees proposed to be cleared (80 trees) over a large area (400ha approx.), and the Completely Degraded (Keighery 1994) condition of the area, it is unlikely the proposal would cause any appreciable land degradation.

## Methodology

Keighery (1994).

GIS Databases:

Acid Sulphate Soil Risk Map, SCP - DOE - 04/11/2004.

Salinity Risk LM 25m - DOLA - 2000.

Groundwater Salinity - Statewide - 22/02/2000.

<sup>\*\*(</sup>Department of Natural Resources and Environment 2002)

## (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

There are 3 CALM Managed Lands located within 13 kms of the proposed area.

Mt Roe National Park is located 13km south-east and 10km south-west.

Tootanellup Nature Reserve is located 7.5km east.

Quindinup Nature Reserve is located 9km north-west.

There is no direct vegetation link between the area proposed to be cleared and the conservation reserves listed above. The proposed area is not deemed to contribute significantly to the environmental values of any of these conservation reserves due to the Completely Degraded condition of the vegetation and its distance from the reserves.

Therefore, the proposal is unlikely to be at variance to this Principle.

#### Methodology

GIS Databases:

CALM Managed Lands and Waters - CALM - 01/07/2005.

System 1 to 5 Areas - DEP - 06/1995.

Register of National Estates - EA - 28/01/2003.

## 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 located within the Nornalup Inlet/Frankland River Catchment Area.

The area under application is not located within a Public Drinking Water Source Area (PDWSA), proclaimed ground water area or surface water area. Average rainfall in the area is 700mm/y.

Due to the small scale clearing proposed, of 80 trees within 400ha, it is unlikely to significantly degrade water quality within the area.

#### Methodology

GIS Databases:

Hydrographic Catchments - Catchments - DOE - 23/03/2005.

RIWI Act Ground Water Areas - WRC - 13/06/2000. RIWI Surface Water Areas - WRC - 18/10/2002.

Rainfall - Mean Annual - BOM - 30/09/2001.

Public Drinking Water Source Areas - DOE - 07/02/2006.

## 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 as a result of the proposed clearing are unlikely to occur due to the size and location of the proposed area. The proposed area is approximately 7kms from the Frankland River. It is considered that the removal of vegetation from the proposed site would have no impact on peak flood height or duration.

### Methodology

GIS Database:

Rivers 250K - GA.

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

## Comments

The proposal is not at variance with any planning instruments and no further licences or approvals are required.

Methodology

### Assessor's recommendations

Method Applied

Decision

Comment / recommendation

Hazard reduction or fire control

Purpose

Burning

area (ha)/ trees 80 Grant

The proponent has applied to clear 80 trees within a 400ha area for the purpose of establishing a blue gum plantation.

The assessable criteria have been addressed and no objections have been raised.

## 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

Department of Natural Resources and Environment 2002.

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)