



1. Application details

1.1. Permit application details

Permit application No.: 2226/1
 Permit type: Area Permit

1.2. Proponent details

Proponent's name: Philip Walter French Ironstone Rise Pty Ltd

1.3. Property details

Property: LOT 1 ON DIAGRAM 10071 (CHANNYBEARUP 6260)
 Local Government Area: Shire Of Manjimup
 Colloquial name:

1.4. Application

Clearing Area (ha)	No. Trees	Method of Clearing	For the purpose of:
2.88		Mechanical Removal	Dam construction or maintenance

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 3 (Nornalup): Medium forest; jarrah-marri (Shepherd et al. 2001; Hopkins et al. 2001).	The proposal involves clearing approximately 2.0 hectares for the purpose of dam construction.	Good: Structure significantly altered by multiple disturbance; retains basic structure/ability to regenerate (Keighery 1994)	The description of the clearing application area is based on a site inspection undertaken by DEC officers on 10 January 2008.
Mattiske Vegetation Complex: - Pemberton (PM1): Tall open forest of Eucalyptus diversicolor with mixtures of Corymbia calophylla on valley slopes and low forest of Agonis juniperina-Banksia seminuda-Callistachys lanceolata on valley floors in the perhumid zone (Mattiske Consulting, 1998).	The area is currently grazed by stock.		

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 at variance to this Principle**
 The proposal is for the clearing of approximately 2.88 hectares of riparian vegetation. The vegetation under application is considered to vary in condition between good and very good (Keighery, 1994; DEC Site Visit, 2008).

The applied area is located on a small tributary of the Beedelup Brook and lies adjacent to the Greater Beedelup National Park. The local area is approximately 85% vegetated, with the majority of that vegetation managed by DEC as State Forest and National Park.

Given the scale (2.88 ha) and the surrounding local vegetation the proposed clearing does not hold a high level of biodiversity and is therefore not at variance to this Principle.

Methodology Keighery (1994);
 DEC Site Visit (2008);

GIS Databases:
 - CALM Managed Lands and Waters - CALM 1/6/04;
 - Manjimup 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 at variance to this Principle

The proposal is for the clearing of approximately 2.88 hectares of riparian vegetation. The vegetation under application is considered to vary in condition between good and very good (Keighery, 1994; DEC Site Visit, 2008).

There are several records of threatened and priority fauna within close proximity to the applied area (10 km radius). The local area is approximately 85% vegetated, with the majority of that vegetation managed by DEC as State Forest and National Park; therefore given the scale (2.88 ha) and the surrounding local vegetation the area under application is not considered significant habitat for fauna indigenous to Western Australia and is therefore not at variance to this Principle.

Methodology Keighery (1994);
 DEC Site Visit (2008);

GIS Databases:
 - Threatened Fauna, SAC Bio Dataset - 22/8/07
 - CALM Managed Lands and Waters - CALM 1/6/04;
 - Manjimup 50cm ORTHOMOSAIC - 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

Two populations of *Caladenia harringtoniae* (DRF) have been recorded approximately 6.5 km south west of the proposed clearing.

Caladenia harringtoniae is a tuberous, perennial herb that flowers in October to November and occurs in winter-wet flats, margins of lakes, creeklines and granite outcrops (DEC, Flora Base, 2008).

DEC Region (2008) advised that there are no known DRF or priority flora known to occur within the vegetation association under application and therefore it is not likely the proposed clearing includes or is necessary for the continued existence of rare flora.

Methodology DEC, Flora Base (2008);
 Northcote et al. (1960-68);
 DEC (2008)

GIS Databases:
 - DEFL, SAC Bio Dataset - 22/8/07;
 - 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 no known records of Threatened Ecological Communities (TECs) within 10 km radius of the proposed clearing; therefore the applied area is unlikely comprise the whole or part of, or be necessary for the maintenance of local TECs, and is therefore not likely to be at variance to this Principle.

Methodology GIS Databases:
 - TEC Database, SAC Bio Dataset - 22/8/07;
 - Threatened Ecological Communities - CALM

(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	Current extent (ha)	Remaining %	% in reserves/DEC-managed land	area (ha)
--------------	---------------------	-------------	--------------------------------	-----------

Warren	833,981	663,141	79.5*	82.4
--------	---------	---------	-------	------

Shire of Manjimup	696,702	589,728	84.6*	59.4
Vegetation type:				
Beard: Unit 3	2,661,403	1,846,588	69.4*	18.4
Mattiske: Pemberton (PM1)	258,061	169,317	65.6**	N/A

* (Shepherd, 2006)

** (EPA, 2006)

The application is located within the Warren Bioregion in the Shire of Manjimup. The extent of native vegetation in these areas is 79.5% and 84.6% (Shepherd, 2006), respectively. There is approximately 85% of native vegetation remaining in the local area (10 km radius), with the majority DEC managed National Park and State forest.

The Pemberton complexes represent the area proposed for clearing. The majority (65.6%) of this type still remains (Mattiske Consulting, 1998), and most is protected within the DEC managed Greater Beedelup National Park.

Given the scale (2.88 ha) and the remaining vegetation in the local area (85% in 10 km radius), the proposed clearing is not considered significant remnant vegetation in an extensively cleared area and is therefore not at variance to this Principle.

