



1. Application details

1.1. Permit application details

Permit application No.: 550/1
Permit type: Area Permit

1.2. Proponent details

Proponent's name: Great Southern Vineyard Holdings Pty Ltd

1.3. Property details

Property: LOT 21 ON PLAN 22229 (FRANKLAND 6396)
LOT 5 ON PLAN 22230 (FRANKLAND 6396)
LOT 4 ON PLAN 22230 (FRANKLAND 6396)
Local Government Area: Shire of Cranbrook
Colloquial name: Lot 4 on Plan 22230

1.4. Application

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

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 Associations 3-Medium forest ; jarrah marri Regional Forest Assessment (Mattiske Consulting 1998)-vegetation_class FH2 (Frankland Hills) Woodland of Eucalyptus wandoo-Corymbia calophylla with some Eucalyptus marginata subspecies. marginata on slopes of low undulating hills in subhumid and semiarid zones.	The vegetation proposed to be cleared consists of two isolated areas (7.6ha in total) in an elevated section of land in the middle of the property. The vegetation consists mainly of jarrah-marri trees in poor condition with little or no understorey present. The areas show past disturbances and it has been used for livestock grazing and shelter. The vegetation observed during the site visit is consistent with the Beard Vegetation Association description. (Site visit TRIM ref AD155)	Degraded: Structure severely disturbed; regeneration to good condition requires intensive management (Keighery 1994)	The property was used for grazing and cropping in the past. The vegetation proposed to be cleared consists of two areas left for shelter of livestock. These proposed areas are left in a degraded state with the proposal of removing the vegetation to expand the existing vineyard. Rehabilitation and/or offsets are offered along northeast boundary (8.6ha) and southern boundary (33.4ha) of Lot 21. These areas will be protected through an ATR. In addition, the proponent has offered to replant creeklines on adjacent Lots 4 and 5 Ferngrove Road (16.5ha).

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**
There is little or no understorey remaining in the area proposed to be cleared. The proposal is not at variance with this Clearing Principle as the vegetation has a low level of biological diversity.

Methodology Site visit (TRIM ref AD155)

(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 at variance to this Principle**
The proposal is not at variance with the Clearing Principle as the vegetation has a relatively low level of value for native fauna. To offset the impacts of the vegetation proposed to be removed, the proponent has offered to permanently protect areas of native vegetation and replant other areas. Therefore the proposal is not at variance with this Clearing Principle.

Methodology Site visit (TRIM ref AD155)

(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

The proposal is not at variance with this Clearing Principle as the vegetation has isolated minimal understorey and the likelihood of significant flora being present is extremely low.

Methodology Site visit (TRIM ref AD155)

(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

No Threatened Ecological Communities have been recorded in the area (within 40km radius). Therefore this proposal is not at variance with this Principle.

Methodology GIS dataset: Threatened Ecological Communities CALM 15/07/2003 and site visit (TRIM ref AD155).

(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 with this Clearing Principle as the vegetation is relatively well represented. While the vegetation association is not adequately reserved, the vegetation subject to this permit application is not a good candidate for reservation.

	Pre-European area (ha)	Current extent (ha)	Remaining status**	Conservation %*	% in reserves/ CALM-managed land
IBRA Bioregion-Jarrah Forest	4,544,335	2,665,480	58.7	Least concern	
Shire-Cranbrook	326,719	123,063	37.7	Depleted	
On the property-Lot 21 (4&5)	149 (182)	52 (25)	35 (14)	Depleted (Vul)	
Beard veg type-3	3,046,385	2,197,837	72.1	Least concern	10.1***
RFA veg type-FH2	469,231	215,378	45.9	Depleted	

* (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 vegetation associations 3.

Methodology Shepherd et al. (2001), Department of Natural Resources and Environment (2002), JANIS (1997)

(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 proposal is not at variance with this Principle as the vegetation is not associated with any wetlands or watercourses. The area proposed to be cleared is not in the same catchment as Byenup Lagoon System (nearby ANCA wetland).

Methodology Site visit (TRIM ref AD155).

(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

The proposal is not at variance with this Principle as the vegetation has limited hydrological function due to its poor condition and small areas. The removal of this vegetation is unlikely to contribute to land degradation risk. The Commissioner for Soil and Land Conservation advises that the water use by the proposed vineyard will be greater than that under the present annual pasture land use. This, when considered in conjunction with the protection of existing vegetation, replanting of degraded valley floors and large scale plantings of commercial timbers, which are occurring both on site and off site suggests a positive effect on groundwater trends is likely. However, it should be noted that the proposed revegetation of the areas along degraded first order streams on Lots 4 and 5 will not directly compensate potential impacts of clearing areas on Lot 21, as they are within a separate sub catchment.

The proposed clearing of 7.59 hectares of land within Lot 21 has the potential to cause appreciable on site and off land degradation in the form of an increase in waterlogging and resultant salinity.

However, land degradation is likely to be minimal, provided the proposed vineyard is established in conjunction with strategic revegetation. The proposal is not likely to be at variance with this Clearing Principle

Methodology DAWA (2005)

(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 vegetation is not associated with conservation land and does not contribute to connectivity in any significant way.

Methodology Site visit (TRIM ref AD155)

(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

The proposal is not at variance with this principle as the areas proposed to be cleared are relatively small and the vegetation is in a degraded state. The vegetation removal will not significantly contribute to degradation of water quality. Offsets and replanting will assist in mitigating any impacts from removal of vegetation.

Methodology Site visit (TRIM ref AD155)

(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 proposal is not at variance with this principle as the area is not prone to flooding.

Methodology Site visit (TRIM ref AD155)

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

Comments

The proposal is not at variance with any known planning instrument or decision.

Methodology

4. Assessor's recommendations

Purpose	Method	Applied area (ha)/ trees	Decision	Comment / recommendation
Horticulture	Mechanical Removal	7.59	Grant	It is recommended that the clearing permit be granted as the proposal is not at variance with any of the clearing principles. Any negative impacts caused by the clearing will be mitigated by the proposed replanting. Replanting is required as a condition.

5. References

DAWA Land degradation assessment report. Office of the Commissioner of Soil and Land Conservation, Department of Agriculture Western Australia. DoE TRIM ref AD165.

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.