Department of Environment and Conservation

Clearing Permit Decision Report

1. Application details

1.1. Permit application details

Permit application No.: 1784/1

Permit type: Area Permit

1.2. Proponent details

Proponent's name: Flona Jane Fenwick

1.3. Property details

Property: LOT 1 ON DIAGRAM 57248 (Lot No. 349 DAVIES 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:
0.41		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
The area subject to this application is located within the Scott River No. 1108 Vegetation Complex (Hopkins et al., 2001). Mattiske (1998) describes the area as Scott (Swd) and D'Entrecasteaux (Drd) vegetation complexes. Scott (Swd) is a mosiac of sedgeland of Restionaceae-Cyperaceae spp. and closed heath of Myrtaceae-Proteaceae spp. with occasional Banksia ilicifolia on swampy depressions and stunted Eucalyptus marginata subsp. marginata-Banksia-attenuata-Xylomelum occidentale on low sandy rises in hyperhumid and prehumid zones. D'Entrecasteaux (Drd) is a woodland or Agonis flexuosa and closed heath of Olearia axillaris-Spyridium globulosum on coastal low dunes in the prehumid zone.		Good: Structure significantly altered by multiple disturbance; retains basic structure/ability to regenerate (Keighery 1994)	No Clearing Description provided, therefore orthomosaic mapping was used to assess the vegetation condition. From the analysis of aerial mapping provided by the proponent (TRIM ref DOC18460) and Department (TRIM DOC18985) the vegetation with in the application appears to be in good condition with a 'significantly' modified understorey.

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 application area is unlikely to provide a significant habitat for fauna, is unlikely to contain rare flora and is unlikely to be associated with any Threatened Ecological Communities.

Orthomosaic mapping indicates that there are extensive areas of native vegetation remaining within the 10km local area that are likely to be of similar or better condition than the application area. The photographs also

indicate that the area proposed to be cleared has a 'significantly' modified understorey.

Given the above it is unlikely that the vegetation that is the subject of this application would represent an ecosystem or genetic diversity of higher ecological value than the other remnant native vegetation in the 10km local area.

Methodology GIS Database:
-Augusta 1.4m Orthomosaic - DOLA 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 application could provide habitat for the Western Ringtail Possum, Pseudocheirus occidentalis (listed as Vulnerable in the EPBC Act 1999 and the WC Act 1950), Brush-tailed Phascogale, Phascogale tapoatafa ssp. (WAM M34) (listed as Vulnerable in the WC Act 1950), Chuditch, Dasyurus geoffroii (listed as Vulnerable in the EPBC Act 1999 and the WC Act 1950), Quokka, Setonix brachyurus (listed as Vulnerable in the EPBC Act 1999 and WC Act 1950), Quenda, Isoodon obesulus fusciventer (listed as Vulnerable in the WC Act 1950), Heath Mouse (Dayang), Pseudomys shortridgei (listed as Vulnerable in the WC Act 1950) and the Masked Owl (SW spp.), Tyto novaehollandiae novaehollandiae (listed as Vulnerable in the WC Act 1950) which records indicate have all occurred in the 10km local area (SAC Bio Datasets, 190407).

Aerial photography shows that there are extensive areas of native vegetation remaining in the 10km local area, therefore, the local fauna populations are likely to find habitat in equal to or in better condition (with fewer disturbances) within the nearby reserves and remnants.

The application area however, is unlikely to provide a 'significant' habitat for fauna due to the modified understorey, the proximity to other remaining remnant vegetation, the good condition of the remaining remnants with in the 10km local area, and the application size (0.41ha).

Methodology SAC Bio Datasets 080407, 190407
GIS Database:
-Augusta 1.4m Orthomosaic - DOLA 00

(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 27 records of 6 Declared Rare Flora taxa and 134 records of 45 Priority flora taxa occurring in the 10km local area. The closest record (Kennedia macrophylla) is approximately 1.5km south west of the application (SAC Bio Datasets 020507).

None of the DRF found in the 10km local area are associated with the vegetation complexes (Mattsike, 1998) or vegetation associations (Shepherd et al. 2001) found within the application.

The application area is unlikely to constitute 'significant' habitat for these flora species as the DRF found in the 10km local area are associated with different vegetation complexes and associations, the applications modified understorey and the application size (0.41ha).

Given the above it is unlikely that the native vegetation within the application includes, rare or priority flora.

Methodology Mattiske (1998)
Shepherd et al. (2001)
SAC Bio Datasets 190407, 020507
GIS Database:
-Augusta 1.4m Orthomosaic - DOLA 00
-Mattiske Vegetation - CALM 24/3/98
-Soils, Statewide - DA 11/99

(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 7 occurrences of 2 Threatened Ecological Communities within the 10km local area. With the closest of the records, community type 'Augusta-microbial', situated approximately 6.6km from the application (SAC Bio Datasets 190407).

The TEC's located within the 10km local area are associated with different soil associations and Mattiske (1998) vegetation complexes than those found within the application area (SAC Bio Datasets 190407). Therefore, it is unlikely that either of these TEC's would be located in the application site.

Given the above it is unlikely that native vegetation within the application area includes any EPBC Act listed or State listed TEC's.

Methodology SAC Bio Datasets 190407

(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

The application is located within the Scott River (Swd) and the D'Entrecasteaux (Drd) Mattiske (1998) vegetation complexes.

72.3% of the Pre-European extent of 'Scott River' is remaining, with 49.9% in conservation reserves (Mattiske, 1998).

97.7% of the Pre-European extent of 'D'Entrecasteaux' is remaining, with 0.0% in conservation reserves (Mattiske, 1998).

