Department of Environment
Government of Western Australia

Clearing Permit Decision Report

1. Application details

1.1. Permit application details

Permit application No.: 834/1
Permit type: Area Permit

1.2. Proponent details

Proponent's name: **Thiss Jan Roelof & Erin Grace Gorter**

1.3. Property details

Property: LOT 5 ON DIAGRAM 43806 (MOBRUP 6395)
Local Government Area: Shire Of Kojonup
Colloquial name:

1.4. Application

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

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 Unit 3 - Medium forest; jarrah-marri	Ninety scattered paddock trees	Degraded: Structure severely disturbed; regeneration to good condition requires intensive management (Keighery 1994)	
Beard Unit 4 - Medium woodland; marri & wandoo	Ninety scattered paddock trees	Degraded: Structure severely disturbed; regeneration to good condition requires intensive management (Keighery 1994)	
Beard Unit 27 - Low woodland; paperbark (Melaleuca sp.)	Ninety scattered paddock trees	Degraded: Structure severely disturbed; regeneration to good condition requires intensive management (Keighery 1994)	
Beard Unit 126 - Bare areas; fresh water lakes	Ninety scattered paddock trees	Degraded: Structure severely disturbed; regeneration to good condition requires intensive management (Keighery 1994)	

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 proposed clearing site is within an EPA Position Statement No. 2 Area, however due to the application being for scattered paddock trees it is unlikely that the vegetation is representative of this Statement.

There are no Declared Rare or Priority Flora or Fauna found within the site therefore lowering biodiversity levels.

Although there is only 15.2% of vegetation left within the Shire of Kojonup, once again due to the degraded quality of the proposed clearing, the vegetation is not representative of this precentage.

As the proposed clearing is for scattered paddock trees, degraded vegetation quality, it is not likely that the proposal is at variance to this Principle.

Methodology EPA (2000)
Keighery (1994)
Hopkins et al. (2001)
GIS database:
- Threatened and Priority fauna - CALM (CALM 2004)
- Declared Rare and Priority Flora List - CALM 13/08/03

(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**
Aerial photography indicates that the vegetation may provide some habitat to fauna species but is highly disturbed due to the relatively degraded quality of the vegetation.

The proposed clearing of scattered paddock trees is unlikely to hold significant fauna value.

Methodology GIS database:
Pemberton 1.4m Orthomosaic - DOLA 99

(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**
There are two Declared Rare Flora within the local area (10km radius), the closest being Gastrolobium lehmannii, 8.1km North of the proposed site. They are of the same vegetation type, Beard Unit 3, as the proposed site.

No Priority 1 populations exist within the local area.

One Priority 2 population exists within the local area, Maleleuca ordinifolia, 7.6km North of the proposed site. This population and the proposed site are of the same vegetation type, beard Unit 3.

No Priority 3 populations exist within the local area.

No Priority 4 populations exist within the local area.

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 likely to be at variance to this Principle**
There are no Threatened Ecological Communities within the local area.

There are no Threatened Plant Communities within the local area.

Methodology GIS databases:
- Threatened Ecological Communities - CALM 15/7/03
- Threatened Plant Communities - DEP 06/95

(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 area under application is located in the Jarrah Forest Bioregion in the Shire of Kojonup. The extent of native vegetation in these areas is 58.3% and 15.2% respectively (Shepherd et al. 2001).

The site of the proposed clearing consists of four vegetation types, Beard units: 4, 3, 27 and 126 with the extent of these vegetation types left being 23.5%, 72.1%, 66.1% and 92.3% respectively.

	Pre-European (ha)*	Current extent (ha)*	Remaining (%)*	Conservation** status
IBRA Bioregion				
- Jarrah Forest***	4 503 156	2 624 301	58.3	Least Concern
Shire of Kojonup	292 938	44 482	15.2	Vulnerable

Vegetation type:				
Beard: Unit 4	1 247 834	292 993	23.5	Vulnerable
Beard: Unit 3	3 046 385	2 197 837	72.1	Least Concern
Beard: Unit 27	161 222	106 631	66.1	Least Concern
Beard: Unit 126	224 442	207 137	92.3	Least Concern

* (Shepherd et al. 2001)
** (Department of Natural Resources and Environment 2002)
*** Within the Intensive Landuse Zone

Although there is only 15.2% of vegetation left within the Shire of Kojonup, it is not believed that the area proposed to clear is representative of these vegetation types, Beard units: 4, 3, 27 and 126, as the application is for scattered paddock trees.

