Clearing Desktop Report – Short Form



This Clearing Desktop Report – Short Form is required for proposals with low clearing impacts that do not require a full assessment through a Clearing Desktop Report (CDR). Clearing that may be or is at variance should not be assessed using this form. This form must be reviewed and endorsed by the Central Review and Submissions Process (CRSP) Team, who will determine whether the clearing impacts have been assessed properly. Send the form via <u>clearingpermit@mainroads.wa.gov.au</u>. The Environment Officer will be advised within **2 business days** if the assessment of the proposal clearing is endorsed. Refer to the <u>Factsheet on the Assessment of Low Impact Clearing under Main Roads Statewide Clearing Permit CPS 818</u> (D17#452322) for further information.

1. PROPOSAL DETAILS

Proposal Name:	Great Eastern Highway Bypass Interchanges Drainage Channel		
Region/Directorate:	Metro		
Local Government Authority:	City of Swan		
Road/Bridge Name and No:	N/A		
Proposal Location (SLK):	50 metres west of Vale Road		
TRIM Link to Spatial Data:	D22#381083		
EOS No:	1867		
Expected Proposal Start Date:	August 2022		
Project No:	2111504	Task Code:	19101
LISC TRIM No:	D22#682985	HRA TRIM No:	D22#381481

2. PURPOSE OF CLEARING

These works are associated with the GEHB and Abernethy Road Interchange works approved by Main Roads in the Great Eastern Highway Bypass Interchanges Project – Abernethy Road Interchange and Lloyd Street Bridge Preliminary Environmental Impact Assessment (PEIA) dated March 2021 (D21#212527.) As a result of design development, it has now been determined that up to 1,360 m2 of additional disturbance may be required to develop the project. This includes impacting three native trees (264 m² ha of native vegetation).

This report addresses the additional area of native vegetation clearing required for the upgrade of an existing drainage channel extending 50 m from Vale Road to discharge into Hazelmere Lake (Figure 1). The drain currently exists, and these works are to allow for realignment of the head of the drain where it connects to Vale Road.

Works will include deepening of the current channel and slight widening to allow for maintenance of existing grade from ground level to the base of the drain.

3. ALTERNATIVES TO CLEARING

Alternatives are not considered appropriate, given that there is an existing drainage line. Any alternative would likely result in more extensive impacts.

4. MEASURES TO AVOID, MINIMISE, MITIGATE AND MANAGE PROPOSAL CLEARING IMPACTS

Works include the steepening of the drain bank to avoid tree 9, which is a potential future black cockatoo breeding tree. Trucks will only turn in the truck turning area as shown on Figure 1 (D22#819931).

The drain has been reduced in length so that it daylights prior to where three *Melaleucas* are growing. This change avoided the proposed works from impacting riparian vegetation.

5. APPROVED POLICES AND PLANNING INSTRUMENTS

The clearing of native vegetation in Western Australia is regulated under the *Environmental Protection Act 1986* (EP Act) and the Environmental Protection (Clearing of Native Vegetation) Regulations 2004 (Clearing Regulations).

In addition to the matters considered in accordance with section 510 of the EP Act (see Section 1.3), Main Roads has also had regard to the following documents.

Environmental Protection Policies:

- Environmental Protection (Peel Inlet Harvey Estuary) Policy 1992
- Environmental Protection (Western Swamp Tortoise Habitat) Policy 2011

Other legislation of relevance for assessment of clearing and planning/other matters:

- Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016 (WA) (BC Act)
- Conservation and Land Management Act 1984 (WA) (CALM Act)
- Country Areas Water Supply Act 1947 (WA) (CAWS Act)
- Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 (Cth) (EPBC Act)
- Planning and Development Act 2005 (WA) (P&D Act)
- Soil and Land Conservation Act 1945 (WA)
- *Rights in Water and Irrigation Act 1914* (WA) (RIWI Act)
- Aboriginal Heritage Act 1972 (WA) (AHA)
- Town Planning and Development Act (WA)1928

Relevant other policies and guidance documents:

