



1. Application details

1.1. Permit application details

Permit application No.: 490/1
Permit type: Area Permit

1.2. Proponent details

Proponent's name: Nathan Webb-Smith

1.3. Property details

Property: LOT 122 ON PLAN 27721 (NANUTARRA 6751)
LOT 2 ON PLAN 130398 (NANUTARRA 6751)
Local Government Area: Shire Of Ashburton
Colloquial name: Wyloo Station Airstrip

1.4. Application

Clearing Area (ha)	No. Trees	Method of Clearing	For the purpose of:
11.6		Mechanical Removal	Building or Structure

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
Beards Vegetation Association #103 - Hummock grasslands, shrub steppe; snakewood over soft spinifex & T. wiseana (Hopkins et al, 2001).	There are no Declared Rare and Priority Flora or Threatened Ecological Communities known to occur within the area proposed for clearing. The area to be cleared has been previously disturbed, so it is unlikely that the vegetation represents significant habitat for fauna.	Very Good: Vegetation structure altered; obvious signs of disturbance (Keighery 1994)	The area to be cleared is unlikely to represent an area of outstanding biological diversity due a long history of pastoral activity on the land.

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 likely to be at variance to this Principle**
The vegetation of the site is comprised of mixed hummock grasslands and shrubs, which are well represented in the area surrounding the project area. The area is unlikely to represent an area of outstanding biological diversity due a long history of pastoral activity on the land.

Methodology GIS Database:
- Pre-European Vegetation - DA 01/01
- Cadastre - DLI 1/05/05

(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**
As the area to be cleared has been previously disturbed, it is unlikely that the vegetation represents significant habitat for fauna.

Methodology Permit application

(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**
There are no known Declared Rare and Priority Species within the area proposed for clearing.

Methodology GIS Database: Declared Rare and Priority Flora List - CALM 13/08/04

(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 known Threatened Ecological Communities within the area proposed for clearing.

Methodology GIS Database: Threatened Ecological Communities - CALM 15/07/03

(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 likely to be at variance to this Principle**
The vegetation under application is Beards Vegetation Association #103 (Hopkins et al, 2001) of which there is ~100% of the pre-European extent still remaining (Shepherd et al, 2001).

Methodology Hopkins et al, 2001;
Shepherd et al, 2001;
GIS Database: Pre-European Extent - 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 likely to be at variance to this Principle**
The vegetation to be cleared is not associated with a wetland or watercourse.

Methodology GIS Database:
- Hydrology, linear - DOE 1/2/04;
- RAMSAR, Wetlands - CALM 21/10/02

(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**
From the information provided, the likely land degradation risks posed by the clearing of vegetation are minimal.

Methodology Permit application

(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**
The project area is not adjacent to any existing or proposed conservation areas.

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**
It is unlikely that the vegetation clearing will have a significant impact on ground or surface water quality as the application area is not in a groundwater recharge area nor associated with any watercourses.

Methodology GIS Database:
- Groundwater Subareas - WRC 10/10/00;
- Hydrography, linear - DOE 1/2/04;
- RIWI Act, Surface Water Areas - WRC 18/10/02

(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 likely to be at variance to this Principle**
Flooding impacts are unlikely to be exacerbated as a result of the proposed clearing due to its location and rainfall levels in the area. The region within which the project area is located receives an average annual rainfall of ~400mm, the majority of which falls during December to March. The elevation of the area is gradually sloping, ranging from 155m to 165m. The rainfall levels and frequency and topographic slope would not impact on peak flood height or duration with the removal of vegetation.

Methodology GIS Databases:
 - Rainfall, Mean Annual - BOM 30/09/01;
 - Topographic Contours, Statewide - DOLA 12/09/02

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

Comments

The vegetation to be cleared is within Lot 2 on Deposited Plan 130398 Certificate of Title 959/23 and Gregory Location Lot 122 on Deposited Plan 27721 Certificate of Title 1967/60.

The Shire of Ashburton has no objection to the proposed clearing.

There are two Native Title Claims over the area under application by the Puutu Kunti Kurrama peoples and the Pinikura peoples. However, the Special Lease has been granted so therefore the granting of a clearing permit does not constitute a future act under the Native Title Act.

Methodology Shire of Ashburton submission (2005)
 GIS Database: Native Title Claims - DLI 19/12/04

4. Assessor's recommendations

Purpose	Method	Applied area (ha)/ trees	Decision	Comment / recommendation
Building or Structure	Mechanical Removal	11.6	Grant	Digitised area about 30ha but only 11.6ha is vegetated. Assessable criteria have been addressed and no objections were raised. The Assessing Officer therefore recommends that the permit should be granted.

5. References

Hopkins, A.J.M., Beeston, G.R. and Harvey J.M. (2001) A database on the vegetation of Western Australia. Stage 1. CALMScience after J. S. Beard, late 1960's to early 1980's Vegetation Survey of Western Australia, UWA Press.

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.