



1. Application details

1.1. Permit application details

Permit application No.: 1523/1
 Permit type: Area Permit

1.2. Proponent details

Proponent's name: Michael John Cheney

1.3. Property details

Property: LOT 312 ON PLAN 103660 (Lot No. 312 PERICLES EAST AUGUSTA 6290)
 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: |
|--------------------|-----------|--------------------|-----------------------|
| 0.07 | | Burning | Building or Structure |
| | | Burning | Building or Structure |

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 125: Bare areas; salt lakes | | Very Good: Vegetation structure altered; obvious signs of disturbance (Keighery 1994) | Vegetation condition was determined from Orthomosaic photography and photographs supplied by the proponent. |
| Beard Vegetation Association 1108: Shrublands; Acacia decipiens | | | |
| Mattiske Vegetation Complex - D'Entrecasteaux (Dr): Tall shrubland of Agonis flexuosa and closed heath of Olearia axillaris-Spyridium globulosum on coastal low dunes in the perhumid zone.. | | | |
| See above | | Excellent: Vegetation structure intact; disturbance affecting individual species, weeds non-aggressive (Keighery 1994) | Vegetation condition was determined from Orthomosaic photography and photographs supplied by the proponent. |

DRAFT

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 under application is for a building structure, access way and fire protection within the Shire of Augusta Margaret River. Aerial photography and photographs supplied by the proponent suggest that vegetation within the 0.07ha proposal site is of very good to excellent condition (Keighery, 1994).

The proposed clearing of 0.07 hectares does not constitute a high level of biodiversity, and is therefore not likely to be at variance to this principle.

Methodology Keighery (1994)

(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 is to clear a total of 0.07 hectares for the purpose of a building structure, access way and fire control within the Shire of Augusta Margaret River. Aerial photography and photographs supplied by the proponent suggest that the condition of vegetation within the application areas ranges from very good to excellent (Keighery, 1994).

Although the area may provide habitat for native fauna, the area proposed to be cleared is small (0.07ha) and surrounding vegetation is extensive and in as good, or better, condition than that proposed to be cleared.

Given the above, the vegetation under application is unlikely to provide significant habitat for indigenous fauna.

Methodology Keighery (1994)

GIS Database:

- FAUNA Sac Bio Datasets 200607

- Augusta Townsite 20cm Orthomosaic y DLI04

(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 22 known records of Declared Rare Flora (DRF) within a five kilometre radius of the area under application. The closest known record is a Priority 2 species, Caladenis abbreviate, located approximately one kilometre north-east of the proposed clearing. All of the known DRF occur on different Mattiske vegetation complexes and different soil types to the application area.

A Flora Report prepared by Matei (2006) on behalf of the proponent found no evidence of rare or priority flora within the proposed clearing.

Given the above, the proposed clearing is unlikely to be at variance to this principle.

Methodology Matei (2006)

GIS Database:

- Soils, Statewide - DA 11/99

- DEFL SAC Bio dataset 200607

(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

Mapping indicates there are no known Threatened Ecological Communities (TECs) within a five kilometre radius of the area under application. The closest TEC is located approximately 7.5kms south-west of the application area, and occurs on a different Mattiske vegetation complex and soil type to the application area.

Given the above, the proposed clearing is not likely to be at variance to this principle.

Methodology GIS Database:

- Soils, Statewide - DA 11/99

- TEC_POINTS Sac Bio Datasets 200607

(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

| Pre-European Tenure | (ha)* | Current Extent (ha)* | Remaining (%)* | Conservation Status** | % in Secure |
|------------------------|-------|-------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|-------------|
|------------------------|-------|-------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|-------------|

IBRA Bioregion:

Warren

834053.950

657114.138

78.8

Least concern

46.7

Shire: Augusta Margaret River 222,718 159,679 71.7 Least concern

Beard Unit 125
Beard Unit 1108
320.291
8744.781

224.676
8098.314

70.1
92.6

Least concern

Least concern
6.6
61.9

Mattiske Veg:

D'Entrecasteaux (Dr)

445

241

54.1

Least concern

The area under application is located in the Shire of Augusta Margaret River and within the Warren Bioregion. The extent of pre-European vegetation within these areas is 71.7% and 78.8% respectively (Shepherd et al., 2001; Shepherd, 2006).

The vegetation proposed to be cleared is a component of Beard Vegetation Associations 125 and 1108 (Hopkins et al., 2001) of which there is 70.1% and 92.6% respectively of the pre-European vegetation extent remaining (Shepherd, 2006). These vegetation types are all considered as having a conservation status of 'Least Concern' (Department of Natural Resources and Environment, 2002).

