Department of Environment
Government of Western Australia

Clearing Permit Decision Report

1. Application details

1.1. Permit application details

Permit application No.: 380/1
Permit type: Area Permit

1.2. Proponent details

Proponent's name: **KD Power Pastoral Co Pty Ltd**

1.3. Property details

Property: LOT 2665 ON PLAN 136363 (MCALINDEN 6225)
LOT 4931 ON PLAN 209661 (TRIGWELL 6393)
Local Government Area: Shire Of Boyup Brook & Shire Of West Arthur
Colloquial name:

1.4. Application

Clearing Area (ha)	No. Trees	Method of Clearing	For the purpose of:
5		Mechanical Removal	Fence Line Maintenance

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
Mattiske Vegetation: Yalanbee - Mixture of open forest of Eucalyptus marginata subsp. thalassica-Corymbia calophylla and woodland of Eucalyptus wandoo on lateritic uplands in semiarid to perarid zones. Dalmore - Woodland of Eucalyptus wandoo-Eucalyptus marginata subsp. marginata-Corymbia calophylla on uplands in semiarid and arid zones. Sandalwood - Woodland of Eucalyptus marginata subsp. marginata with some Corymbia calophylla and Eucalyptus wandoo over Hakea prostrata and Dryandra sessilis on steeper uplands in the semiarid zone. Qualeup - Woodland of Eucalyptus marginata subsp. marginata-Banksia grandis on slopes and woodland of Eucalyptus wandoo on lower slopes in the semiarid zone. (mattiske consulting 1998)	The area in question is fence line vegetation with very little understorey and does not represent the vegetation complexes associated with the area.	Degraded: Structure severely disturbed; regeneration to good condition requires intensive management (Keighery 1994)	GIS database: Bridgetown 1m Orthomosaic - DOLA 01

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 vegetation under application is not considered to have a high level of bilolgical diversity due to the condition of the vegetation being degraded and of a small area.

Methodology Keighery, BJ (1994)

(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

There was no request for assessment by CALM. the structure of the egetation under application is significantly altered by multiple disturbance. It is therefore unlikely to be significant for native fauna.

Methodology GIS database: Bridgetown 1m Orthomosaic - DOLA 01

(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

Five populations of Drakaea confluens (Declared Rare Flora) occurs within a 10km radius of the area under application the closest being approximately 6km east.

The Vegetation under application is significantly altered by multiple disturbances limiting it's potential conservation value. It is therefore unlikely that the proposed clearing will impact on significant flora.

Methodology GIS database: 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) in the vicinity of the proposed clearing, the nearest is approximately 70 km away.

Given that the structure of the vegetation under application is significantly altered by multiple disturbance it is unlikely to be significant for ecological communities.

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 may be at variance to this Principle

The application is located in the Jarrah Forest Bioregion in the Shire of West Arthur. The extent of native vegetation in these areas is 58.3% and 29.8% respectively (Shepherd et al. 2001). There is approximately 45% of native vegetation remaining in the local area.

Two of the Mattiske vegetation types in the area under application are under 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).

It is noted that the structure of the vegetation under application is significantly altered by multiple disturbance and does not represent the vegetation types in the area.

	Pre-European (ha)*	Current extent (ha)*	Remaining (%)*	Conservation** status	% In reserves/CALM managed land
IBRA Bioregion					
- Jarrah Forrest***	4 503 156	2 624 301	58.3	Least Concern	
Shire of West Arthur	282 614	84 226	29.8	Vulnerable	
Vegetation type:					
Beard: Unit 3	3 046 385	2 197 837	72.1	Least Concern	10.1
Mattiske:					
Yalanbee (Y5)	1 243 773	852 364	68.5	Least Concern	
Dalmore (DM2)	-	-	19	Vunerable	8.3
Sandalwood (SD)	89 636	41 876	46.7	Depleted	
Qualeup (QU)	-	-	20	Vunerable	2.6

* (Shepherd et al. 2001)
** (Department of Natural Resources and Environment 2002)
*** Within the Intensive Landuse Zone

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.

(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 area under application is approximately 150m from the closest watercourse.

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

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

Comments **Proposal is not likely to be at variance to this Principle**
There was no request for assessment by DAWA.

There is a low risk of salinity within the proposed clearing.

Methodology GIS databases:
- Salinity Mapping LM 25m - DOLA 00
- Salinity Monitoring LM 50m - DOLA 00
- Salinity Risk LM 25m - DOLA 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 may be at variance to this Principle**
There is a Conservation Reserve at the end of the proposed clearing to the east. The vegetation structure of the area under application is significantly altered by multiple disturbances and therefore is not considered as a significant link.

Methodology GIS database: CALM Managed Lands and Waters - CALM 1/06/04

(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 proposed clearing is not expected to impact on groundwater tables. There is approximately 0.08 ha of proposed clearing within the Warren River Water Reserve.

Methodology GIS databases: Public Drinking Water Source Areas (PDWSAs) - DoE 1/6/04

(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**
Due to the scale of the proposed clearing, flooding impacts are unlikely to occur.

Methodology

Planning instrument or other matter.

Comments

The proposal is not at variance with any planning instruments. Proposal is not at variance to this Principle

Methodology

4. Assessor's recommendations

Purpose	Method	Applied area (ha)/ trees	Decision	Comment / recommendation
Fence Line Maintenance	Mechanical Removal	5	**Grant**	Recommend that the permit be granted.

5. References