



## 1. Application details

### 1.1. Permit application details

Permit application No.: 1820/1  
Permit type: Area Permit

### 1.2. Proponent details

Proponent's name: Matthew David Forrest

### 1.3. Property details

Property: LOT 8 ON PLAN 15712 (House No. 56 OLDMEADOW LOWDEN 6240)  
Local Government Area: Shire Of Donnybrook-Balingup  
Colloquial name:

### 1.4. Application

Clearing Area (ha)	No. Trees	Method of Clearing	For the purpose of:
12.2		Mechanical Removal	Grazing & Pasture

## 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 1184: Medium woodland-fringing; jarrah, marri, flooded gum & peppermint (Shepherd et al. 2001).	The proposal involves clearing approximately 12.2 hectares of native vegetation in Degraded to Completely Degraded condition (Keighery, 1994; DEC Site Visit, 2007).	Degraded: Structure severely disturbed; regeneration to good condition requires intensive management (Keighery 1994)	The description of the clearing application area is based on a site visit conducted by DEC officers on 30 July 2007.
Balingup Slopes Vegetation Complex: Open forest of jarrah-marri with some flooded gum on valley floors (Mattiske Consulting, 2002).	The vegetation under application comprises mainly marri and flooded gum regrowth with the odd jarrah, with a completely absent understorey (DEC Site Visit, 2007).		
Lowden Vegetation Complex: Mixture of an open forest of jarrah-marri, a low open forest of peppermint on the lower valley slopes and a woodland of flooded gum and paperbark on the slopes (Heddle et al. 1980).	The area under application is understood to have been broad acre cleared in the mid-1900s; approximately 50% has regrown, however the area has been continually grazed. Cattle are currently being grazed over the entire property, and the cleared paddocks are cropped for hay on a rotational basis (DEC Site Visit, 2007).		

## 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 proposed for clearing is 12.2 hectares of remnant vegetation for the purpose of cropping and grazing.

The vegetation under application is located in a valley comprised of Beard Vegetation Association 1184 (Hopkins et al. 2001) of which there is 51.7% (Shepherd et al. 2001) of the pre-1750 extent remaining. The local area (10 km radius) is over 70% vegetated, with approximately 65% of that vegetation in DEC-managed State forest.

Historical management practices, i.e. logging, long grazing regimes, etc. have resulted in limited native understorey and species diversity; given the degraded (Keighery, 1994) condition of the vegetation under application, it is unlikely to represent a high level of biological diversity in comparison to larger areas of remnant vegetation within the local setting.

Based on the above information, the proposal is unlikely to be at variance to this Principle.

**Methodology** Keighery (1994);  
DEC Site Visit (2007);  
Hopkins et al. (2001);  
Shepherd et al. (2001);  
GIS Databases:  
- CALM Managed Lands and Waters - CALM 1/06/04;  
- Busselton 50cm ORTHOMOSAIC - DLI03;  
- Bridgetown 50cm ORTHOMOSAIC - DLI04;  
- Collie 50cm ORTHOMOSAIC - DLI 04;  
- Bunbury 50cm ORTHOMOSAIC - DLI04

**(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 area proposed for clearing comprises scattered patches of predominately marri regrowth within a degraded (Keighery, 1994) landscape.

The local area (10 km radius) is approximately 70% vegetated, most of which is DEC-managed State forest, including the Wellington, Mumballup and Wilga State forests; the Greater Preston National Park; the Wellington National Park; the Wellington Discovery Forest, all of which are likely to offer equal or better habitat than that within the application area.

DEC records indicate the presence of threatened fauna occurring within DEC-managed lands surrounding the area under application, including the Quenda, Forest Red Black Cockatoo and Baudin's Cockatoo. However, given the degraded (Keighery, 1994) condition of the vegetation under application; and considering the high percentage of DEC-managed state forest within the local area, the vegetation of the application area is not likely to represent significant habitat for fauna within the local setting.

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

**Methodology** Keighery (1994);  
GIS Databases:  
- CALM Managed Lands and Waters - CALM 1/06/04;  
- Threatened Fauna Database

**(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**  
Several populations of Priority Flora have been identified within the local area (10 km radius), with the closest records including *Acacia semitrullata* (P3) and *Asplenium aethiopicum* (P4). All known records occur in different soil and vegetation types as the application area; most have been recorded along the banks of, or in association with, the Preston River.

The vegetation under application is unlikely to contain and/or be providing habitat for any threatened flora species due to its parkland cleared, highly degraded nature (DEC Site Visit, 2007); therefore the proposal is unlikely to be at variance to this Principle.

**Methodology** DEC Site Visit (2007);  
GIS Database:  
- Threatened Flora Database (DEFL) - DEC 17/04/07;  
- Geology Database (Regolith) - DEC 8/8/07;  
- Vegetation Complexes - DEC 8/8/07  
- Heddle Vegetation Complexes

**(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**  
No Threatened Ecological Communities (TECs) have been recorded within the local setting (10 km radius).



The degraded (Keighery, 1994) condition of the vegetation under application would limit any potential values of any known TEC. It is unlikely the area under application contains or is necessary for the maintenance of any known TEC.

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

**Methodology** Keighery (1994);  
GIS Databases:  
- Threatened Ecological Communities - CALM 12/04/05;  
- Threatened Plant Communities - DEP 06/95;  
- Environmentally Sensitive Areas - DoE 30/05/05

**(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 likely to be at variance to this Principle**

The proposed clearing occurs within the Shire of Donnybrook-Balingup, which retains approximately 72% (Shepherd et al. 2001) of native vegetation. The local area is also within the Jarrah Forest Bioregion, with 58% (Shepherd et al. 2001) pre-1750 extent remaining.

