



## 1. Application details

### 1.1. Permit application details

Permit application No.: 714/1  
Permit type: Area Permit

### 1.2. Proponent details

Proponent's name: Michael Ross Hair

### 1.3. Property details

Property: LOT 12378 ON PLAN 206991 (FRANKLAND 6396)  
Local Government Area: Shire of Cranbrook  
Colloquial name: Boyup Brook Rd - Lot 12378 on Plan 206991; Vol 1504 Fol 776

### 1.4. Application

Clearing Area (ha)	No. Trees	Method of Clearing	For the purpose of:
3		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 Association 3 - Medium forest; jarrah-marri (Shepherd et al, 2001). Mattiske Consulting (1998) describes the vegetation as: Frankland Hills (FH1) Woodland to low open forest of Eucalyptus marginata subsp. marginata with some Corymbia calophylla on uplands in subhumid and semiarid zones.	The vegetation under application is 3ha of a remnant of 4.5ha. The property is highly cleared with less than 10% native vegetation remaining. There is a large intact area of native vegetation on another parcel of land immediately adjacent to the area under application.	Degraded: Structure severely disturbed; regeneration to good condition requires intensive management (Keighery 1994)	Information submitted by the applicant (AI825) shows that the vegetation is degraded, with no understorey remaining due to previous grazing pressure.

## 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 native vegetation under application does not display biodiversity that is outstanding for the bioregion or local area (photographs submitted TRIM ref AI825) and the proposal is not at variance with this Clearing Principle.

**Methodology** Photos submitted by applicant TRIM ref AI825

### (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**

While the trees may provide some habitat for fauna species the poor condition of the vegetation, and the presence of a large area of vegetation in excellent condition (immediately to the west) means that the vegetation is not essential to maintain specially protected fauna, ecological functions or ecological linkage.

**Methodology** GIS database-  
-NLWRA Current extent of native vegetation DA 30/01/2001  
Photographs submitted by applicant TRIM ref AI825

**(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**

It is not known if the site contains Declared Rare Flora as it has never been surveyed. The nearest recorded Declared Rare Flora is 13km to the south (*Diuris micrantha*), and 13.5km to the north east (*Gastrolobium lehmannii*) of the area proposed to be cleared. The proposal is unlikely to be at variance with this Clearing Principle as there is no understorey remaining in the area proposed to be cleared.

**Methodology** GIS Databases:  
-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 threatened ecological community.**

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

The nearest Threatened Ecological Community (TEC) to the area under application is 57km to the south. There are no TECs in the area proposed to be cleared.

**Methodology** GIS Databases:  
-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 at variance to this Principle**

There is less than 10% of native vegetation remaining on the property under application (Figure-TRIM ref AD221). Beard vegetation association 3 (Hopkins et al, 2001, Shepherd et al, 2001) has 72% remaining and Mattiske Consulting (1998) reported that there is 54.8% of FH1 vegetation complex remaining, which indicates that it is of 'least concern' for biodiversity conservation (Department of Natural Resources and Environment, 2002). The Shire of Cranbrook has 37% of native vegetation remaining (Shepherd et al, 2001) which indicates that it is 'depleted' (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. However, with over 2 million hectares remaining, this is not considered to be relevant to this clearing application. Therefore, this proposal is not at variance with this Clearing Principle.

**Methodology** Department of Natural Resources and Environment (2002), Hopkins et al (2001), JANIS (1997), Mattiske Consulting (1998), Shepherd et al (2001)

**(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 area under application is associated with a minor non-perennial water course which is 200m to the east. This watercourse drains into a seasonally inundated wetland which is 3.6km to the south east. Due to the small area proposed to be cleared and its distance from the watercourse, the clearing proposed is not likely to significantly impact on the watercourse or wetland.

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

**(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**

The area under application is on a gently sloping hillside on a property that has been largely planted to bluegums. Clearing of this area is not likely to significantly contribute to land degradation as there is not a high risk of erosion, acid soils or waterlogging. The applicant has noted that prior to planting the blue gums in 1999, there were small areas of salt scalds in the centre and west of the property. These have stabilised since the blue gums have grown and the owner is aware of the link between perennial vegetation and salinity risk and plans to retain vegetation and plant local native species as part of his farm plan (Michael Hair, pers comm 6/9/05).

**Methodology** GIS datasets-  
-Topographic contours, Statewide DOLA 12/9/2002  
Michael Hair pers comm 6/9/05

**(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 nearest conservation area is 6km to the north east (Cootayerup Nature Reserve No 16031). Clearing is not likely to affect buffers or linkage to this or other conservation reserves.

**Methodology** GIS Databases:  
-CALM Managed Lands and Water - CALM 01/06/04

**(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 area under application lies within Zone A of the proclaimed boundary of the Warren River Country Areas Water Supply Act. However, it is currently understood that the area is in the Frankland River/Nornalup Inlet catchment. The small area proposed to be cleared is not likely to impact on quality of surface or underground water, or cause eutrophication on or off site. The area is proposed to be used for a vineyard and this land use will need to be managed to best practice standards to ensure that water quality is not degraded by nutrient or chemical use.

**Methodology** GIS databases-  
- CAWSA Pt IIA Clearing Control Catchments DoE 17/11/2004  
- Hydrographic catchments- subcatchments- 23/03/2005

**(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 under application is in a small subcatchment of moderate relief and it is considered that the 3ha proposed to be cleared will have either no or very low impact on duration or incidence of flooding.

**Methodology** GIS datasets-  
-Topographic contours, Statewide DOLA 12/9/2002

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

**Comments**

The area proposed to be cleared is within a gazetted Country Area Water Supply Act area. However, a CAWS licence is not required if the application is considered under the Environmental Protection Act as no compensation has been paid on the property for the previous refusal of a CAWS licence. The Shire of Cranbrook supports the proposal to clear the vegetation for use as a vineyard (TRIM ref AI824). The proposal is not known to be at variance with any other planning instrument, previous decision or other matter.

**Methodology** Submission from Shire of Cranbrook (TRIM ref AI824)  
GIS databases-  
- CAWSA Pt IIA Clearing Control Catchments DoE 17/11/2004  
- Hydrographic catchments- subcatchments- 23/03/2005

**4. Assessor's recommendations**

Purpose	Method	Applied area (ha)/ trees	Decision	Comment / recommendation
Horticulture	Mechanical Removal	3	Grant	It is recommended that the clearing permit application be granted as the proposal is either not at variance with Clearing Principles (a, d and e) and not likely to be at variance with Clearing Principles (b, c, f, g, h, l and j).

**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.

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)