Clearing Desktop Report – Short Form



1. PROPOSAL DETAILS

Proposal Name:	Maintenance Zone Establishment Project (H053)		
Region/Directorate:	Wheatbelt		
Local Government Authority:	Shire of Williams and Shire of Narrogin		
Road/Bridge Name and No:	Williams Narrogin Highway (H053)		
Proposal Location (SLK):	9.18 SLK		
TRIM Link to Spatial Data:	n/a		
EOS No:	510		
Expected Proposal Start Date:	10 January 2022		
Project No:	30000170	Task Code:	19503
LISC TRIM No:	D21#1297886	HRA TRIM No:	D16#150922

2. PURPOSE OF CLEARING

The purpose of the proposed clearing is to improve safety of Williams Narrogin Highway by establishing a clear zone next to the road. This will provide an additional recovery area for errant vehicles. This tree is located less than 4 m from the road edge.

3. ALTERNATIVES TO CLEARING

The tree to be removed is within 4 m of the road and, as such represents a hazard to road users that currently have limited space to recover an errant vehicle should they run off the road. Given its proximity to the road, there is no alternative to clearing the tree without jeopardising the intended safety outcome. The clearing width has already been reduced from 8 m to 4m.

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

- During the detailed design process, the clearing was reduced to only a maximum of 4 m from the road edge instead of the 8 m recommended in the Austroads Standard. This tree is less than 4 m from the road edge.
- The tree will be clearly demarcated using flagging or spray paint to the commencement of native vegetation clearing in order to prevent accidental overclearing.

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):	0.01 ha	No. Trees Cleared:	One
Species Name:	Eucalyptus rudis		
Easting and Northing:	116.9653358, -33.0091260		
7. EXISTING ENVIRONMENT AND SITE INFORMATION			
Site Vegetation Description/Association:	Site has been mapped as 'Revegetated areas' by GHD (2016). This vegetation type includes some remnant isolated native trees. Given the age of the subject tree, it is being conservatively treated as a remnant Eucalypt for approvals purposes.		
Site Vegetation Condition:	Degraded		
Pre-European Extent Remaining (%):	Vegetation association 7 (Medium woodland; York gum (<i>Eucalyptus loxophleba</i>) & wandoo) – 12.73 percent remaining Statewide; and 19.61 percent remaining in Jarrah Forest IBRA Region.		
A ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL ACAINST SEEADING PRINCIPLES			

8. ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL AGAINST CLEARING PRINCIPLES

Is vegetation to be cleared at variance with:	Justification or Evidence:
Principle (a) – Native vegetation should not be cleared if it comprises a high level of biological diversity.	The proposal involves clearing of a single <i>Eucalyptus rudis</i> tree in an area that is mapped as revegetation in a Degraded condition. The tree to be cleared is a locally common species and no significant flora species or communities will be impacted by the proposed clearing. As such, the vegetation does not comprise a high level of biological diversity and the proposed clearing is therefore not at variance to 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.	Although the tree proposed to be cleared has a DBH of 70 cm, it does not contain any hollows. GHD (2016) identified this vegetation type as providing limited resources to conservation significant fauna species including black cockatoos and the Redtailed Phascogale. For these reasons, the proposed clearing is not likely to be at variance to this principle.
Principle (c) – Native vegetation should not be cleared if it includes, or is necessary for the continued existence of, rare flora.	No Threatened flora were recorded during the 2015 biological survey at the site. Based on the highly modified nature of the site proposed to be cleared, none are considered likely to occur. The clearing is not likely to be at variance with this principle.
Principle (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.	The biological survey undertaken in Spring 2016 confirmed that the vegetation within the clearing area and immediate surrounds does not represent any Threatened Ecological Communities. The proposed clearing is therefore not at variance with 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.	Although the vegetation to be cleared occurs within an under- represented mapped vegetation association (i.e. <30% of pre- European extent remaining), the vegetation proposed to be cleared has been mapped as revegetation with isolated remnant Eucalypts, in Degraded condition. The vegetation in this location is no longer considered to be representative of the remnant vegetation association. As such, the clearing of a single Eucalypt is not considered to be at variance with principle (e).
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.	The vegetation proposed to be cleared is not growing in or in the proximity to any watercourse or wetland. As such, the proposed clearing is not at variance with this principle.
Principle (g) – Native vegetation should not be cleared if the clearing of the vegetation is likely to cause appreciable land degradation.	Based on the very small area (i.e. a single tree) and degraded nature of the vegetation proposed to be cleared, the proposed clearing will not cause appreciable land degradation and is therefore unlikely to be at variance with this principle.
Principle (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.	There are no Environmentally Sensitive Areas, Class A Reserves or DBCA managed lands located in the vicinity of the proposed clearing and impacts on any conservation areas are therefore not expected. The proposed clearing is therefore unlikely to be at variance to 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.	No watercourses occur in the vicinity of the proposed clearing. For this reason, and due to the relatively small scale of the proposed clearing, it is not anticipated that the clearing will result in any adverse impacts on surface or ground water. The proposed clearing is not at variance to 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.	Given that such a relatively small area of native vegetation is proposed to be cleared, the clearing is not likely to cause or exacerbate flooding. As a result, the clearing is not likely to be at variance with this principle.
Methodology Used and References:	Main Roads Site Inspection (refer to Attachment 1) Photographs of each tree (refer to Attachment 1) GHD (2016) Maintenance Zone Establishment: Toodyay Goomalling Road (M060), Williams Narrogin Highway (H053) and Pinjarra Williams Road (M053) Biological Survey (D16#261520)
Completed By:	
Job Title Senior Environment Officer	

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

DECISION ON CLEARING ASSESSMENT				
Clearing Assessment	ENDORSED ⊠	REFUSED		
Comments	I agree that the proposed clearing under CPS 818 is not at variance to any of the clearing principles as it involves clearing a single Eucalyptus rudis tree in degraded condition. Therefore we will not be submitting to DWER.			
Job Title	Senior Environment Officer			
Date	24/12/2021			

Attachment 1 – Photographs of tree proposed to be cleared from site inspection undertaken by Main Roads SEO and Wheatbelt Vegetation Manager 03/12/2021.