- Environmental Offsets Policy (Government of Western Australia, 2011)
- A guide to the assessment of applications to clear native vegetation (DEC, December 2014)
- Procedure: Native vegetation clearing permits (DWER, October 2019)
- Environmental Offsets Guidelines (Government of Western Australia, August 2014)
- Technical guidance Flora and Vegetation Surveys for Environmental Impact Assessment (EPA, 2016)
- Technical guidance Terrestrial Vertebrate Fauna Surveys for Environmental Impact Assessment (EPA, 2020)
- Approved conservation advice under section 266B of the EPBC Act for threatened flora/fauna/vegetation communities
- Approved Recovery Plans for threatened species
- EPBC Act Referral guidelines for the three threatened black cockatoo species
- Strategic advice EPA

6. CLEARING AREA			
Clearing Area (ha):	0.26	No. Trees Cleared:	3
Species Name:	Eucalyptus rudis		
Easting and Northing:	405,203.196 6,468,572.749 405,290.677 6,468,547.309		
7. EXISTING ENVIRONMENT AND SITE INFORMATION			
Site Vegetation Description/Association:	 The site comprises three native trees and a large artificial drainage swale measuring approximately 92 m. During the time of the site visits, the drainage swale contained no water. The soil within the survey area is a brown sandy loam and becomes relatively light and fine closer to and within the 		

Site Vegetation Condition:	 drainage basin. The survey area is relatively flat and is a low-lying area with a gentle slope. The area is largely grass with minimal bare ground, and there is also a large amount of course and fine litter. Vegetation condition is Degraded (EPA 2016). Disturbance is present in the form of weeds, grazing, fencing, buildings, and tracks. Native vegetation foliage cover is 5% overstorey Species were classified as overstorey, midstorey and understorey using the indicative height thresholds for major vegetation groups defined in Appendix A of the Vegetation Assessment Guide (DoE, 2013). 	
Remaining (%):	 Bassendean 1001 – 22.05% Bassendean 1018 – 17.39% 	
8. ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSA	L AGAINST C	
Is vegetation to be cleared at with:	variance	Justification or Evidence:
Principle (a) – Native vegetation s cleared if it comprises a high level diversity.	hould not be of biological	 The Proposal lies within the Swan Coastal Plan IBRA region, with two vegetation sub-associations occurring: 1001: Bassendean Medium very sparse woodland; jarrah, with low woodland; <i>Banksia & Casuarina</i>; 1018: Bassendean Mosaic: Medium forest; Jarrah-Marri / Low woodland; <i>Banksia /</i> Low forest; teatree / Low woodland; <i>Casuarina obesa</i>. No vegetation recorded at the proposal area resembles any known TEC or PEC communities. Habitat loss from proposed clearing is not likely to be significant as the same habitat types are available in better condition immediately adjacent to the cleared areas towards Hazelmere Lake. The clearing of three <i>Eucalyptus rudis</i> that are in Degraded condition and in an area with evidence of previous disturbance is not considered to provide a high level of biological diversity and therefore, the proposed clearing is not at variance with this principle.
Principle (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.		One fauna habitat is located in the proposal area - Scattered Eucalyptus/Marri in cleared areas. Vegetation is in Degraded condition and impacted by weeds, grazing, fencing, buildings and tracks and is not considered necessary for the maintenance of, a significant habitat for indigenous fauna. The proposed clearing is not at variance with this principle.
Principle (c) – Native vegetation s cleared if it includes, or is neces continued existence of, rare flora.	hould not be	No Declared or Threatened flora taxa were recorded during the desktop and field assessment or are considered likely or possible to occur in the proposal area (D22#662461). MRWA flora and herbarium GIS layers database searches identified no known Threatened or Priority flora species within 100m of the proposal clearing area. Proposed clearing is not at variance to this Principle.
rinciple (a) – Native vegetation s cleared if it comprises the whole of	nould not be r a part of, or	proposed clearing area. DBCA mapping shows the clearing area