The application is located within the Warren bioregion and vegetation association 1108. 89.6% of this vegetation association remains with 92.6% located in the Warren bioregion (Shepherd et al. 2001).

The application is located in the Augusta-Maragret River Shire and this shire has 71.7% remnant vegetation remnaining (Shepherd et al. 2001).

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.

The Scott River (Swd) complex has large areas of uncleared and reserved vegetation and although there is no D'Entrecasteaux (Drd) complex in conservation reserves, large areas remain uncleared. Also, the vegetation association (1108) found within the application is well represented within the bioregion and shire and on this basis, this proposal is not likely to be at variance to this Principle.

Methodology

AGPS (2001)
Mattiske (1998)
Shepherd et al. (2001)
SAC Bio Datasets 180407
GIS Database:
Pre-European Vegetation - DA 01/01
Heddle Vegetation Complexes - DEP 21/06/95
Mattiske Vegetation - CALM 24/03/98

(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 at variance to this Principle

The application area is associated with a Sumpland (seasonally inundated basin) (GIS Database).

A small proportion of the application area contains native vegetation that is growing in the sumpland and thus the application is at variance to this principle.

This issue can be adequately managed with appropriate permit conditions on the permit holder to ensure ground cover is maintained within the application and the retention of vegetative material and topsoil removed by the clearing.

Methodology

GIS Database:
-Geomorphic Wetlands, Augusta to Walpole - DOE 18/6/03

(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

GIS Database mapping shows moderate to high disturbance risk of Acid Sulfate Soils less than 3.0m from the surface.

GIS Database mapping shows no risk of an increase in salisation on or off site.

The application is associated with a sumpland however due to the size (0.41ha) of the application area it is

unlikely that wind, water and/or waterlogging on or off site would be increased significantly.

Given the above it is unlikely that the proposed clearing will cause any appreciable land degradation issues.

Methodology GIS Database:
-Acid Sulfate Soil Risk Map, Swan Coastal Plain - DEC
-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**
GIS Database records indicate that the closest DEC reserve to the application area is an Un-named Nature Reserve 2.7km north, north-east of the application.

Given the distance from reserves and the relatively small area proposed to be cleared (0.41 hectares) it is unlikely the proposed clearing will be at variance to this principle.

Methodology GIS Database:
-CALM Managed Lands and Waters - CALM 1/07/05

(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 application is located within the Coastal Catchment and the Blackwood River Basin (GIS Database) further database mapping shows groundwater salinity to be 500mg/L.

The application is associated with a sumpland that is subject to inundation (seasonally inundated basin).

Given the small application area proposed to be cleared (0.41 hectares) it is not likely that the proposed clearing will be at variance to this principle.

Methodology GIS Database:
-Groundwater Salinity, Statewide - DOW
-Hydrographic Catchments - Catchments - DOW
-Hydrographic Catchments - Basins - DOW
-ANCA, Wetlands - CALM 08/01
-Geomorphic Wetlands, Augusta to Walpole - DOE 18/6/03
-RAMSAR, Wetlands - CALM 14/02/03
-Hydrography, linear - DOE 1/2/04

(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**
GIS Database mapping shows that the area is located between the 0 and 5 metre topographic contours. Therefore, the application area is likely to be relatively flat with a sight undulation towards the coast.

Sections of the application area are also effected by seasonal inundation (GIS Database).

Given the above and the small area proposed to be cleared (0.41 hectares) it is not likely that the proposed clearing would be at variance to this principle.

Methodology GIS Database:
-Topographic Contours, Statewide - DOLA 12/09/02_1
-Spot Heights
-Hydrography, linear - DOE 1/2/04

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

Comments

There where no submissions received for this application.

The proposed clearing is for a clearence zone for overhead powerlines.

The area is zoned 'Rural' in East Augusta in the Shire of Augusta/Margaret River Town Planning Scheme No.11

Methodology GIS Database:
-Public Drinking Water Source Areas (PDWSAs) - DOW

-RIWI Act, Groundwater Areas - DOW
-RIWI Act, Surface Water Areas - DOW
-RIWI Act, Areas - DOW
-RIWI Act, Irrigation Districts - DOW
-RIWI Act, Rivers - DOW
-WRL Properties
-Cadastre - DLI
- Town Planning Scheme Zones - MFP 8/98_1

4. Assessor's comments

Purpose	Method	Applied area (ha)/ trees	Comment
Miscellaneous	Mechanical Removal	0.41	The Assessing Officer has assessed the above clearing proposal and found the proposal to be at variance to Principle (f) and not likely to be at variance to all other principles. The conditions imposed if the clearing proposal is approved are; 1. Within one month of the completion of the range and associated infrastructure, the permit holder must ensure ground cover is maintained on the area hatched yellow on attached plan 1784/1. 2. The Permit Holder shall retain the vegetative material and topsoil removed by clearing in accordance with this Permit. (a) Within one month of the completion of the range and associated infrastructure, the permit holder must revegetate the area by: (i) Laying vegetative material and topsoil retained in accordance with condition 2(a) on the area.

5. References

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

Department of Environment and Conservation (2007) SAC Bio Datasets 080407, 190407, 020507. Department of Environment and Conservation, Western Australia.

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.

Havel, J.J. and Mattiske Consulting Pty Ltd (2002) Review of management options for poorly represented vegetation complexes, Conservation Commission.

Hopkins, A.J.M., Beeston, G.R. and Harvey J.M. (2001) A database on the vegetation of Western Australia. Stage 1. CALMScience 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.

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)