Department of Environment and Conservation

Clearing Permit Decision Report

1. Application details

1.1. Permit application details

Permit application No.: 2612/1

Permit type: Area Permit

1.2. Proponent details

Proponent's name: Cheryl Ann & Debbie Marie Brady

1.3. Property details

Property: LOT 66 ON PLAN 55439 (PELICAN POINT 6230)
LOT 66 ON PLAN 55439 (PELICAN POINT 6230)

Local Government Area: City Of Bunbury

Colloquial name:

1.4. Application

Clearing Area (ha)	No. Trees	Method of Clearing	For the purpose of:
0.86		Mechanical Removal	Industrial

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 998 : Medium woodland; tuart	The vegetation under application is considered to be in a degraded to good (Keighery 1994) condition, with tracks cutting through the application area on the western side and large sections of poorly vegetated to bare areas present throughout the entire application area.	Good: Structure significantly altered by multiple disturbance; retains basic structure/ability to regenerate (Keighery 1994)	The condtion and description of the vegetation under application was determined via 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

Refer to principle J

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

Refer to principle J

Methodology

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

Comments

Refer to principle J

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

Refer to principle J

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

Refer to principle J

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

Refer to principle J

Methodology

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

Comments

Refer to principle J

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

Refer to principle J

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

Refer to principle J

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

The area proposed to be cleared (0.86 hectares) is for the purpose of establishing an industrial site. The vegetation under application is considered to be in a degraded to good (Keighery 1994) condition, with tracks cutting through the application area on the western side and large sections of poorly vegetated to bare areas present throughout the entire application area.

The application area is located 27 metres from the Leschenault estuary, which is an Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA). The actual amount of proposed cleared vegetation within this ESA is only 0.06 hectares and is situated at the northern extent of the application area in the buffer zone to the estuary. Where practical, existing undisturbed local prevenance native vegetation should be retained beside natural waterways, wetlands and estuaries (DoE 2005). In most cases the minimum recommended buffer is 50 metres (Water & Rivers Commission 2001), however due to the lack of vegetation within the application area a 30 metre vegetated buffer should be sufficient in this instance.

The Leschenault estuary area is known to be a high risk area for acid sulphate soils, however the proposed clearing is unlikely result in any risk soils being exposed, hence they will not be able to turn acidic.

Due to the size and condition of the area to be cleared, the proposed clearing is unlikely to be significant habitat for any of the 7 fauna species located within the local area (10km radius).

There were 3 rare and 20 priority listed flora species recorded within the local area, however it is unlikely that the application area is necessary for the continued existence of these flora.

There are no known Threatened Ecological Communities (TECs) present with the application area. Within the local area there are 5 different TECs, with the closest being located 5.7km south west. It is unlikely that the proposed clearing will impact on any one of these communities.

The vegetation present within the application area consists of beard association 998. This association is poorly represented within the shire of Bunbury, yet due to the small size of the proposed clearing, impacts on this vegetation association will be insignificant.

The proposed clearing is considered unlikely to be at variance to any of the clearing principles.

Methodology

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

Comments

Approval from the WAPC has been granted. The Shire has given conditional approval (Trim Ref:DOC 62719)

Methodology

4. Assessor's comments

Comment

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 was found:

- not likely to be at variance to any of the clearing principles

5. References

Department of Environment (2005) Water Quality Protection Note: Vegetation buffers to sensitive resources

Keighery, B.J. (1994) Bushland Plant Survey: A Guide to Plant Community Survey for the Community. Wildflower Society of WA (Inc). Nedlands, Western Australia.

Water and Rivers Commission (2001). Position Statement: Wetlands, Water and Rivers Commission, Perth.

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)