



1. Application details

1.1. Permit application details

Permit application No.: 377/1

Permit type: Area Permit

1.2. Proponent details

Proponent's name: Durnbond Pty Ltd

1.3. Property details

Property: LOT 10181 ON PLAN 203442 (MANJIMUP (S))

Local Government Area: Shire Of Manjimup

Colloquial name:

1.4. Application

Clearing Area (ha)	No. Trees	Method of Clearing	For the purpose of:
2.5		Mechanical Removal	Grazing & Pasture

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
<p>The vegetation proposed to be cleared is:</p> <p>Mattiske vegetation Kb (Keystone) complex which comprises a mosaic of tall open forest of Eucalyptus guilfoylei-Eucalyptus jacksonii-Eucalyptus diversicolor on slopes of major hills rising above coastal plain with Allocasuarina.</p> <p>On a broader scale the vegetation is part of Beard vegetation association 23 which comprises low woodland jarrah and Banksia.</p>	<p>The vegetation is Eucalyptus marginata/Corymbia calophylla forest with hardly any native understorey remaining, which broadly fits the Beard vegetation association description.</p>	<p>Degraded: Structure severely disturbed; regeneration to good condition requires intensive management (Keighery 1994)</p>	<p>The understorey comprises pasture grass species with occasional Hakea sp. This was established during a site visit held on 17/2/2005.</p>

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**
The proposal is not at variance with this Clearing Principle as the site does not display a high level of biodiversity.

Methodology Site visit

(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**
While this vegetation is likely to provide habitat for local fauna, it is considered that the impacts will be relatively low, especially if the adjacent vegetation and wetland areas are fenced and allowed to revegetate. Therefore the proposal is not likely to be at variance with this Clearing Principle.

Methodology Site visit

(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

The proposal is not likely to be at variance to this Clearing Principle as there is very limited understorey remaining and the tree species are not significant flora.

Methodology Site visit

(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

The proposal is not likely to be at variance to this Clearing Principle as the site has not been identified as a threatened ecological community or significant ecological community.

Methodology GIS database Threatened Ecological Communities 15/07/2003 CALM. Site visit.

(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 proposal is not at variance to this Principle, although it should be noted that there is only 17.9% of vegetation remaining on the property.

reserves/CALM-	Pre-European area (ha)	Current extent (ha)	Remaining %*	Conservation status**	% in managed land
IBRA Bioregion- Warren	851,529	739,273	86.8	Least concern	
Shire of Manjimup	705,670	591,748	83.9	Least concern	
On the property	83.6	15	17.9		
Beard veg type-23	50,127	33,700	67.2	Least concern	57.4
RFA veg type-Kb*** (Shepherd et al. 2001)	283460	231926	81.8	Status	

** (Department of Natural Resources and Environment 2002) *** (Mattiske Consulting 1998)

Methodology Shepherd et al. (2001), Department of Natural Resources and Environment (2002), Mattiske Consulting (1998)

(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 area proposed to be cleared is immediately adjacent to an environmentally sensitive area, a seasonally inundated paluslope (as defined in Mapping and Wetland Classification of Wetlands from Augusta to Walpole (V & C Semeniuk Research Group, 1997). It is unlikely that the clearing proposed would impact on the paluslope. In fact, if the paluslope and palusplain is fenced and allowed to revegetate, it is likely that there will be a net improvement in the watercourses and wetlands.

Methodology V & C Semeniuk Research Group (1997). Site visit.

(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

No salinity or other land degradation risks have been identified for this catchment. The proposal is not at variance with this Clearing Principle (DAWA 2005a).

Methodology Site visit, DAWA (2005a)

(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 at variance to this Principle

The proposal is not at variance with this Principle as the nearest conservation area (Walpole Nornalup National Park) is 800m to the south and not likely to be impacted by the clearing proposed.

Methodology GIS database: CALM Managed lands and waters (1/6/04)

(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 area proposed to be cleared is within one of the surface water catchments for the town of Walpole's drinking water supply. Advice from the Water Corporation suggests that this proposal will not impact on the potable water supply. It is unlikely that the clearing will impact on surface or groundwater due to the small area proposed to be cleared.

Methodology Water Corporation (pers comm Bunbury office).

(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 is not prone to flooding, so the clearing is not at variance to this Clearing Principle.

Methodology Site visit

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

Comments

The proposal is not at variance with any known planning instruments, past EPA decisions or other matter. Native title has been extinguished on this property.

Methodology

4. Assessor's recommendations

Purpose	Method	Applied area (ha)/ trees	Decision	Comment / recommendation
Grazing & Pasture	Mechanical Removal	2.5	Grant	It is recommended that this clearing permit application be granted subject to the condition of fencing. The proposal for clearing for pasture and gravel extraction is not at variance with any of the Clearing Principles. The landowners have also offered to make the clearing conditional on the fencing of 5ha of an adjacent area of native vegetation and part of the Environmentally Sensitive Area (paluslope and palusplain).

5. References

- DAWA (2004a) Land degradation assessment report from Land Conservation Officer. Office of the Commissioner of Soil and Land Conservation, Department of Agriculture Western Australia. DoE TRIM ref AD120.
- 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.
- Mattiske Consulting (1998) Mapping of vegetation complexes in the South West forest region of Western Australia, CALM.
- Semeniuk V & C (1997) Wetland mapping classification between Augusta and Walpole. Prepared for Waters and Rivers Commission.
- 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.