



1. Application details

1.1. Permit application details

Permit application No.: 207/1
Permit type: Area Permit

1.2. Proponent details

Proponent's name: Hamersley Iron Pty Ltd, c/o Hames Sharley

1.3. Property details

Property: UNALLOCATED CROWN LAND
Local Government Area: Shire of Ashburton
Colloquial name: Karajini Lodge Special Use Area, Tom Price

1.4. Application

Clearing Area (ha)	No. Trees	Method of Clearing	For the purpose of:
23		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 567 - Hummock grasslands, shrub steppe; mulga and kanji over soft spinifex and T. basedowii	The vegetation of the site shows evidence of previous disturbance and is bisected by a track.	Very Good: Vegetation structure altered; obvious signs of disturbance (Keighery 1994)	The site has been degraded and is bordered by residential areas and the Karijini Lodge.

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**
Part of the area proposed for clearing has been previously disturbed. A survey of the site located no Declared Rare or Priority Flora, however, four exotic species (*Cenchrus ciliaris*, *Cenchrus setigerus*, *Aerva javanica*, and *Acetosa vesicaria*) were recorded, consistent with the disturbance on site (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**
The area is bisected by a track and borders a residential area and the Karijini Lodge. The disturbance to the vegetation (Pilbara Iron, 2004) combined with impacts from adjacent land uses suggests that the site is unlikely to be significant habitat for fauna.

Methodology Aerial photograph

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

Comments **Proposal is not at variance to this Principle**
There are no known Declared Rare or Priority Flora species within or adjacent to the proposed clearing.

Methodology GIS Database: Declared Rare and Priority Flora List - CALM 13/08/03, Pilbara Iron (2004)

(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 at variance to this Principle**
There are no known Threatened Ecological Communities at or adjacent to the site.

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 vegetation at the site is a component of Vegetation Association 567 of which there is ~100% of the pre-European extent remaining.

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 to be cleared 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 likely to be at variance to this Principle

An 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

The area is not adjacent to a conservation reserve.

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

Some non-perennial drainage lines will drain surface run-off towards the town drainage system.

Methodology GIS database: Hydrology, linear - DOE 1/2/04

(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 clearing of vegetation on the site will increase the incidence of flooding. Run-off will be directed towards the town's drainage system.

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

(k) Planning instrument or other matter.

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

The site appears to be Unallocated Crown Land which is subject to a Native Title claim. The proponent has indicated that the Department for Planning and Infrastructure is developing a lease for the area, and DPI has indicated support for the proposed works (H Farrar, pers comm).

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 this Lot to Special Zone, which will allow residential and tourism uses (K Pearson, pers comm).

Methodology GIS database: Cadastre, Land Tenure - DLI 1/9/04

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	23	Grant	

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. 2004/42
- 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.