

Clearing Permit Decision Report

1. Application details

Permit application details

Permit application No.: 344/1 Permit type: Area Permit

1.2. Proponent details

Proponent's name: MR Steven John Adams

Property details 1.3.

Property: PART LOT 1820 ON PLAN 122746 (CATTERICK 6255)

Local Government Area: Shire Of Bridgetown-Greenbushes

Application

Colloquial name:

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

Site Information

Existing environment and information

2.1.1. Description of the native vegetation under application

Vegetation Description Clearing Description Vegetation Condition

The vegetation consists of wet area species including Eucalyptus rudis (flooded gum), Melaleuca hamulosa, Melaleuca preissiana (modong), Astarta fascicularis (astartea), Baumea juncea (twig rush), Lepidosperma

effusum.

Riparian Vegetation contained domestic rubbish within

Very Good: Vegetation structure altered; obvious signs of disturbance (Keighery 1994)

Comment

Assessment of application against clearing principles

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

Comments Proposal may be at variance to this Principle

> The vegetation under application consists of wet area species including Eucalyptus rudis (flooded gum), Melaleuca hamulosa, Melaleuca preissiana (modong), Astarta fascicularis (astartea), Baumea juncea (twig rush), Lepidosperma effusum. The vegetation also had domestic rubbish within it.

Methodology EPA (2000).

(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

> There was no request for assessment by CALM. The site visit undertaken indicates that the vegetation may provide some habitat for fauna species.

Methodology DoE Site Visit (2005)

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

Comments Proposal is not at variance to this Principle

No Declared Rare of Priority Flora species are mapped with in the local area (10km radius).

There is a low probability of the proposed clearing being at variance with this principle.

Methodology GIS databases: 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

There are no records of Threatened Ecological Communities (TEC) within the local area (10km radius).

There is a low probability of the proposed clearing being at variance with this principle.

Methodology GIS databases:

- Threatened Ecological Communities CALM 15/7/03
- Threatened Plant Communities DEP 06/95.

(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

The application is located in the Jarrah Forest Bioregion in the Shire of Bridgetown Greenbushes. The extent of native vegetation in these areas is 58.3% and 67.9% respectively (Shepherd et al. 2001).

reserves/CALM	Pre-European	Current extent Remaining		Conservation**	% In
	(ha)*	(ha)*	(%)*	status	managed land
IBRA Bioregion - Jarrah Forest***	4544335	2 624 301	58.3	Least Concern	
Shire of Manjimup	135 387	91 961	67.9	Least Concern	
Vegetation type: Beard: Unit 3	3 046 385	2 197 837	72.1	Least Concern	10.1
Mattiske: Catterick (CC1)	274 435	192 294	70.1	Least Concern	
Heddle Complex: Darling Plateau Catterick	na	na	na	na	

^{* (}Shepherd et al. 2001)

The vegetation under application is of Least Concern as the remaining vegetation is over 30%. The State Government is committed to the National Objectives Targets for Biodiversity Conservation which includes a target that prevents clearance of ecological communities with an extent below 30% of that present pre-1750 (Department of Natural Resources and Environment, 2002; EPA, 2000).

The property has approximately 12.5 ha (41.4%) of native vegetation remaining, and if implemented, this clearing proposal will leave 38.8% remaining (11.7 ha). There is 60% native vegetation in the 10 km radius surrounding the area under application.

Methodology

Hopkins et al. (2001); Havel (2002); Shepherd et al. (2001).

GIS databases:

- Mattiske Vegetation CALM 24/3/98
- Interim Biogeographic Regionalisation of Australia EM 18/10/00
- Pre European Vegetation DA 01/01.
- Heddle Vegetation Complexes DEP 21/06/95

(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

There is a water course (minor perennial) that flows within the area under application.

Methodology GIS databases: Hydrography Linear - DoE 1/2/04

^{** (}Department of Natural Resources and Environment 2002)

^{***} Within the Intensive Landuse Zone

(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

There is no information for Acid Sulphate Soils on the property. Groundwater salinity is mapped at 500 - 1000 mg/L. Salinity is mapped at a medium to high risk area.

It is not likely that the proposed clearing will cause appreciable land degradation.

Methodology GIS databases:

- Salinity Risk LM 25m DOLA 00.
- Groundwater Salinity, Statewide 22/02/00

(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

CALM Managed Lands/Water located near the area under application include the Wilga State Forest 2.5 km NE of the area, the Hester State Forest located 2.836 km SW of the area. All areas are not linked vegetatively to the area under application.

It is not likely that the area under application is at variance to this principle.

Methodology GIS database:

- CALM Managed Lands and Waters CALM 1/06/04
- Register of National Estate EA 28/01/03
- System 6 Conservation Reserves DEP 06/95.

(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 proposed clearing is within the hardy estuary blackwood river catchment and not within a gazetted public drinking water supply area and is not likely to degrade water quality.

Methodology GIS databases:

- Public Drinking Water Source Areas (PDWSAs) DOE 29/11/04
- Hydrographic Catchments, Catchments DoE 3/4/03

(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

Flooding impacts are unlikely to occur as a result of the proposed clearing due to its size.

Methodology GIS databases:

- Topographic Contours, Statewide - DOLA 12/09/02

Planning instrument or other matter.

Comments Proposal is not at variance to this Principle

No planning issues or other issues have been raised by the Shire of Manjimup.

The property is zoned RURAL. Proposal is not at variance to this Principle

Methodology GIS database: Town Planning Scheme Zones - MFP 8/98.

4. Assessor's recommendations

Purpose Method Applied Decision Comment / recommendation area (ha)/ trees

Dam Mechanical 0.8 **Grant** This application is at variance to principal F. Construction Removal

However the decision to grant this permit is based on the applicants willingness to fence off the dam area after construction is completed and to clean up domestic rubbish within the water course left by the previous owners.

5. References