Mattiske et al. (1998) defines the original vegetation as the Balingup Slopes Complex, which is of depleted status for biodiversity conservation (Department of Natural Resources and Environment, 2002), with 24% (Mattiske Consulting, 2002) of the pre-1750 extent remaining.  
of native vegetation.

Heddle et al. (1980) defines the original vegetation as the Lowden Complex, which is also of depleted status for biodiversity conservation (Department of Natural Resources and Environment, 2002), with 44% of the pre-1750 extent remaining.

Given the above information, the area proposed for clearing is not considered to be a significant remnant within an extensively cleared area.

**Methodology** Shepherd et al. (2001);  
Department of Natural Resources and Environment, 2002);  
Heddle et al. (1980);  
Mattiske Consulting (2002);  
Mattiske et al. (1998);  
GIS Databases:  
- Mattiske Vegetation - CALM 24/3/98;  
- Heddle Vegetation Complexes - DEP 21/06/95;  
- 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**

There are no mapped wetlands within a 10 km radius; however three (3) minor, perennial watercourses intersect the property.

The nearest major watercourse is the Preston River, approximately 1.5km south. The proposed clearing is unlikely to affect this watercourse due to the distance between the river and the proposed clearing.

A small strip of vegetation under application runs parallel with one minor, degraded watercourse along the eastern boundary of the property; however the proposed clearing is not considered to impact on watercourses or riparian vegetation.

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

**Methodology** GIS databases:  
- ANCA, Wetlands - CALM 08/01;  
- EPP Areas - DEP 06/95;  
- EPP Lakes - DEP 28/07/03;  
- Geomorphic Wetlands (Mgt Categories) Swan Coastal Plain - DoE 15/9/04;  
- Hydrography Linear - DoE 1/2/04;  
- RAMSAR, Wetlands - CALM 21/10/02

**(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**

The area proposed for clearing has a low salinity risk (GIS Database) and a groundwater salinity of 500-1000 mg/L (GIS Database).

The applicant is willing to revegetate 5.6 hectares to provide windbreaks and conserve the small watercourse running through the property (information supplied by applicant). No clearing is proposed for steep areas; therefore the proposal is unlikely to cause appreciable land degradation.

**Methodology      GIS databases:**

- Acid Sulfate Soil Risk Map, SCP - DoE 01/02/04;
- Salinity Risk LM 25m - DOLA 00;
- Groundwater Salinity, Statewide - 22/02/00

**(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**

There is a high percentage of forested land that is managed by DEC within the local setting. The Wellington State Forest is located approximately 1 km north (buffered by private property), and is vegetatively linked to the area under application.

The Greater Preston National Park, Wilga State Forest, Wellington National Park and Mumballup State Forest all occur outside a 6 km radius of the area under application.

In lieu of the above information, due to the degraded condition of the vegetation under application, it is unlikely clearing of the proposed area will impact on the environmental values of any nearby conservation area.

**Methodology      GIS Databases:**

- CALM Managed Lands and Waters - CALM - 01/07/05;
- Cadastre - DLI;
- Busselton 50cm ORTHOMOSAIC - DLI03;
- Bridgetown 50cm ORTHOMOSAIC - DLI04;
- Collie 50cm ORTHOMOSAIC - DLI 04;
- Bunbury 50cm ORTHOMOSAIC - DLI04

**(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 area is located within the Preston Subcatchment of the Leschenault Estuary - Preston River Catchment and is not within a Public Drinking Water Source Area (PDWSA). The area proposed to be cleared has a low salinity risk (GIS Database) and a groundwater salinity of 500-1000 mg/L (GIS Database).

Due to the Degraded condition of the vegetation and the high percentage of vegetation remaining within the local area (10 km radius); the proposal is unlikely to be at variance to this Principle.

**Methodology      GIS databases:**

- Hydrographic Catchments, Catchments - DoE 3/4/03;
- Public Drinking Water Source Areas (PDWSAs) - DOE 29/11/04

**(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**

Given the high percentage of vegetation within the local area, the proposed clearing is unlikely to increase the peak flood height or duration.

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

**Methodology      GIS Database:**

- Topographic Contours, Statewide - DOLA 12/09/02

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

**Comments**

The land is zoned as Rural under the Shire of Donnybrook-Balingup TPS.



The Shire of Donnybrook-Balingup (2007) advises that it has no comment to make with regards to the proposal.

No other approvals from the Department of Environment and Conservation are required for this proposal.

No public submissions have been received.

**Methodology** Shire of Donnybrook-Balingup Submission (2007);  
GIS Database:  
- Town Planning Scheme Zones - MFP 08/98

#### 4. Assessor's comments

Purpose	Method	Applied area (ha)/ trees	Comment
Grazing & Pasture	Mechanical Removal	12.2	Assessment of the clearing application revealed the proposal is not likely to be at variance to all ten clearing principles.

#### 5. References

- DEC Site Visit (2007). Department of Environment and Conservation, Western Australia. TRIM Ref: DOC29998.
- 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.
- Hedde, E. M., Loneragan, O. W., and Havel, J. J. (1980) Vegetation Complexes of the Darling System, Western Australia. In Department of Conservation and Environment, Atlas of Natural Resources, Darling System, Western Australia.
- 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.
- Shire of Donnybrook-Balingup submission (2007). TRIM Ref: DOC26932.

#### 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)