is necessary for the maintenance of, a threatened ecological community.	lies within the buffer for Banksia Woodlands of the Swan Coastal Plain TEC/PEC. However, vegetation in the clearing area was mapped by Biota as part of the contextual area considered in the GEHBI biological survey (D21#1157274) and vegetation units mapped in the area are not consistent with any TECs. The site inspection conducted by GCA also confirmed the vegetation is not representative of a TEC (D22#662461). The vegetation is therefore not part of or necessary for the maintenance of a TEC and is therefore not at variance to this principle.
Principle (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.	The EPA Position Statement No. 2 on Environmental Protection of Native Vegetation in Western Australia (EPA, 2000) recognises that the retention of 30% or more of the pre-clearing extent of each ecological community is necessary if Western Australia's biodiversity is to be protected. In constrained areas such the Perth and Peel region the EPA recognises that 10% representations should be maintained. The proposal area intersects two vegetation associations mapped by Beard (1976) representing pre-European vegetation. Bassendean Association 1001 has 26.18% remaining and Bassendean Association 1018 has 16.42% remaining in the City of Swan. Therefore, the proposed clearing area does not represent a significant remnant of native vegetation in an area that has been extensively cleared. Targeted clearing of three trees in degraded condition will not reduce the remaining pre-European vegetation below the 10%
	threshold and therefore the clearing is not at variance to this principle.
Principle (f) – Native vegetation should not be cleared if it is growing in, or in association with, an environment associated with a watercourse or wetland.	No Ramsar Wetlands, nationally Important Wetlands or DBCA managed waters occur within the survey area. The proposal area is mapped as a Multiple Use Wetland (UFI 15267) on the basis that it comprises a paddock that can become seasonally waterlogged. The project has been designed to avoid impacting any wetland vegetation including Melaleucas associated with the nearby Resource Enhancement Wetland (UFI 9134). The proposal is therefore not at variance to this principle.
Principle (g) – Native vegetation should not be cleared if the clearing of the vegetation is likely to cause appreciable land degradation.	Department of Primary Industries and Regional Development (DPIRD) soil degradation risk mapping shows the project area is mapped as L1. Less than 3% of this map unit has a high to extreme water erosion risk. Wind and water erosion, as well as waterlogging pose the greatest risk of land degradation to the Proposal Area. It is unlikely that the Proposal will cause appreciable land degradation given that the area of clearing will remain bound by vegetation to the east and west, and will be managed via the implementation of a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP). Clearing is not at variance with this Principle
Principle (h) – Native vegetation should not be	The vegetation proposed for clearing is not associated with a
cleared if the clearing of the vegetation is likely to have an impact on the environmental values of any adjacent or nearby conservation area.	conservation area. The nearest conservation area is a river reserve approximately 2 km north west of the project area. The clearing of three trees will not impact any of the environmental values of any conservation areas. The proposal is not at variance with this Principle.

Principle (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.		The proposed clearing is not expected to have an impact upon surface water and groundwater quality. The clearing is for the realignment of an existing drain that will continue to carry stormwater of similar quality and quantity. Clearing is not at variance with this Principle.		
Principle (j) – Native vegetation should not be cleared if clearing the vegetation is likely to cause, or exacerbate, the incidence or intensity of flooding.		DPIRD mapping (DPIRD-007) shows the flooding risk in the area is L1 and <3% of the map unit has a moderate to high flood risk. The proposed works will facilitate the movement of stormwater of similar volumes as current, and will not result in an increased likelihood of flooding. The proposed clearing is not at variance to this principle.		
Methodology Used and References:		Shapefile of clearing area/trees D22#381083 Site Inspection Report D22#662461 Figure of impacted trees D22#832977 Figures D22#819931		
Completed By:				
Job Title	Environmental Scientist GCA			
Date	20/07/2022			
Job Title	Environment Officer (Main Roads)			
Date	4/8/2022			

Once all sections are completed, send the form to CRSP for review and endorsement.

DECISION ON CLEARING ASSESSMENT				
Clearing Assessment	ENDORSED 🛛 REFUSED 🗆			
Comments	The 3 <i>Eucalyptus rudis</i> trees are located in an area with evidence of previous disturbance and in degraded condition. Sufficient justification has been provided to demonstrate the removal of these trees is low impact and not at variance with the clearing principles.			
Job Title	Senior Environment Officer			
Date	05/08/2022			



- Approved PEIA (D21#212527)

metres

GREAT EASTERN HIGHWAY BYPASS INTERCHANGE PROJECT

Figure