Methodology Department of Natural Resources and Environment (2002)
EPA (2000)
Hopkins et al. (2001)
Shepherd et al. (2001)
GIS databases:
- Mattiske Vegetation - CALM 24/3/98
- Heddle Vegetation Complexes - DEP 21/06/95
- Interim Biogeographic Regionalisation of Australia - EM 18/10/00
- Local Government Authorities - DLI 8/07/04
- Pre European Vegetation - 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

There are two non-perennial swamps on the proposed site.
Although there is proposed clearing within relatively close proximity to one of the swamps, it is unlikely to reduce significant environmental value due to the scattered trees chosen to be cleared.

There are no RAMSAR, Geomorphic or ANCA wetlands on the proposed site or within the local area (10km radius).

There are no EPP areas or lakes within the local area.

Methodology GIS databases:
- Hydrography Linear - DoE 1/2/04

(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

There is no information for Acid Sulphate Soils within the area under application.
Groundwater salinity is mapped at 3000 - 7000 mg/L.
There is no known salinity risk for the area under application.

Methodology GIS databases:
- Acid Sulfate Soil Risk Map, SCP - DoE 01/02/04
- Salinity Risk LM 25m - DOLA 00.
- Groundwater Salinity, Statewide - 22/02/00

(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

Cootayerup Nature Reserve lies 1.1km west of the proposed site. The proposed site and the Reserve have the same vegetation type, Beard unit 4.
Wandoora Nature Reserve is located 1.4km north east of the proposed site and are both within the same vegetation type, Beard unit 3.

Registered National Estate, Bolbelup East Area, is 7.2km south east of the propose site and they are connected by vegeation types, Beard units 3 and 4.

Methodology GIS database:
- CALM Managed Lands and Waters - CALM 1/06/04
- 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 at variance to this Principle

The area under application is within two Hydrographic Catchment areas, Warren River and Nornalup Inlet - Franklin River, and is not within a Public Drinking Water Source Area.

The proposed site is not within a RIWI ground water area.

There are no WRL properties within the proposed sites local area (10km radius).

Methodology GIS databases:
- Hydrographic Catchments, Catchments - DoE 3/4/03
- Public Drinking Water Source Areas (PDWSAs) - DOE 29/11/04
- RIWI Act Groundwater Areas WRC 13/06/00
- WRL, Properties, Surface Water Licences - WRC (Current)
- WRL, Properties, Ground Water Licences - WRC (Current)

(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

Flooding impacts are unlikely to occur as a result of the proposed clearing due to its size.

Methodology GIS databases:
- Topographic Contours, Statewide - DOLA 12/09/02

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

Comments

The site proposed to clear is zoned Rural.

The Shire have no objections to the proposed clearing. No submission was received , however verbal confirmation was made with Russell Hobman from the Shire by Karis Tingey (on November 11, 2005, see section 3 of this report) to ensure they had no issues with the proposal.

There are no other RIWI or EP licences on the proposed site.

Methodology GIS database:
- Town Planning Scheme Zones - MFP 8/98
- WRL, Properties, Surface Water Licences - WRC (Current)
- WRL, Properties, Ground Water Licences - WRC (Current)

4. Assessor's recommendations

Purpose	Method	Applied area (ha)/ trees	Decision	Comment / recommendation
Plantation	Mechanical Removal	90	**Grant**	The assessment showed that the application was not at variance to any of the Principles. The department recommends the proposal be granted without conditions.

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.

Havel, J.J. and Mattiske Consulting Pty Ltd (2002) Review of management options for poorly represented vegetation complexes, Conservation Commission.

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.

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)