



## 1. Application details

### 1.1. Permit application details

Permit application No.: 244/1  
Permit type: Area Permit

### 1.2. Proponent details

Proponent's name: Brian Hunt

### 1.3. Property details

Property: LOT 6 ON DIAGRAM 64866 (Lot No. 6 SOUTH WESTERN CARDUP 6122)  
Local Government Area: Shire Of Serpentine-Jarrahdale  
Colloquial name: Pt Lot 6, Shale Rd, Cardup, 3km from Byford

### 1.4. Application

Clearing Area (ha)	No. Trees	Method of Clearing	For the purpose of:
0.4	30	Mechanical Removal	Extractive Industry

## 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 4: Medium woodland; marri (E. calophylla) & wandoo (E. wandoo). (Hopkins et al. 2001, Shepherd et al. 2001).	The area under notice is located at the base of the Darling Range, approximately five kilometres south of Byford. The proposal includes the clearing of 0.4 of a hectare or approximately 30 mature <i>Corymbia calophylla</i> .	Completely Degraded: No longer intact; completely/almost completely without native species (Keighery 1994)	Observed during site visit 20/10/2004: Native vegetation within the property has been severely altered through historical and on-going landuse practises. Other than the two creek lines, which are not within the application area, stock grazing within the property has lead to a complete removal of understorey vegetation, extreme thinning of trees, and the introduction of pasture grasses and weeds. Vegetation under application consists of approximately 30 <i>Corymbia calophylla</i> trees.
Mattiske vegetation complex Forrestfield (Fo): Mosaic of open forest of <i>Corymbia calophylla</i> - <i>Eucalyptus wandoo</i> - <i>Eucalyptus marginata</i> subsp. <i>elegantella</i> and open forest of <i>Eucalyptus marginata</i> subsp. <i>Marginata</i>			
Hedde vegetation complex - Darling Scarp Complex & Forrestfield Complex (Hedde et al. 1980).			

## 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**  
Vegetation within Pt Lot 6 was been extensively altered through past landuse practises. Understorey species have been replaced with pasture grasses, while upperstorey species have been reduced to consist mainly of paddock trees. With the limited size of this application, and a relatively high number of reserves and vegetated areas present within close proximity, it is not considered that the application area is representative of higher biological diversity in the region.

**Methodology** Site inspection 20/10/2004

**(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 under application has been significantly altered from its original vegetation structure, now containing only a sparse upperstorey of *Corymbia calophylla*. The area surrounding this application contains a much wider variety of habitat types, and as such this vegetation is not considered to be representative of significant habitat for fauna, both locally and regionally.

**Methodology** Site inspection 20/10/2004

**(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**

Although there are no known examples of Declared Rare or Priority Flora within the subject lot, there are 35 known populations within the local area surrounding this application, with 5 populations in the same vegetation complex within one kilometre of the application site.

Despite these populations being located within close proximity to the applied area, the complete alteration of vegetation structure makes its presence within the area under application very unlikely.

**Methodology** Site inspection 20/10/2004  
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**

The local area (10 km) surrounding the application site contains 58 known Threatened Ecological Communities (TEC), the majority of which are located within vegetated road reserves. There are no known TEC within the boundaries of the property under application, and based on the condition of remaining vegetation, and due to the completely degraded / altered community structure, it is considered unlikely that an TEC will be impacted through this application.

**Methodology** Site inspection 20/10/2004  
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 may be at variance to this Principle**

The property under application has been covered within three studies investigating vegetation representation. Both Beard (Hopkins et al. 2001) and Heddle (EPA, 2003) describe the vegetation under application as having a representation of less than 30% of the pre-European extent.

The State Government is committed to the National Objectives Targets for Biodiversity Conservation 2001-2005 (AGSP, 2001) which includes a target that prevent the clearance of ecological communities with an extent below 30% of that present pre-1750 (Department of Natural Resources and Environment 2002; EPA 2000). Beyond this value species extinction is believed to occur at an exponential rate and any further clearing may have irreversible consequences for the conservation of biodiversity and is, therefore, not supported.

