



## 1. Application details

### 1.1. Permit application details

Permit application No.: 1512/1  
Permit type: Purpose Permit

### 1.2. Proponent details

Proponent's name: Shire of Coorow

### 1.3. Property details

Property: GREEN HEAD TOWNSITE LOT 185 (House No. 165 OCEAN VIEW GREEN HEAD 6514)  
GREEN HEAD TOWNSITE LOT 210 (House No. 165 OCEAN VIEW GREEN HEAD 6514)  
Local Government Area: Shire Of Coorow  
Colloquial name: Coastal cliffs

### 1.4. Application

Clearing Area (ha)	No. Trees	Method of Clearing	For the purpose of:
0.03		Mechanical Removal	Miscellaneous

## 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 1026: Mosaic: Shrublands; Acacia rostellifera, A. Cyclops (S) & Melaleuca cardiophylla (N) thicket. (Hopkins et al. 2001, Shepherd et al. 2001).	The proposal includes clearing of up to 0.03ha of coastal vegetation. The vegetation under application consists of Frankenia pauciflora (Sea heath), Poa pomiformis (Coastal poa-grass), Portulaca oleracea (Pig face), Stylobasium australe and Threlkedia diffusa (Borger J Consultant Flora survey report, 2006).	Excellent: Vegetation structure intact; disturbance affecting individual species, weeds non-aggressive (Keighery 1994)	The description and condition of the vegetation under application was obtained from the Consultant's Flora Survey conducted in May 2006 (DEC Trim Ref No. DOC5736).

## 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 proposal includes clearing of up to 0.03ha of coastal vegetation. The vegetation under application consists of Frankenia pauciflora (Sea heath), Poa pomiformis (Coastal poa-grass), Portulaca oleracea (Pig face), Stylobasium australe and Threlkedia diffusa (Borger J Consultant Flora survey report, 2006). Due to the small area under application (0.03ha) it is unlikely that the vegetation under application comprises of a high level of biological diversity. This proposal is therefore unlikely to be at variance with this Principle.

**Methodology** (Borger J Consultant Flora survey report, 2006)  
GIS Databases:  
- Interim Biogeographic Regionalisation of Australia - EA 18/10/00.

### (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 proposal includes clearing of up to 0.03ha of coastal vegetation. The vegetation under application consists of Frankenia pauciflora (Sea heath), Poa pomiformis (Coastal poa-grass), Portulaca oleracea (Pig face), Stylobasium australe and Threlkedia diffusa (Borger J Consultant Flora survey report, 2006). Due to the small area under application (0.03ha) it is unlikely that the vegetation under application represents a significant habitat for fauna. This proposal is therefore unlikely to be at variance with this Principle.

**Methodology** (Borger J Consultant Flora survey report, 2006)

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

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

One Priority two species is located approximately 300m and one Priority four species is located approximately 9km from the area under application. A botanical consultant was engaged to conduct a Rare Flora Survey over the area under application. The flora survey identified fourteen species of which none are considered rare or threatened (Borger J Consultant Flora survey report, 2006). It is therefore unlikely that the proposed clearing will impact on significant flora.

**Methodology (Borger J Consultant Flora survey report, 2006)**

GIS Databases:

- Declared Rare and Priority Flora list - CALM 01/07/05
- Clearing Regulations - Environmentally Sensitive Areas - DoE 30/05/05

**(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 at variance to this Principle**

There are no records of Threatened Ecological Communities (TEC'S) within 10km from the area under application. This proposal is therefore not at variance with this Principle.

**Methodology GIS Databases:**

- Threatened Ecological Communities - CALM 12/04/05

**(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 under application is representative of Beard Vegetation Association 1026 (Hopkins et al. 2001) of which there is 89.2% of the pre-European extent remaining (Shepherd et al. 2001). The application falls within the Geraldton sandplains IBRA Bioregion and the Shire of Coorow which has 42.2% and 38.8% respectively of the pre-European extent remaining (Shepherd et al. 2001).

Beard Vegetation Association 1026 is therefore of 'least concern' for biodiversity conservation with the Geraldton Sandplains IBRA Region and the Shire of Coorow 'depleted' by conservation status (Department of Natural Resources and Environment 2002). Given the small area under application (0.03ha) and the 'least concern' status of Beard vegetation type 1026 this proposal is therefore not at variance with this Principle.

