



## 1. Application details

### 1.1. Permit application details

Permit application No.: 683/1  
Permit type: Area Permit

### 1.2. Proponent details

Proponent's name: John Paul & Esther Sterndale

### 1.3. Property details

Property: LOT 34 ON DIAGRAM 84939  
Local Government Area: Shire Of Kalamunda  
Colloquial name:

### 1.4. Application

Clearing Area (ha)	No. Trees	Method of Clearing	For the purpose of:
0.4		Burning	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
<p>Beard vegetation association 4: Medium woodland; marri &amp; wandoo (Shepherd et al 2001, Hopkins et al 2001).</p> <p>Hedde vegetation complex - Forrestfield Complex: Vegetation ranges from open forest of Eucalyptus calophylla - E. wandoo - E. marginata to open forest of E. marginata - E. calophylla - C. fraseriana - Banksia species. Fringing woodland of E. rudis in the gullies that dissect this landform (Hedde et al 1980).</p> <p>Mattiske vegetation complex DS: Mosaic of open forest of Eucalyptus marginata subsp. marginata-Corymbia calophylla, with some admixtures with Eucalyptus laeliae in the north (subhumid zone), with occasional Eucalyptus marginata subsp. elegantella (mainly in subhumid zone) and Corymbia haematoxylon in the south (humid zone) on deeper soils adjacent to outcrops, woodland of Eucalyptus wandoo (subhumid and semiarid zones), low woodland of Allocasuarina huegeliana on shallow soils over granite outcrops, closed heath of Myrtaceae-Proteaceae species and lithic complex on or near granite outcrops in all climate zones (Mattiske Consulting 1998).</p>	<p>The clearing as proposed consists of a number of small areas which together total 0.4ha. The property in which the area under application is located is approximately 1ha in size. From the photographs provided by the proponent, the area under application appears to have been previously parkland cleared as there is little to no original understorey vegetation remaining. The trees within the area proposed to be cleared consists of various Eucalypt species. The understorey consists of grasses and weed species.</p>	<p>Good: Structure significantly altered by multiple disturbance; retains basic structure/ability to regenerate (Keighery 1994)</p>	<p>Information pertaining to the vegetation descriptions was obtained from photographs provided by the proponent (DoE Trim Ref IN22064).</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 likely to be at variance to this Principle**

The area under application appears to have been previously parkland cleared with little to no original understorey vegetation remaining. The Gooseberry Hill National Park is located approximately 400m from the area under application. It is considered that the vegetation in this National Park would be of a higher biological

diversity compared to the small, scattered areas under application.

Although this property is currently registered as a Bush Forever site, the Bush Forever Office is in the process of removing this classification and other properties that make up site 217 from the register. It is considered that vegetation in this area was mapped incorrectly and has become increasingly degraded (Kieron Beardmore pers comm 08/11/05).

Given the above, it is considered that the clearing as proposed is not at variance to this Principle.

**Methodology** Information provided by the proponent (DoE Trim Ref IN22064)  
GIS Databases:  
- CALM Managed Lands and Waters - CALM 01/08/04  
- Bush Forever - MFP 07/01

**(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**  
A search of the Department of Environment and Heritage database for the area listed three species or species habitat likely to occur: Baudin's Black-Cockatoo, (*Calyptorhynchus baudinii*), Chuditch or Western Quoll (*Dasyurus geoffroii*) and Carnaby's Black-Cockatoo, (*Calyptorhynchus latirostris*). However, given that the area under application has been previously parkland cleared, it is considered unlikely that the area under application provides significant habitat for endemic native fauna.

**Methodology** Department of Environment and Heritage EPBC Act database  
Information provided by the proponent (DoE Trim Ref IN22064)

**(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 Declared Rare Flora (DRF) species, *Conospermum undulatum*, is recorded as occurring within 1km of the proposed clearing. A number of Priority species are also recorded as occurring within this 1km range. It is considered unlikely however, that these understorey species of conservation significance would occur within the area under application given the complete lack of understorey vegetation.

**Methodology** GIS databases:  
- Declared Rare and Priority Flora List - CALM 13/08/03.  
- Clearing Regulations - Environmentally Sensitive Areas - DOE 8/03/05  
- Pre-European Vegetation - DA 01/01.

**(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 likely to be at variance to this Principle**  
The nearest Threatened Ecological Communities (TECs) are approximately 1.03km from the area under application. While some of these TECs occur on the same vegetation type as that in the area under application, most are within different vegetation associations and therefore unlikely to be found within the area under application. It is also considered that given the absence of understorey vegetation within the area under application, TECs are unlikely to occur within the proposed clearing or the remainder of the property.

**Methodology** GIS databases:  
- Threatened Ecological Communities - CALM 15/7/03  
- Pre-European Vegetation - DA 01/01.

**(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 State Government is committed to the National Objectives and Targets for Biodiversity Conservation 2001-2005 (AGPS 2001) which includes a target that prevents clearance of ecological communities with an extent below 30% of that present pre-European settlement (Department of Natural Resources and Environment 2002; EPA 2000).

The Mattiske vegetation complex identified in the area under application is above this 30% representation (43.3%) (Mattiske Consulting 1998) whereas the vegetation complexes for Beard and Heddle are below this 30% minimum (23.5% and 17.5% respectively) (Shepherd et al 2001, Hopkins et al 2001, Heddle et al 1980). However, given that the area under application has a distinct lack of understorey vegetation, it may not be an accurate representation of these vegetation complexes.

This is supported further as the Bush Forever Office is recommending that this site be removed from the Bush Forever registry due to the increased level of disturbance and a revised interpretation of the Heddle vegetation complexes (Kieron Beardmore pers com 08/11/05). As such it is considered that the clearing as proposed is unlikely to be at variance to this Principle.

