



1. Application details

1.1. Permit application details

Permit application No.: 286/1

Permit type: Area Permit

1.2. Proponent details

Proponent's name: MR Peter Johnston

1.3. Property details

Property: LOT 407 ON PLAN 238097 (INGGARDA 6701)

Local Government Area: Shire Of Carnarvon

Colloquial name: Gascoyne Location 407, Callagiddy Station

1.4. Application

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

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 344: Mosaic: Shrublands; bowgada scrub and associated spp. / Shrublands; Acacia sclerosperma, bowgada & A. victoriae scrub. Beard 346: Mosaic: Shrublands; Acacia sclerosperma, A. victoriae & snakewood scrub / Shrublands; patches of low mixed scrub.	The vegetation under notice is open Acacia shrubland dominated by Acacia linophylla, A. tetragonophylla, Hakea preissii, and Eremophila forrestii interspersed with Santalum spicatum. The understorey is sparse and consists of Stylobasium spathulatum, Scaevola tomentosa, Ptilotus polakii and numerous grasses and annuals.	Very Good: Vegetation structure altered; obvious signs of disturbance (Keighery 1994)	The area under application is on the Yalbalgo Plain between the Wooramel and Gascoyne Rivers. It is a flat plain covered with sandy ridges and is dominated by open Acacia shrubland. Drainage is disorganised and the soil on the flats is heavy with poor infiltration and drainage (Beard 1976). The area under notice is in good condition with seedlings present indicating a gemination event had occurred and grazing pressure is low. The trees and shrubs present did not show signs of overgrazing.

3. Assessment of application against clearing principles

(a) Native vegetation should not be cleared if it comprises a high level of biological diversity.

Comments

No information was provided to enable an assessment against this principle

Methodology CALM (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 may be at variance to this Principle**

One threatened fauna species was recorded as occurring approximately 4km north of the notified area. This record is from 1969, and the habitat requirements for this species have not been determined in this appraisal, therefore the likelihood of this species occurring within the notified area is unknown.

Therefore there appears to be a low probability of the proposed clearing to be at variance with Principle (b).

Methodology CALM (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**

While there are no records of threatened or priority flora occurring within close proximity to the notified area (the closest record is 17km away), there is a possibility that the notified area contains similar habitat that some of these species utilise. A flora survey at the appropriate time/s of year would confirm the presence or absence of these species. However, the habitat is extensive, and it is unlikely that the proposed area would be significant

to any flora that might be found in the area.

Given the above there appears to be a low probability of the proposed clearing to be at variance with Principle (c).

Methodology CALM (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 likely to be at variance to this Principle**

No occurrences of currently-identified threatened ecological communities have been recorded within a 50km radius of the notified area.

Therefore there appears to be a low probability of the proposed clearing to be at variance with Principle (d).

Methodology CALM (2004)

(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**

Bioregion is predominantly uncleared, though degraded through the effects of overgrazing. 99% of the pre-European extent of this vegetation remains, of which 0.3% is in conservation reserves (Shepherd et al. 2001). 0.1% of the vegetation type is in pastoral leases managed by CALM.

Pre-European	Current area (ha)	Remaining extent (ha)	Conservation %*	% in reserves / status**	CALM-managed land
IBRA Bioregion - Carnarvon available	8,523,963	8,523,963	~100%	Least concern	No information
Shire - Carnarvon	No information available				
Beard veg type - 344	248,561	248,561	~100%	Least concern	0%

* (Shepherd et al. 2001)

** (Department of Natural Resources and Environment 2002)

Methodology Shepherd et al. 2001
Department of Natural Resources and Environment 2002.

(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 at variance to this Principle**

No watercourses or wetlands are present.

Methodology GIS Database

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

Comments **Proposal may be at variance to this Principle**

The soils in the area are not one uniform type and in parts can be expected to be duplex with an increasing salinity trend at depth. Indicator species *Ptilotus polakii* and *Acacia xiphophylla* can be expected to correlate with areas that have relatively high sub-surface levels of dissolved salts.

The soil has a slight to moderate susceptibility to erosion and the infiltration potential of the soil will vary.

Methodology Department of Agriculture (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**

No conservation areas have been identified within five kilometres of the proposed area.

The closest CALM-managed land is a Marine Park located west of the notified area. While the notified area may fall within the catchment area of rivers terminating in this Marine Park, it is unlikely that the proposed activities to be undertaken within the notified area would have any deleterious effect on this conservation land.

Therefore there appears to be a low probability of the proposed clearing to be at variance with Principle (h).

Methodology CALM (2004)

(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 at variance to this Principle

There is a limited storage of surficial groundwater in the area and no current usages. The artesian aquifer is confined and very deep (600 m), and therefore unlikely be affected by the proposal. There are no potential impacts on the groundwater resource that have been identified.

Methodology Department of Environment (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 at variance to this Principle

The area under application is in an area of disorganised drainage and historically is not prone to flooding. The land relief is very low and the soil types are of a sandy nature so the risk of water shedding is low.

Methodology P Johnson (per. comm.)
Site Visit.

Planning instrument or other matter.

Comments Proposal is not at variance to this Principle

The Shire of Carnarvon states they have no objections to the proposal.

Methodology Shire of Carnarvon Advice

4. Assessor's recommendations

Purpose	Method	Applied area (ha)/ trees	Decision	Comment / recommendation
Cropping	Mechanical Removal	80	Grant	<p>The assessable criteria have been addressed and no objections were raised. To the best of the assessors knowledge there is no significant risk to these criteria.</p> <p>The assessing officer therefore recommends that the permit should be granted. The Department of Agriculture makes the following recommendations: 1) The areas should be progressively cleared as as plantings are made. DAWA does not support the clearance of land for cropping purposes when planting is likely to be delayed for more than six months; and 2) If a Permit is issued the Department of Environment will need to recognise that the proponents cropping proposals include the potential commercial production of sweet corn and forage grains, rather than forage crops alone.</p>

5. References

CALM (2004) Land clearing proposal advice. Advice to A/Director General, Department of Environment (DoE). Department of Conservation and Land Management, Western Australia. DoE TRIM ref XXXXX.

DAWA (2004) Land degradation assessment report. Office of the Commissioner of Soil and Land Conservation, Department of Agriculture Western Australia. DoE TRIM ref XXXXX.

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.

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.