

1. Application detai	ils							
1.1. Permit applica	tion de	tails						
Permit application No.:		878/1						
Permit type:		Area Permit						
1.2. Proponent deta	ails							
Proponent's name:		Shire of Bridgetown -Greenbushes						
1.3. Property detail	s							
Property:			T 903 ON PLAN 189961 (BRIDGETOWN 6255)					
Local Government Area: Colloquial name:		Shire Of Bridgetown-Greenbushes						
1.4. Application								
Clearing Area (ha) 0.87	No. T	rees		f <b>Clearing</b> cal Removal		the purpose of: ding or Structure		
•	he nativ Clearii	ment and information native vegetation und Clearing Description 0.87 hectares		er application Vegetation Condition Very Good: Vegetation structure altered;		<b>Comment</b> Vegetation condition established through aerial photography.		
jarrah-marri				obvious signs of disturbance (Keighery 1994)				
Mattiske: Hester (HR) - Tall open forest to open forest of Eucalyptus marginata subsp. marginata- Corymbia calophylla on lateritic uplands in perhumid and humid zones.			:	Very Good: Vege structure altered; obvious signs of disturbance (Keig 1994)				
Balingup Slopes (BL) - Open forest of Eucalyptus marginata subsp. marginata-Corymbia calophylla on slopes and woodland of Eucalyptus				Very Good: Vege structure altered; obvious signs of disturbance (Keig 1994)				

Heddle:

**Dwellingup & Hester** Complex in High Rainfall-Central and South supports an open-forest of jarrah-marri.

Very Good: Vegetation structure altered; obvious signs of disturbance (Keighery 1994)

### Assessment of application against clearing principles 3.

# (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 vegetation proposed to be cleared is in very good condition (Keighery 1994), with 88.8% of vegetation remaining on the property. The granting of the proposed clearing would result in 85.3% of vegetation remaining on the property. The vegetation directly fringing the landfill cells is likely to be more disrupted by weed species than vegetation further from the landfill cells.

There is 58.3% of vegetation remaining within the Jarrah Forest Interim Biogeographic Regionalisation of Australia region, 67.9% of vegetation remaining within the Shire of Bridgetown-Greenbushes, 72.1% remaining within vegetation type Beard unit 3 and 82.3% remaining within Mattiske vegetation type Hester (HR).

	The proposed clearing of 0.87 hectares within these highly vegetated areas is unlikely to reduce the local level of biological diversity due to the remaining high percentages of vegetation on the property.
	As stated in the Field Survey of Flora & Vegetation (by Onshore Environmental Consultants), 'No plant taxa gazetted as Declared Rare Flora pursuant to subsection (2) of section 23F of the Wildlife Conservation Act (1950), nor any Priority flora, were located within the survey area.'
Methodology	Onshore Environmental Consultants Field Survey of Flora & Vegetation and Desktop Fauna Survey of Waste Management Facility, Bridgetown Keighery (1994) GIS database: - Bridgetown 1m Orthomosaic - DOLA 01
	regetation should not be cleared if it comprises the whole or a part of, or is necessary for the name of, a significant habitat for fauna indigenous to Western Australia.
Comments	Proposal is not likely to be at variance to this Principle
	Given the area of proposed clearing is less than 1 hectare, and that the property will have 85.3% vegetated remaining if a permit for 0.87ha is issued, it is unlikely the proposal will have a significant impact on native fauna.
	As stated in the Desktop Fauna Survey (by Onshore Environmental Consultants), 'The proposed disturbance is unlikely to adversely impact on fauna with conservation significance due to, the relatively small area being disturbed (0.5ha), the wide local distribution of the vegetation complex described at the site, the current position of the survey are immediately adjacent to the existing waste management facility and the historical logging of larger trees from the site and resultant prominence of regrowth.'
Methodology	GIS database: - Bridgetown 1m Orthomosaic - DOLA 01
(c) Native rare flo	vegetation should not be cleared if it includes, or is necessary for the continued existence of,
Comments	Proposal is not likely to be at variance to this Principle
	There are no Declared Rare Flora within the local area (10km radius) of the proposed clearing.
	One Priority 1 population is mapped within the local area, Carex tereticauis, 4.5km south of the proposed site. There is no direct vegetative link between this population and the area proposed to clear, however they are both located within Beard unit 3.
	There are no Priority 2 populations within the local area of the proposed clearing.
	There are no Priority 3 populations within the local area of the proposed clearing.
	There are no Priority 4 populations within the local area of the proposed clearing.
	There is one population with no data within the local area, Euchiton collinus, 6.3km south of the proposed clearing. There is no direct vegetative link between this population and the area proposed to clear, however they are both located within Beard unit 3.
Methodology	GIS databases: - Declared Rare and Priority Flora List - CALM 13/08/03 - Pre European Vegetation - DA 01/01
	vegetation should not be cleared if it comprises the whole or a part of, or is necessary for the nance of a threatened ecological community.
Comments	<b>Proposal is not likely to be at variance to this Principle</b> There are no Threatened Ecological Communities or Threatened Plant Communities within the local area of the proposed site.
Methodology	GIS databases: - Threatened Ecological Communities - CALM 15/7/03 - Threatened Plant Communities - DEP 06/95
	Page 2

