



## 1. Application details

### 1.1. Permit application details

Permit application No.: 2392/1  
 Permit type: Area Permit

### 1.2. Proponent details

Proponent's name: MR Arthur John & Wendy Marie Thompson

### 1.3. Property details

Property: LOT 201 ON DIAGRAM 94394 (House No. 147 ULSTER YAKAMIA 6330)  
 LOT 201 ON DIAGRAM 94394 (House No. 147 ULSTER YAKAMIA 6330)  
 Local Government Area: City Of Albany

Colloquial name:

### 1.4. Application

Clearing Area (ha)	No. Trees	Method of Clearing	For the purpose of:
0.75		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 3: Medium forest; jarrah-marri	The Vegetation proposed to be cleared is in Excellent condition throughout (Keighery 1994).	Excellent: Vegetation structure intact; disturbance affecting individual species, weeds non-aggressive (Keighery 1994)	The description and condition of the vegetation under application was obtained via the use of aerial mapping systems.

## 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**  
 To be assessed.

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**  
 To be assessed.

Methodology

### (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**  
 To be assessed.

Methodology

### (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 at variance to this Principle**  
 To be assessed.

Methodology

- (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**  
To be assessed.

Methodology

- (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 may be at variance to this Principle**  
To be assessed.

Methodology

- (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**  
To be assessed.

Methodology

- (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**  
To be assessed.

Methodology

- (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 may be at variance to this Principle**  
To be assessed.

Methodology

- (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**  
To be assessed.

Methodology

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

Comments

The 0.75ha of native vegetation under application is considered to be in excellent condition (Keighery 1994). Within the local area (10km radius) there are 12 Declared Rare Flora (DRF) species, totalling 41 occurrences and 58 species of priority listed flora, totalling 183 occurrences.

The application area is part of a bush corridor, these are important for faunal species that have large habitat ranges and are key components in the conservation of biodiversity (Lindenmayer & Nix 1993). However, due to the small size of the application area and given the amount of surrounding vegetation, it is not likely that the proposed area to be cleared is a significant habitat for fauna communities.

The area under application is within EPA Position Statement No. 2, agricultural zone. The EPA Position Statement No. 2 is of the view that it is unreasonable to expect to be able to clear native vegetation from land within the agricultural area other than relatively small areas and where alternative mechanisms for protecting biodiversity are addressed (EPA 2000).

The application area is comprised of beard vegetation association 3, this is described as consisting of Medium forest; jarrah-marri. This particular vegetation association is well represented within the Jarrah Forest bioregion, subregion (JF2) and Shire (Shepherd et al. 2006).

There is a watercourse which runs adjacent to the south western boundary of the application area. It is likely that riparian vegetation exists within the area under application. To minimise the impact of the clearing on the watercourse and erosion concerns (Waters & Rivers Commission 2000), a buffer condition will be imposed should a permit be granted.

The land under application is Freehold; therefore native title has been extinguished.

#### Methodology

### 4. Assessor's comments

Purpose	Method Applied	area (ha)/ trees	Comment
Grazing & Pasture	Mechanical Removal	0.75	The assessment against clearing has found that: - Principles (f) & (i) may be at variance - Principles (a), (b), (c), (e), (g) & (j) are not likely to be at variance - Principles (d) & (h) is not at variance

### 5. References

- EPA (2000) Environmental protection of native vegetation in Western Australia. Clearing of native vegetation, with particular reference to the agricultural area. Position Statement No. 2. December 2000. Environmental Protection Authority.
- Keighery, B.J. (1994) Bushland Plant Survey: A Guide to Plant Community Survey for the Community. Wildflower Society of WA (Inc). Nedlands, Western Australia.
- Lindenmayer & Nix (1993) Conservation Biology, Vol. 7, No. 3, pp. 627-630
- Shepherd, D.P., Beeston, G.R. and Hopkins, A.J.M. (2001a) Native Vegetation in Western Australia, Extent, Type and Status. Resource Management Technical Report 249. Department of Agriculture, Western Australia (updated 2006).
- Water & Rivers Commission 2000, Advisory notes for managers on river and wetland restoration, accessed 8 April 2008, from [http://portal.environment.wa.gov.au/pls/portal/docs/PAGE/DOE\\_ADMIN/FACT\\_SHEET\\_REPOSITORY/TAB1144247/WRCWN04.PDF](http://portal.environment.wa.gov.au/pls/portal/docs/PAGE/DOE_ADMIN/FACT_SHEET_REPOSITORY/TAB1144247/WRCWN04.PDF)

### 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)

