

# **Clearing Permit Decision Report**

# 1. Application details

1.1. Permit application details

Permit application No.:

1412/1

Permit type:

Area Permit

1.2. Proponent details

Proponent's name:

Hugh Smith

1.3. Property details

Property:

LOT 871 ON PLAN 160636

Local Government Area:

Shire Of Serpentine-Jarrahdale

Colloquial name:

1.4. Application

Clearing Area (ha)

No. Trees

Method of Clearing

For the purpose of:

6 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

Mattiske vegetation complex - Yarragil Complex 1 - Open forest of Eucalyptus marginata subsp. Marginata - Corymbia calophylla on slopes with mixtures of Eucalyptus patens and Eucalyptus megacarpa on the valley floors in humid and subhumid zones.

#### **Clearing Description**

The proposal includes the removal of six Eucalyptus trees for the extension of an existing dam. The proposed area is located directly adjacent to a seasonal watercourse, the majority of which contains introduced non-native species.

#### **Vegetation Condition**

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

#### Comment

Vegetation clearing description based on information obtained during a site inspection on 14 June 2006

Beard vegetation association 3: Medium forest; jarrah-marri

### 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

Based on the limited area of vegetation under application, the condition of said vegetation, and the proximity to well vegetated areas, it is considered unlikely that the proposed area is representative of an area of higher biological diversity.

Methodology

Site inspection 14/6/2006 (DEC TRIM ref: DOC2250)

(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 under application consists of 6 relatively young *Eucalyptus* trees, with no nesting hollows or other obvious habitat observed during the site inspection. Based on the limited amount of vegetation under application, and the proximity to nearby vegetated areas, the clearing as proposed is not likely to be at variance to this principle.

Methodology

Site inspection 14/6/2006 (DEC TRIM ref: DOC2250)

(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 8 known occurrences of Declared Rare or Priority Flora (DRF) within the local area (5km radius of the application), the closest of which is located approximately 2.4km to the north. Based on the selectively

nature of the proposed clearing, and the highly modified area in which it is proposed, clearing is considered unlikely to be at variance to this principle.

#### Methodology

GIS Databases:

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 vegetation under application is located approximately 3.6 kilometres east of the nearest known TEC. The vegetation under application is also considered to be within a completely degraded condition, having native species within the area limited to six individual Eucalyptus trees. It is therefore considered unlikely that the proposed clearing is at variance to this principle.

#### Methodology

GIS Database:

Threatened Ecological Communities - CALM 12/04/05

Site inspection (14/06/2006)

# (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

Mattiske Consulting (1998) identifies the vegetation under application as Yarragil complex of which there is 87.9% of pre-European vegetation remaining, and which is considered to be in the category of least concern (Department of Natural Resources and Environment 2002).

The vegetation under application is also part of Beard vegetation association 3 of which there is 66.2% remaining (Shepherd et al. 2002), and which is also considered to be in the category of least concern (Department of Natural Resources and Environment 2002).

Given the vegetation complex representation, and limited extent of the tree removal, the proposed clearing is not considered likely to be at variance to this Principle.

#### Methodology

Department of Natural Resources and Environment (2002)

Shepherd et al. (2001)

GIS Databases:

Mattiske Vegetation - CALM 24/03/98 Pre-European Vegetation - DA 01/01

# (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 likely to be at variance to this Principle

The vegetation proposed for removal is located directly adjacent to a minor perennial watercourse, with the vegetation considered to be in a completely degraded condition. The proposed clearing is considered unlikely to impact on the nearby watercourse, and is therefore considered unlikely to be at variance to this principle.

### Methodology

Site inspection 14/6/2006 (DEC TRIM ref: DOC2250)

GIS Database:

Hydrography, linear - DOE 1/2/04

Geomorphic wetlands (Mgt Categories), Swan Coastal Plain - DOE

EPP, Lakes - DEP 1/12/92

# (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 landform and soils within the proposed area are identified as 'Mw31', defined as deeply incised, steep scarp and valley slopes, with chief soils seem to be acid red earth. The soils on site were observed to have a relatively high clay content, and did not appear susceptible to wind erosion.

While the proposed removal of vegetation is located directly adjacent to a minor perennial watercourse, it is considered unlikely to be at variance to this principle, based on the limited extent and already existing modified environment.

#### Methodology

Site inspection 14/6/2006 (DEC TRIM ref: DOC2250)

GIS Database:

Soils, Statewide - DA 11/99

(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 vegetation under application is located on a property completely surrounded by State Forest. Based on the limited size of the proposed clearing, and the highly modified environment in which it is present, the clearing as proposed is not considered likely to be at variance to this principle.

Methodology

GIS Database:

CALM Managed Lands and Waters - CALM 1/07/05

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 proposed clearing is not located within, or upstream of, a proclaimed Public Drinking Water Source Area. Based on the limited extent of the proposed clearing, and the high nutrient and moisture retention properties of the soil, the clearing as proposed is not considered likely to be at variance to this principle.

Methodology

GIS Database:

Public Drinking Water Source Areas (PDWSA) - DOE 07/02/06

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

While the proposed clearing is located directly adjacent to a minor perennial watercourse, it is considered unlikely to be at variance to this principle due to the limited amount of vegetation under application.

Methodology

Site inspection 14/6/2006 (DEC TRIM ref: DOC2250)

GIS Database:

Hydrography, linear - DOE 1/2/04

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

Comments

The minor perennial watercourse is not a proclaimed watercourse under the Rights in Water and Irrigation Act 1914, and thus proposed works do not require a Permit to Modify Bed and Banks.

No further approvals are required in relation to this application.

Methodology

### Assessor's recommendations

area (ha)/ trees

Purpose Method Applied

Decision

Comment / recommendation

Dam Mechanical construction oRemoval

maintenance

Grant

The assessable criteria have been addressed and no objections were raised. The assessing officer therefore recommends that the permit should be granted.

# 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.

EPA (2003) Guidance for the Assessment of Environmental Factors -level of assessment of proposals affecting natural areas within the System 6 region and Swan Coastal Plain portion of the System 1 Region. Report by the EPA under the Environmental Protection Act 1986. No 10 WA.

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

Department of Conservation and Land Management Department of Agriculture Department of Environmental Protection (now DoE) CALM

DAWA

DEP

DoE

DoIR

DRF

Department of Environmental Protection
Department of Environment
Department of Industry and Resources
Declared Rare Flora
Environmental Protection Policy
Geographical Information System EPP GIS Hectare (10,000 square metres)
Threatened Ecological Community ha TEC

WRC Water and Rivers Commission (now DoE)