	Pre-European Reserves/CALM- area (ha)	Current extent (ha)	Remaining %*	Conservation status**	managed land,
%					
IBRA Bioregion - Geraldton Sandplains	3,136,277***	1,324,440***	42.2	Depleted	Not available
Shire - Coorow	424,583***	164,895***	38.8	Depleted	Not available
Beard veg type - 1026	70,704	63,068	89.2	Least concern	52.4

\* (Shepherd et al. 2001)

\*\* (Department of Natural Resources and Environment 2002)

\*\*\* Area within Intensive Landuse Zone

**Methodology GIS Databases:**

- Interim Biogeographic Regionalisation of Australia - EA 18/10/00
- Pre-European Vegetation - DA 01/01
- Local Government Authorities - DLI 08/07/04
- EPA Position Paper No 2 Agriculture Region - DEP 12/00
- Shepherd et al, 2001.
- Department of Natural Resources and Environment, 2002

**(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**

No watercourses or wetlands are located within the area under application. The coastal waterline lies adjacent to the area under application however the vegetation under application is not growing in association with the identified waterline. This proposal is therefore not at variance with this Principle.

**Methodology GIS Databases:**

- Hydrography, linear - DoE 01/02/04
- Hydrographic Catchments - Catchments - DoE 23/03/05

**(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 is characterised as coastal dune formations backed by the low lying deposits of inlets and estuaries. The chief soils on the dunes are calcareous sands. The consultant report identified that the area consists of limestone with shallow sandy soil (Borger J Consultant Flora survey report, 2006). Due to the small area under application (0.03ha) and that the vegetation will be rolled, it is therefore unlikely that this proposal will cause appreciable land degradation.

**Methodology (Borger J Consultant Flora survey report, 2006)**

- GIS Databases:
- Rainfall, Mean Annual - BOM 30/09/01
  - Salinity Risk LM 25m - DOLA 00
  - Acid Sulphate Soil risk map, SCP DOE 04/11/04
  - 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 Jurien Bay Marine Park is located adjacent to the area under application however the vegetation under application is terrestrial vegetation and is therefore unlikely to impact on the environmental values of the identified Marine Park. This proposal is therefore unlikely to be at variance with this Principle.

**Methodology GIS Databases:**

- CALM Regional Parks - CALM 12/04/02
- CALM Managed Lands & Waters - CALM 01/07/05
- Proposed National Parks FMP-CALM 19/03/03
- Register of National Estate - EA 28/01/03
- Clearing Regulations - Environmentally Sensitive Areas - DoE 30/05/05

**(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 consists of 0.03ha of coastal vegetation. The area under application receives average rainfall of approximately 500mm per annum. Due to the small area under application, it is unlikely that this proposal will cause deterioration in the quality of surface or underground water.

**Methodology GIS Databases:**

- Hydrographic Catchments - Catchments - DOE 23/03/05
- Hydrography, linear - DoE 01/02/04
- Rainfall, Mean Annual - BOM 30/09/01

**(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 is characterised as coastal dune formations backed by the low lying deposits of inlets and estuaries. The chief soils on the dunes are calcareous sands. The consultant report identified that the area consists of limestone with shallow sandy soil (Borger J Consultant Flora survey report, 2006). Due to the small area under application (0.03ha) and the sandy nature of the soils it is unlikely that this proposal will cause, or exacerbate, the incidence of flooding.

**Methodology (Borger J Consultant Flora survey report, 2006)**

- GIS Databases:
- Rainfall, Mean Annual - BOM 30/09/01
  - Topographic Contours, Statewide - DOLA 12/09/02
  - Soils, Statewide - DA 11/99

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

**Comments**

The Shire of Coorow has advised that there are no planning approvals or other requirements that will affect this proposal.

There is no further requirement for a RIWI Act Licence, Works Approval or EP Act Licence for the area under application.

There are two Aboriginal Sites of Significance over the area under application. The proponents will be advised in the covering letter.

The area under application is within Crown Reserve 31229, reserved for the purpose of parking and recreation. It is the CEO of the Department's view that the grant of a clearing permit in this case constitutes a secondary approval that removes the Environmental Protection Act's prohibition on the applicant exercising its statutory powers. Accordingly the CEO is not required to comply with future act procedures under the Native Title Act 1993.

Two Environmental Impact Assessments (EIA's) were conducted over the area under application as part of the Shire of Coorow Town Planning Scheme which identified proposed areas for infrastructure and areas of conservation within the Shire of Coorow. Neither of the proposals were formally assessed and managed through scheme maps, provisions and local planning strategy. These EIA's do not affect this application as the property is vested with the Shire of Coorow for parking and recreation and is zoned accordingly to conduct these works (EPA reference CRN145179).

#### Methodology

### 4. Assessor's comments

Purpose	Method	Applied area (ha)/ trees	Comment
Miscellaneous	Mechanical Removal	0.03	The assessable criteria have been addressed and no objections were raised. The assessing officer therefore recommends that the permit should be granted.

### 5. References

- Borger J (2006) Rare Flora Search of Dynamite Bay Greenhead Shire of Coorow. Western Australia. DEC TRIM ref No. DOC5736.
- 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 (2000) Environmental protection of native vegetation in Western Australia. Clearing of native vegetation, with particular reference to the agricultural area. Position Statement No. 2. December 2000. Environmental Protection Authority.
- 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.
- 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)



