



1. Application details

1.1. Permit application details

Permit application No.: 352/1
Permit type: Area Permit

1.2. Proponent details

Proponent's name: Great Southern Property Managers

1.3. Property details

Property: HAY LOCATION 2046 (ROCKY GULLY 6397)
HAY LOCATION 2047 (ROCKY GULLY 6397)
HAY LOCATION 2081 (ROCKY GULLY 6397)
HAY LOCATION 2082 (ROCKY GULLY 6397)
LOT 2037 ON PLAN 29178 (ROCKY GULLY 6397)
HAY LOCATION 2060 (ROCKY GULLY 6397)
LOT 1 ON DIAGRAM 65036 (Lot No. 1 KENT RIVER ROCKY GULLY 6397)
HAY LOCATION 2040 (ROCKY GULLY 6397)
LOT 1914 ON PLAN 203463 (ROCKY GULLY 6397)

Local Government Area: Shire Of Plantagenet
Colloquial name: Great Southern Plantations Ltd

1.4. Application

Clearing Area (ha)	No. Trees	Method of Clearing	For the purpose of:
6.64		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 vegetation association 3: Medium Forest, jarrah-marri	This proposal involves the clearing of single paddock trees with no understorey.	Degraded: Structure severely disturbed; regeneration to good condition requires intensive management (Keighery 1994)	The single paddock trees in this proposal are generally the unhealthy ones which appear to be dying. They all have some signs of ill health with dead or broken limbs and little leaf coverage.
Beard vegetation association 27: Low Woodland, paperbark	The trees comprise of Jarrah, Yates and Marri.		

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 at variance to this Principle**
This proposal is not at variance with this Clearing Principle because single pad trees are being removed. The paddock trees to be removed have been selected due to their ill health. Most of these are marri and have very little leaf cover.

Methodology Site inspection

(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**
Although the paddock trees might be stepping stones for native fauna it's not likely that this proposal is at variance with this principle as relatively few trees are being removed.

Methodology Site inspection

(c) 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 understorey is proposed to be cleared in this proposal and the tree species are not Declared Rare species. Therefore this proposal is not at variance with this Principle.

Methodology Site inspection

(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 at variance to this Principle

This proposal is not at variance with this Principle as the GIS Dataset (Threatened Ecological Communities) 15/07/03 CALM shows there are no significant communities.

Methodology GIS Dataset (Threatened Ecological Communities) 15/07/03 CALM

(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

This proposal is not at variance with this principle as the vegetation types are well represented.

reserves/CALM-	Pre-European area (ha)	Current extent (ha)	Remaining %*	Conservation status**	% in managed land
IBRA Bioregion	4,544,335	2,665,480	58.7	Least Concern	
Shire-Plantagenet	485,073	231,912	47.8	Depleted	
Beard veg type 27	161,222	106,631	66.1	Least Concern	39.9
Beard veg type 3	3,046,385	2,197,837	72.1	Least Concern	10.1#
Mattiske veg type Bey2	783,045	285,693	36.5	Depleted	
Mattiske veg type CM	306,094	208,013	68	Least Concern	
Mattiske veg type FH5	214,498	125,315	58.4	Least Concern	
Mattiske veg type QN	90,724	67,364	74.3	Least Concern	
Mattiske veg type S2	211,189	126,439	59.9	Least Concern	
Mattiske veg type V5	52,496	29,726	56.6	Least Concern	

* (Shepherd et al. 2001)

** (Department of Natural Resources and Environment 2002)

The benchmark of 15% representation in conservation reserves (Janis, 1997) has not been met for this vegetation association.

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 at variance to this Principle

The trees to be removed are placed higher in the landscape in the timber company's plantable area. None of the trees that have been requested to be removed are situated near a watercourse or wetland. This proposal is not at variance to this principle.

Methodology Site inspection

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

Comments Proposal is not at variance to this Principle

Due to the low density and condition of the single paddock trees to be removed, this proposal is not at variance to this Principle. In addition, the establishment of plantation timber is likely to be beneficial in terms of preventing land degradation.

Methodology Site inspection

(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 conservation area is within 5km of this property however this proposal is not likely to be at variance with this Clearing Principle because the trees to be removed are a very small number of the existing single paddock

trees on this property.

Methodology Site inspection

(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**

This proposal is not at variance with this Clearing Principle as the trees being removed represent a very small number of the existing single paddock trees on this property. The reason for the removal of these trees is due to their ill health thus they would have a low hydrological value in the landscape. The establishment of blue gums will mitigate against the loss of the paddock trees in terms of hydrological function.

Methodology Site inspection

(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**

This proposal is not at variance with this Clearing Principle because the single paddock trees proposed to be removed are in poor condition and make up a small percentage of the total paddock trees on this property. The area where these trees are situated is not prone to flooding and the removal of these trees will not increase the risk of flooding.

Methodology Site inspection

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

Comments

Not applicable

Methodology

4. Assessor's recommendations

Purpose	Method	Applied area (ha)/ trees	Decision	Comment / recommendation
Cropping	Mechanical Removal	6.64	Grant	I recommend that this permit be granted as it is not at variance with any of the Clearing Principles. Part of this property is situated within a Country Areas Water Supply (CAWS) area. A CAWS licence was issued to allow the removal of trees otherwise exempt under the EP Act. A condition of this licence was for the landowner to enter into an Agreement to Reserve with the Water and Rivers Commission to maintain and protect an area (minimum of 10 times the area to be cleared) of healthy native vegetation in perpetuity.

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.

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.

JANIS Forests Criteria (1997) Nationally agreed criteria for the establishment of a comprehensive, Adequate and Representative reserve System for Forests in Australia. A report by the Joint ANZECC/MCFFA National Forest Policy Statement Implementation Sub-committee. Regional Forests Agreement process. Commonwealth of Australia, Canberra.

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

Mattiske Consulting (1998) Mapping of vegetation complexes in the South West forest region of Western Australia, CALM.

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.