



## 1. Application details

### 1.1. Permit application details

Permit application No.: 668/1  
Permit type: Area Permit

### 1.2. Proponent details

Proponent's name: Hardy Wine Company

### 1.3. Property details

Property: LOT 1611 ON PLAN 122001 (MOUNT BARKER 6324)  
Local Government Area: Shire Of Plantagenet  
Colloquial name: Hardy Wine CompanyOmrah Vineyard

### 1.4. Application

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

## 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 (Hopkins et al 2001, Shepherd et al 2001)	The vegetation proposed to be cleared comprises jarrah-marri trees with little or no understorey present. The trees are in a poor condition due to their location in a depression, along a watercourse. The soil around these trees has become soft and unstable due to heavy rainfalls. Some of the trees have fallen over, which has become a hazard for the vineyard workers in that area.	Degraded: Structure severely disturbed; regeneration to good condition requires intensive management (Keighery 1994)	The existing trees, although in a poor and unstable condition, provide some soil stability along the watercourse. The proponent has proposed to replant native shrubs to maintain soil stability and prevent further erosion.

## 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**  
Proposal is not at variance with this Clearing Principle as the vegetation has a low level of biological diversity. The revegetation proposed by the applicant will increase the biodiversity values of the site.

**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 at variance to this Principle**  
The proposal is not at variance with this Clearing Principle as the vegetation under application is a small area in a degraded condition and not likely to provide significant habitat compared to other nearby vegetation. The revegetation proposed by the applicant will increase the value of the area to fauna.

**Methodology** Site inspection

**(c) Native vegetation should not be cleared if it includes, or is necessary for the continued existence of, rare flora.**

**Comments Proposal is not likely to be at variance to this Principle**

The proposal is not likely to be at variance with this Clearing Principle as the vegetation has no understorey and the likelihood of significant flora being present is low. The nearest DRF is 2.3km to the north east of the proposed clearing (*Caladenia christineae*).

**Methodology** GIS Databases:  
-Declared Rare and Priority Flora List - CALM 13/08/03  
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 threatened ecological community.**

**Comments Proposal is not at variance to this Principle**

The site does not contain a Threatened Ecological Community. The nearest TEC is 23km to the east. The proposal is not at variance with this Clearing Principle.

**Methodology** GIS dataset:  
-Threatened Ecological Communities CALM 15/07/2003  
Site inspection

**(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 vegetation under application is part of Beard vegetation association 3 with 72.1% remaining (Hopkins et al. 2000, Shepherd et al.2001). Therefore, the clearing proposed is not at variance to this Clearing Principle.

Pre-European	Current area (ha)	Remaining extent (ha)	Conservation %*	% in reserves/CALM-status**	managed land
BRA Bioregion-Jarrah Forest	4,544,335	2,665,480	58.7	Least concern	
Shire of Plantagenet	485,073	231,912	47.8	Least concern	
Beard veg type-3	3,046,385	2,197,837	72.1	Least concern	10.1***

\* 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 association 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 vegetation proposed to be cleared is associated with a minor perennial watercourse. The impacts on the watercourse will be minimised as the proponent has committed to replant native shrubs to stabilise the soil and prevent any erosion. Because of this rehabilitation planting, the proposal is not considered to be at variance with this clearing Principle.

**Methodology** GIS Databases  
-Hydrography, linear - DOE 01/02/04  
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**

The removal of this vegetation will be offset by the proponent who will replant native shrubs to minimise land degradation risk. Also, method of removal will be done in such a way as to minimise degradation risk. The proposal is not considered to be at variance with this Principle.

**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 at variance to this Principle**

The nearest CALM Managed Lands and Water is the Lake Barnes Road Nature Reserve 8km south of the

proposed clearing. The proposal is not considered to be at variance with this Principle as the vegetation is not associated with conservation land and does not contribute to the connectivity in any significant way.

**Methodology** GIS Databases:  
-CALM Managed Lands and Water - CALM 01/08/04  
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**  
The area under application is not in a gazetted or proclaimed water catchment area. The vegetation removal will not significantly contribute to degradation of water quality as conditions can be set to control the impacts of clearing on surface water quality. The proposal is not considered to be at variance with this Principle.

**Methodology** GIS Databases:  
-Public Drinking Water Source Area (PDWSAs) - DOE 04/11/04  
Site inspection

**(j) Native vegetation should not be cleared if clearing the vegetation is likely to cause, or exacerbate, the incidence or intensity of flooding.**

**Comments** **Proposal is not at variance to this Principle**  
The proposal is not at variance with this Principle as the clearing is not likely to significantly increase the incident or intensity of flooding.

**Methodology** Site inspection

**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
Miscellaneous	Mechanical Removal	0.75	Grant	It is recommended that the application to remove 0.75ha of native vegetation be granted as the impacts of the clearing will be offset by planting of local native species and management of other impacts. Because of this, the proposal is either not at variance or not likely to be at variance with the Clearing Principles.

**5. References**

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.

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.

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.

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.

**6. Glossary**

Term	Meaning
CALM	Department of Conservation and Land Management
DAWA	Department of Agriculture

DEP	Department of Environmental Protection (now DoE)
DoE	Department of Environment
DoIR	Department of Industry and Resources
DRF	Declared Rare Flora
EPP	Environmental Protection Policy
GIS	Geographical Information System
ha	Hectare (10,000 square metres)
TEC	Threatened Ecological Community
WRC	Water and Rivers Commission (now DoE)