Methodology Shepherd (2006);
Mattiske Consulting (1998);

GIS databases:

- Interim Biogeographic Regionalisation of Australia - EM 18/10/00;
- Mattiske Vegetation - CALM 24/3/98;
- Pre-European Vegetation - DA 01/01;
- Local Government Authorities - DLI 8/7/04

(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 proposal is for the clearing of approximately 2.88 hectares of riparian vegetation and is within a watercourse and surrounding riparian vegetation, therefore the area under application is in association with a watercourse and is at variance to this Principle.

Methodology GIS Databases:
- Hydrography, Linear - DoE 1/2/04;
- Geomorphic Wetlands, Augusta to Walpole - DoE 18/6/03;
- Manjimup 50cm ORTHOMOSAIC - DLI04

(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 soils of the area under application are described as steep hilly plateau with hard and sandy acidic-yellow mottled soils with conspicuous but relatively smaller areas of red earths (Northcote et al. 1960-68).

The groundwater salinity is 500 to 1000 mg/L and the hydrogeology consists of rocks of low permeability with local aquifers in fractured and weathered rocks.

Given the scale (2.88 ha) and the remaining vegetation in the local area (85% in 10 km radius), the proposed clearing is not likely to cause appreciable land degradation and is therefore not likely to be at variance to this Principle.

Methodology Northcote et al. (1960-68);

GIS Databases:
- Hydrogeology, Statewide - DoW;
- Groundwater Salinity, Statewide - DoW;
- CALM Managed Lands and Waters - CALM 1/07/05;

(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

The applied area lies adjacent to the Greater Beedelup National Park. Other areas set aside for conservation within close proximity include the Donnelly and Big Brook State Forest.

The proposed clearing may increase edge effects on the National Park however these impacts are not likely to degrade the environmental values of the National Park.

Methodology GIS Databases:

- Register of National Estate - EA 28/01/03;
- 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 area under application falls within the Donnelly River water catchment area. This area is not managed as a Public Drinking Water Source Area (PDWSA).

The local area has an average annual rainfall > 1400mm with regional groundwater salinity ranging between 500 to 1000 mg/L. The applied area is located approximately 800m west of the Carey Brook watershed.

The slope of the area under application is 160 to 165 metres AHD (Australian Height Datum) over 350 metres.

Given the scale (2.88 ha), the low gradient slope and the remaining surrounding vegetation in the local area (85% in 10 km radius), the proposed clearing is not likely to cause deterioration in the quality of surface or underground water and is therefore not likely to be at variance to this Principle.

Methodology GIS Databases:

- Hydrographic Catchments, Catchments - DoW;
- Rainfall, Mean Annual - DoW;
- Groundwater Salinity, Statewide - DoW;
- Geomorphic Wetlands, Augusta to Walpole - DoE 18/6/03;
- Public Drinking Water Source Areas (PDWSA) - DoW;
- CALM Managed Lands and Waters - CALM 1/07/05;

(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 scale (2.88 ha) and the remaining surrounding vegetation in the local area (85% in 10 km radius), the proposed clearing is unlikely to cause or exacerbate the incidence or intensity of flooding and is therefore not likely to be at variance to this clearing principle.

Methodology GIS Databases:

- CALM Managed Lands and Waters - CALM 1/07/05;
- Topographic Contours, Statewide - DOLA 12/9/02

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

Comments

DoW (2008) advises the proposal is located on a stream that begins on the property and as such, falls outside of the current RIWI provisions, i.e. does not require a) a surface water licence; or b) a permit to construct a new dam.

The proposed dam may impact on the environmental flows within the neighbouring National Park, sedimentation and water quality degradation may also result from the construction of the dam.

The property is zoned Rural under the Shire of Manjimup TPS.

No public submissions have been received for the proposal.

Methodology DoW (2008);

GIS Database:

- Town Planning Scheme Zones - MFP 08/98

4. Assessor's comments

Purpose	Method	Applied area (ha)/ trees	Comment
Dam construction or maintenance	Mechanical Removal	2.88	<p>The application has been assessed against the clearing principles, planning instruments and other matters in accordance with s51O of the Environmental Protection Act 1986, and the proposed clearing is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - at variance to Principle (f); and - not or not likely to be at variance to the remaining clearing Principles.

5. References

- DEC (2008) Regional Advice, Warren Region, Department of Environment and Conservation (DEC). Manjimup, Western Australia. TRIM Ref: DOC47491.
- DEC Site Visit (2008). Site Inspection Report, Department of Environment and Conservation (DEC). Bunbury, Western Australia. TRIM Ref: DOC42957.
- DEC, Florabase (2008) <http://florabase.dec.wa.gov.au/browse/profile/13619>. (Retrieved 3 January 2008).
- Department of Water (DoW) (2008). TRIM Ref: DOC44086.
- 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.
- Northcote, K. H. with Beckmann G G, Bettenay E., Churchward H. M., van Dijk D. C., Dimmock G. M., Hubble G. D., Isbell R. F., McArthur W. M., Murtha G. G., Nicolls K. D., Paton T. R., Thompson C. H., Webb A. A. and Wright M. J. (1960-68): 'Atlas of Australian Soils, Sheets 1 to 10, with explanatory data'. CSIRO and Melbourne University Press: Melbourne.
- Sac Bio Datasets (22/8/07). Department of Environment and Conservation, Sac Bio Datasets, Kensington, Western Australia.
- Shepherd, D.P. (2006). Adapted from: Shepherd, D.P., Beeston, G.R., and Hopkins, A.J.M. (2001), Native Vegetation in Western Australia. Technical Report 249. Department of Agriculture Western Australia, South Perth. Includes subsequent updates for 2006 from Vegetation Extent dataset ANZWA1050000124.
- 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)

