



1. Application details

1.1. Permit application details

Permit application No.: 204/1

Permit type: Area Permit

1.2. Proponent details

Proponent's name: Hamersley Iron Pty Ltd c/o Hames Sharley ACN 004 558 276

1.3. Property details

Property: LOT 10 ON PLAN 241873
GREGORY PART LOCATION 4
LOT 46 ON PLAN 215303
LOT 332 ON PLAN 15263

Local Government Area: Shire of Ashburton

Colloquial name: Tom Price Townsite

1.4. Application

Clearing Area (ha)	No. Trees	Method of Clearing	For the purpose of:
11		Mechanical Removal	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
Vegetation Association 181 - Shrublands; mulga and snakewood scrub	No Declared Rare or Priority flora were noted at the sites. Five alien species (<i>Acetosa vesicaria</i> , <i>Averva javanica</i> , <i>Cenchrus</i> <i>ciliaris</i> , <i>Cenchrus setigerus</i> and <i>Malvastrum</i> <i>americanum</i>) are present at the sites - these species are commonly found in disturbed areas.	Very Good: Vegetation structure altered; obvious signs of disturbance (Keighery 1994)	

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 sites to be cleared are areas between residential developments in the town of Tom Price. Parts of these sites are already disturbed as indicated by the presence of exotic species (*Acetosa vesicaria*, *Averva javanica*, *Cenchrus ciliaris*, *Cenchrus setigerus* and *Malvastrum americanum*) (Pilbara Iron, 2004).

Methodology

(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**

It is unlikely that the vegetation to be cleared provides greater habitat value for fauna than vegetation further away from the townsite. The level of disturbance exhibited at the sites (Pilbara Iron, 2004) would also reduce their habitat value.

Methodology

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

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

No declared rare or priority flora were located at the sites (Pilbara Iron, 2004).

Methodology GIS database: Declared Rare and Priority Flora List - CALM 13/08/03

(d) Native vegetation should not be cleared if it comprises the whole or a part of, or is necessary for the maintenance of a significant ecological community.

Comments **Proposal is not likely to be at variance to this Principle**
No known Threatened Ecological Communities exist within or adjacent to the sites.

Methodology GIS database: Threatened Ecological Communities - CALM 15/7/03

(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 sites are within Vegetation Association 567 of which there is ~100% (848,590ha) of this vegetation type remaining. Of this, over 20% of the vegetation association is protected within the conservation reserve system.

Methodology GIS database: Pre-European Vegetation - DA 01/01, Shepherd et al (2001)

(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 is not associated with a wetland or watercourse.

Methodology GIS database - Hydrography, linear - DOE 1/2/04

(g) Native vegetation should not be cleared if the clearing of the vegetation is likely to cause appreciable land degradation.

Comments **Proposal is not at variance to this Principle**
A desktop assessment of the application did not identify that the clearing of vegetation is likely to cause appreciable land degradation.

Methodology LCO DAWA Advice

(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 at variance to this Principle**
There are no conservation reserves adjacent or close to the proposed sites.

Methodology GIS database: CALM Managed Lands and Waters - CALM 1/06/04

(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 vegetation clearing is for the purpose of residential development. It is unlikely that the clearing of vegetation at the four proposed sites will have a significant impact on surface or ground water quality. Storm water run-off will be connected to the town's existing system.

Methodology

(j) Native vegetation should not be cleared if clearing the vegetation is likely to cause, or exacerbate, the incidence of flooding.

Comments **Proposal is not likely to be at variance to this Principle**
It is unlikely that the proposed vegetation clearance and residential development will increase the impact of flooding. The residential sites will be connected to the existing town drainage system.

Methodology LCO DAWA Advice

(k) Planning instrument or other matter.

Comments **Proposal is not at variance to this Principle**
The Shire of Ashburton Town Planning Scheme #7 has been referred to the Minister for Planning for gazettal. This will amend the current zonings for these Lots to Residential (K Pearson, pers comm).

Methodology

4. Assessor's recommendations

The recommendations of the Department of Environment to the CEO of the Department should be made consistent with the outcomes of the assessment by each of the agencies. Any conditions on the approval should also be outlined. These may be developed in consultation with such other agencies as required.

Purpose	Method	Applied area (ha)/ trees	Decision	Comment / recommendation
Building or Structure	Mechanical Removal	11	Grant	Accommodation/housing

5. References

- Keighery, BJ (1994) Bushland Plant Survey: A Guide to Plant Community Survey for the Community. Wildflower Society of WA (Inc). Nedlands, Western Australia.
- Pilbara Iron (2004) Botanical Survey Advice No. 2004/57
- 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.