	vegetation should not be cleared if it is significant as a remnant of native vegetation in an area s been extensively cleared.
Comments	Proposal is not likely to be at variance to this Principle The application is located in the Jarrah Forest Bioregion in the Shire of Bridgetown-Greenbushes. The extent of native vegetation in these areas is 58.3% and 67.9% respectively (Shepherd et al. 2001). The exact area applied to clear is located in vegetation type Mattiske Hester (HR) with 82.3% remaining.
	The vegetation of the area applied to clear is a component of Beard Unit 3 (Hopkins et al. 2001) of which there is 72.1% (Shepherd et al. 2001) of the pre-European extent remaining, and Mattiske Hester (HR) of which there is 82.3% (Shepherd et al. 2001) of the pre-European extent remaining and therefore of a 'least concern' status for biodiversity conservation (Department of Natural Resources and Environment 2002).
	The area applied to be cleared is less than 1 hectare granting of this application would leave 85.3% of the property vegetated.
Methodology	Department of Natural Resources and Environment (2002) EPA (2000) Havel (2002) Heddle et al. (1980) 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
	vegetation should not be cleared if it is growing in, or in association with, an environment ated with a watercourse or wetland.
Comments	<b>Proposal is not likely to be at variance to this Principle</b> There is a major perennial watercourse, Blackwood River, 2.7km south of the proposed site. The area proposed to be cleared is not linked by vegetation.
	There are many minor perennial watercourses within the local area, however due to the size of the clearing proposed it is unlikely the clearing will impact these watercourses.
	There are no wetlands within the local area.
Methodology	GIS databases: - Hydrography Linear - DoE 1/2/04
	vegetation should not be cleared if the clearing of the vegetation is likely to cause appreciable gradation.
Comments	<b>Proposal is not likely to be at variance to this Principle</b> There is no information for Acid Sulphate Soils on the property. The Groundwater Salinity is mapped at 500- 1000 mg/L. There is no known salinity risk for the property.
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
	vegetation should not be cleared if the clearing of the vegetation is likely to have an impact on ironmental values of any adjacent or nearby conservation area.
Comments	<b>Proposal is not likely to be at variance to this Principle</b> The Hester State Forest is located 400m north east of the proposed site, with a direct vegetation link between the two sites, Mattiske Hester (HR).
	Three un-named CALM Managed Lands are located within the local area, 5.5km west, 6.2km south and 7.6km south east. There is no direct vegetation link between any of these lands and the proposed site.
	The Yornup State Forest is located 5.9km south west of the proposed site, with a direct vegetation link between the two sites, Mattiske Balingup Slopes (BL).

	The property under application is 88.8% vegetated; leaving 85.3% vegetated after proposed clearing occurs. The proposed clearing will occur within the middle of the property leaving all surrounding areas of the property fully vegetated. This will prevent damage to vegetation corridors between the property and surrounding vegetation for fauna species. Due to the size of the proposed clearing and the amount of vegetation remaining on the property, it is unlikely the clearing would impact directly any on CALM Managed Lands within the local area.				
	A System 6 Conservation Reserve is located 5.4km west of the proposed site. There is no vegetation link between this Reserve and the area under application.				
Methodology	GIS database: - CALM Managed Lands and Waters - CALM 1/06/04 - System 6 Conservation Reserves - DEP 06/95				
	vegetation should not be cleared if the clearing of the vegetation is likely to cause deterioration juality of surface or underground water.				
Comments	<b>Proposal is not likely to be at variance to this Principle</b> The area proposed to be cleared is within the southern half of the Hardy Estuary - Blackwood River Hydrographic Catchment area. Due to the size of the proposed clearing it is unlikely that it would reduce water quality within the area.				
	The area proposed to clear is located on a thick bed of clay. Groundwater in the area has a static water level of 24m from ground water therefore minimising any possible water quality impact.				
	The proposed site is not within any RIWI surface water areas, ground water areas or irrigation districts.				
Methodology	GIS databases: - Hydrographic Catchments, Catchments - DoE 3/4/03				
	vegetation should not be cleared if clearing the vegetation is likely to cause, or exacerbate, the ince or intensity of flooding.				
Comments	Proposal is not likely to be 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 in	strument, Native Title, Previous EPA decision or other matter.				
Comments	The proposed site is zoned public purposes.				
	Under the EP Act the Shire of Bridgetown-Greenbushes has a Licence to operate a landfill (L48/97) for the site under application. An EP officer from the Department of Environment confirmed 'that the EP section have no objection to the expansion of the landfill'.				
Methodology	GIS database: - Town Planning Scheme Zones - MFP 8/98 - Perscom, Joel McShane, Department of Environment				
4. Assess	or's recommendations				
Purpose Met	hod Applied Decision Comment / recommendation				
Building or Mech Structure Rem	area (ha)/ trees nanical 0.87 Grant The application is not at variance to any principles therefore it is recommended the application is granted				

## 5. References

Removal

Structure

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.

application is granted

- 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.

Hill, A.L., Semenuik, C. A, Semenuik, V. Del Marco, A. (1996) Wetlands of the Swan Coastal Plain. Volume 2b, Wetland mapping, classification and evaluation. Wetland Atlas. WRC and DEP. Perth WA.

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. Onshore Environmental Consultants Field Survey of Flora & Vegetation and Desktop Fauna Survey of Waste Management Facility, Bridgetown

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)