**Methodology** AGPS (2001)  
Shepherd et al (2001)  
Hopkins et al. (2001)  
Department of Natural Resources and Environment (2002)  
EPA (2000)  
Mattiske Consulting (1998)  
Heddle et al (1980)  
GIS databases:  
- Pre-European Vegetation - DA 01/01.  
- Heddle Vegetation Complexes - DEP 21/06/95.  
- Mattiske Vegetation - CALM 24/03/98  
- Interim Biogeographic Regionalisation of Australia - EA 18/10/00.

**(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**  
There are no wetlands or watercourses within 3km of the area under application.

**Methodology** GIS databases:  
- Hydrography, linear - DOE 01/02/04.  
- Geomorphic wetlands (Mgmt Categories) - Swan Coastal Plain - DOE 15/09/04.  
- Clearing Regulations - Environmentally Sensitive Areas - DOE 8/03/05

**(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 Acid Sulphate Soil risk map shows no known risk of shallow or deeper Acid Sulphate Soils (ASS) or Potential Acid Sulphate Soils (PASS) in the area under application. The soils are a hard yellow sand, however, given the relatively small size of proposed clearing (0.4ha) and the large amount of remnant vegetation in the local area, the clearing as proposed is not likely to cause appreciable land degradation.

**Methodology** GIS databases:  
- Acid Sulphate Soil risk map, SCP DOE 01/02/04.  
- Soils, Statewide - DA 11/99

**(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 area under application is situated within the Bush Forever site 217. However, the Bush Forever Office has recommended that this site be removed from the Bush Forever registry due to the increased level of disturbance and the revised interpretation of the Heddle vegetation complexes (vegetation of site 217 is now considered to be of the Darling Scarp Complex rather than the Forrestfield Complex as first gazetted). In addition the Bush Forever Office has raised no objection to the clearing as proposed.  
  
Other conservation areas adjacent to the area under application include Gooseberry Hill National Park which is located 400 metres from the proposed clearing. However, given the small size of the area under application it is unlikely that the clearing as proposed would have any significant impact on the National Park.

**Methodology** GIS databases:  
- CALM Managed Lands and Waters - CALM 01/08/04  
- Bushforever - MSP 07/01  
- Register of National Estate - EA 28/01/03

**(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**  
There are no watercourses or wetlands within 3km of the area under application, nor are there any surface water flow-lines. In addition, the area under application is not located within a groundwater protection area of a Public Drinking Water Source Area. Given the relatively small size of the area under application and the large amount of vegetation within the local area, it is unlikely that the clearing as proposed would have a significant

impact on the quality of surface or underground water.

- Methodology**
- Groundwater Salinity, Statewide - 22/02/00.
  - Hydrography, linear - DOE 01/02/04.
  - Hydrographic Catchments, Sub-catchments - DOE 01/07/03
  - Rainfall, Mean Annual - BOM 30/09/01
  - Public Drinking Water Source Areas (PDWSAs) - DOE 29/11/04

**(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 likely to be at variance to this Principle**

The area shows a general relief in topography toward the south. Given the relatively small size of proposed clearing (0.4ha) and the large amount of vegetation in the area, the clearing as proposed is not likely to cause or exacerbate the incidence of flooding.

- Methodology** GIS Databases:
- Hydrography, linear - DOE 01/02/04.
  - Topographic Contours, Statewide - DOLA 12/09/02.

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

**Comments**

The area under application is located within a Declared Bush Forever site 217. As part of the Metropolitan Region Scheme (MRS) amendment process, officers undertook a site survey of Bush Forever site 217. The assessment concluded that the vegetation complex had been mapped incorrectly. As such, Bush Forever site 217 has been recommended to be deleted from the register. This will mean that if the amendment is approved by Parliament, Bush Forever site 217 will not be considered in a Bush Forever Protection area.

Shire of Kalamunda has approved a development application in respect to keeping of animals, as it complies with the purpose and intent of the zone and Council guidelines.

There is no other RIWI Act Licence, Works Approval or EP Act Licence that will affect the area that has been applied to clear.

- Methodology**
- Department for Planning and Infrastructure submission (DoE Trim Ref EI2712)
  - Information provided by the proponent: Shire of Kalamunda Planning Services Committee Minutes for 11 April 2005 (DoE Trim Ref IN22064)

**4. Assessor's recommendations**

Purpose	Method	Applied area (ha)/ trees	Decision	Comment / recommendation
Building or Structure	Burning	0.4	Grant	<p>The area under application is currently registered as a Bush Forever Protection area. However, the Bush Forever Office has recommended that this site be removed from the Bush Forever register due to the increased level of disturbance and a revised interpretation of the Heddle vegetation complexes. This recommendation is to be presented Western Australian Planning Commission (WAPC) within the coming months.</p> <p>Notwithstanding, the application has been assessed and the proposed clearing is not likely to be at variance to any of the ten clearing principles. Furthermore the areas applied to be cleared are relatively small and have been parkland cleared, and therefore do not represent areas of high biological diversity or areas of conservation significance.</p> <p>The assessor therefore recommends that this permit be granted.</p>

**5. References**

- AGPS (2001) The national objective and targets for biodiversity conservation 2001-2005. Commonwealth of Australia, Canberra.
- 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.
- EPA (2000) Environmental protection of native vegetation in Western Australia. Clearing of native vegetation, with particular reference to the agricultural area. Position Statement No. 2. December 2000. Environmental Protection Authority.
- Heddle, E. M., Loneragan, O. W., and Havel, J. J. (1980) Vegetation Complexes of the Darling System, Western Australia. In Department of Conservation and Environment, Atlas of Natural Resources, Darling System, Western Australia.
- 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.

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.

## 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)