	Pre-European area (ha)	Current extent (ha)	Remaining %*	Conservation status**	% in managed land
reserves/CALM-					
IBRA Bioregion - Jarrah Forest		4,544,335	2,665,480	58.3%	Least concern
Shire of Serpentine - Jarrahdale		90,478	53,038	58.6%	Least concern
Beard veg association					
- 4	1,247,834	292,993	23.5%	Vulnerable	11%
Mattiske Vegetation Complex					
- Forrestfield Complex (Fo)	37,106	11,371	30.6	Depleted	
Heddle vegetation Complex					
- Darling Scarp Complex	49,338	18,227	36.9	Depleted	2.7%
- Forrestfield Complex	20,052	3,518	17.5%	Vulnerable	0.3%

\* (Shepherd et al. 2001)

\*\* (Department of Natural Resources and Environment 2002)

**Methodology** 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 property under application contains two minor non-perennial watercourses within its boundaries, although neither of these are present within the two areas proposed for clearing.

A site inspection of the property on 20/10/2004 found that the vegetation under application is located upon areas of higher elevation, and is not associated with either watercourse, and that the clearing of said vegetation is considered unlikely to impact on the watercourses or associated vegetation.

**Methodology** GIS Database - Hydrography, linear - DOE 01/02/04  
Site inspection 20/10/2004

**(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**

DAWA (2004) advise that as the proposed clearing relates mainly to clearing of approximately 20 to 30 individual paddock trees, the potential for land degradation to result from the proposed clearing would be minimal.

**Methodology** DAWA (2004)

**(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**

A search within the local area for CALM managed lands and water has found that Pt Lot 6 is located approximately 1.5 kilometres from the Jarrahdale State Forest, and 2.5 kilometres from the Cardup Nature Reserve. The area under application is also within relatively close proximity to Bush Forever Sites 271, 350, 352, 354, and 361.

Due to the limited clearing associated with this proposal, being approximately 20 to 30 individual trees, it is not considered that the approval of this application will impact on the environmental values of these reserves.

**Methodology** GIS Database - CALM Managed Lands and Water - CALM 01/08/04

**(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 removal of approximately 20 to 30 individual trees from the proposed area is not expected to impact negatively on the groundwater table.

**Methodology** Site inspection 20/10/2004

**(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**

Flooding impacts are considered unlikely to occur as a result of the proposed clearing due to its size and location. Pt Lot 6 is situated at an elevation between 94 metres AHD to 122 metres AHD, rising into the Darling Range to the east.

Due to the relatively small scale of proposed clearing, and the location of the area within the landscape, it is considered unlikely that flooding impacts would occur as a result of this application.

**Methodology** Site inspection 20/10/2004  
GIS Database - Topographic Contours, Metropolitan Area - DLI

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

### Comments

No comment.

### Methodology

## 4. Assessor's recommendations

Purpose	Method	Applied area (ha)	trees	Decision	Comment / recommendation
Extractive Industry	Mechanical Removal	0.4	30	Grant	<p>The assessable criteria have been addressed, and the proposal may be at variance to Principle (e).</p> <p>Due to the limited size and current condition of the vegetation under application, it is not considered that the approval of this application will adversely impact on the vegetation representation at a local and/or regional scale.</p> <p>All conditions possible for this Permit are adequately covered through the conditions of the Local Government Authorities Extractive Industry Licence.</p> <p>The Department of Environment therefore recommends that this application be granted with the following advice.</p> <p>Advice:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. The Permit Holder should obtain all necessary approvals prior to the commencement of any clearing activities.</li></ol>

## 5. References

- AGPS (2001) The national objective and targets for biodiversity conservation 2001-2005. Commonwealth of Australia, Canberra.
- DAWA Land degradation assessment report. Office of the Commissioner of Soil and Land Conservation, Department of Agriculture Western Australia. DoE TRIM ref CEO1674/04.
- 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.
- 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.
- EPA (2003) Guidance for the Assessment of Environmental Factors -level of assessment of proposals affecting natural areas within the System 6 region and Swan Coastal Plain portion of the System 1 Region. Report by the EPA under the Environmental Protection Act 1986. No 10 WA.
- 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, BJ (1994) Bushland Plant Survey: A Guide to Plant Community Survey for the Community. Wildflower Society of WA (Inc). Nedlands, Western Australia.
- 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.