The proposed clearing also forms a component of Mattiske vegetation complex D'Entrecasteaux (Dr) which retains 54.1% of its pre-European extent (Mattiske Consulting, 1998) and has a conservation status of 'Least Concern' (Department of Natural Resources and Environment, 2002).

Given that the proposed clearing does not fall within an extensively cleared area and that the pre-European extent of the Warren Bioregion, Beard Vegetation Associations and Mattiske Vegetation Complex of the area under application meet the National Objectives Targets for Biodiversity Conservation 2001 - 2005 (being greater than 30% of that present pre-1750) this proposal is not at variance to this principle.

Methodology Shepherd et al (2001)
Shepherd (2006)
Hopkins et al., 2001
Mattiske Consulting (1998)
Department of Natural Resources and Environment (2002)
GIS Database:
- Pre-European Vegetation - DA 10/01
- Interim Biogeographic Regionalisation of Australia - EA 18/10/00
- Mattiske Vegetation - CALM 24/3/98

(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**
There are no wetlands or watercourses within the proposed clearing site.

A minor perennial watercourse is located approximately 300m to the north of the proposed clearing and the Hardy Inlet lies some 70m to the south. The Hardy Inlet has been classified as an Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA). Aerial photography suggests that the application area is separated from the Hardy Inlet by a dense wall of coastal vegetation.

Due to the low topography of the local area (0 ý 5m AHD) and the buffering of coastal vegetation to the south, clearing of native vegetation as proposed is unlikely to compromise the values of the Hardy Inlet.

The proposed clearing is unlikely to be at variance to this principle.

Methodology GIS Database:
- Hydrography, Linear - DOE 1/2/04
- Clearing Regulations - Environmentally Sensitive Areas - DOE 30/0/05
- Topographic Contours, Statewide - DOLA 12/09/02

(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**
Department of Agriculture and Food (DAFWA, 2006) advised that the proposed clearing of 0.07 hectares of native vegetation for building structure, access and firebreak is unlikely to cause appreciable land degradation.

The proposal is unlikely to be at variance to this principle.

Methodology DAFWA (2006)

(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**
There are three conservation areas within a five kilometre radius of the proposed clearing. The closest of these is the Scott National Park, located approximately 2.6km to the north-east of the application area. The vegetation under application forms a discreet area of Mattiske Vegetation Complex D'Entrecasteaux (Dr) (Mattiske, 1998) on the low dunal system of the Hardy Inlet. This vegetation complex is different to the Mattiske vegetation types of the nearby conservation reserves.

Given the distance between the proposed clearing and the identified conservation reserves, it is unlikely that the clearing of native vegetation will impact the environmental values of nearby conservation areas.

Methodology GIS Database:
- CALM Managed Lands and Waters - CALM 1/07/05
- Mattiske Vegetation - CALM 24/3/98

(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 proposed clearing site lies within the _Coastal Catchment. The region is of extremely low relief (0 -5m AHD) due to its position on the shores of the hardy Inlet, and has an annual rainfall of 1100mm. Groundwater salinity has been mapped at <500 mg/L.

Due to the small area proposed to be cleared in relation to the topography, it is unlikely that the clearing of native vegetation will cause deterioration in the quality of surface water or groundwater within the local area.

Methodology GIS Database:
- Hydrographic Catchments - Catchments - DOE 23/03/05
- Rainfall, Mean Annual - BOM 30/09/01
- Topographic Contours, Statewide - DOLA 12/09/02
- Groundwater Salinity, Statewide - 22/02/00

(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**
Due to the topography within the local area, and the scale and nature of the proposed clearing, it is unlikely to exacerbate the incidence of flooding within the local area.

Methodology GIS Database:
- Topographic Contours, Statewide ý DOLA 12/09/02

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

Comments
The applicant has received approval from the Shire of Augusta Margaret River to construct 2 dwellings and an outbuilding at Lot 312 Pericles St, East Augusta subject to conditions set out in Planning Approval P26081.

There is a Native Title Claim over the area under application. The Department of Environment and Conservation's advertising of the application in the West Australian Newspaper constitutes legal notification of the Native Title representative body for the purpose of the future act procedures under the Native Title Act 1993. No response was received from the representative body.

Methodology GIS Database:
- Native Title Claims - DLI 07/11/05

4. Assessor's comments

| Purpose | Method | Applied area (ha)/ trees | Comment |
|-----------------------|---------|--------------------------|---|
| Building or Structure | Burning | 0.07 | The assessable criteria have been addressed and the proposal is not at variance to Principle (e); and is not likely to be at variance to Principles (a), (b), (c), (d), (f), (g), (h), (i) and (j). |
| Building or Structure | Burning | | Building zone / Access way / Fire protection. |

5. References

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) |

