

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 clearingpermit@mainroads.wa.gov.au. The Environment Officer will be advised within **2 business days** if the assessment of the proposal clearing is endorsed. Refer to the [Factsheet on the Assessment of Low Impact Clearing under Main Roads Statewide Clearing Permit CPS 818 \(D17#452322\)](#) for further information. Text in *red italics* are guidance notes and should be deleted once the HRA is complete. *Blue non-italicised* text is where relevant information is to be added and changed to black once complete.

1. PROPOSAL DETAILS

Proposal Name:	Swan River Crossings – Bracks Street Laydown Area		
Region/Directorate:	Metro		
Local Government:	Fremantle		
Road/Bridge Name & Number:	85 Bracks Street		
Proposal Location (SLK):	N/A		
CDR Short Form TRIM Number:	D24#850099		
Spatial Data TRIM Number:	D24#851221		
EOS Number:	1808		
Expected Proposal Start Date:	17 June 2024		
Oracle Project No:	21115632	Task Code:	19301
LISC TRIM Number:	D24#837977	HRA TRIM Number:	D24#840215

2. PURPOSE OF CLEARING

The vegetation clearing is proposed to facilitate the use of 85 Bracks Street as a laydown and storage area to support the Swan River Crossings Project.

3. ALTERNATIVES TO CLEARING

The initial location considered for the laydown and storage area was to use already cleared land adjacent to the project. However, negotiations with the landowner to use this land were not successful.

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

The following alternatives to clearing were considered during the development of the proposal:

- In locating suitable land for a laydown area, the key considerations were a suitable size, proximity to the project and a preference for already cleared land. Although some native vegetation is present in the assessment area the land was historically used as an industrial site until 2015 when it was decommissioned and remediated. Since then, the property has been left vacant and vegetation on the property is regrowth that is in Degraded to Completely Degraded condition.
- Main Roads retains frangible vegetation where a clear zone is to be established for road projects. For this project, however, clearing will only be required to accommodate the road formation, with no clear zone being established. Accordingly, the retention of frangible vegetation does not apply to this proposal.
- Reducing the speed limit to minimise clearing requirements, while still balancing safety (driver fatigue) and freight efficiency. Speed Limits are an essential mechanism to ensure the safe and efficient operation of road networks. The application of appropriate speed limits and other traffic management measures is a key mechanism in managing vehicle speeds to achieve desired safety, mobility, traffic management, local amenity, and road user expectations. There are several factors involved in road safety, including road conditions, driver behaviour and overall road design. Except in special situations, reducing speed limits below national standards on state and national roads is not typically supported as it has the potential to contribute to driver frustration, impatience, tiredness and recklessness. The environmental values protected

by reducing the speed limit, do not justify the impacts on freight efficiencies nor road user safety. Accordingly, the reduction of the speed limits to avoid clearing of native vegetation for this proposal is not proposed.

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 51O 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):	0.54 Ha	No. Trees Cleared:	
Species Name(s):	<i>Acacia Rostellifera</i> , Smokebush (<i>Olearia axillaris</i>), Pigface (<i>Carpobrotus virescens</i>), <i>Scaevola crassifolia</i>		
Easting and Northing:	115.7487816°E, 32.0315940°S		

7. EXISTING ENVIRONMENT AND SITE INFORMATION

Site Vegetation Description/Association:	<p>Native vegetation consists of regrowth in two clusters of <i>Acacia Rostellifera</i> over an understorey dominated by weeds with Smokebush (<i>Olearia axillaris</i>), Pigface (<i>Carpobrotus virescens</i>) and <i>Scaevola crassifolia</i>.</p> <p>The proposal area is mapped as vegetation association SPEARWOOD_1007, described as "Mosaic: Shrublands; <i>Acacia lasiocarpa</i> & <i>Melaleuca acerosa</i> heath / Shrublands; <i>Acacia rostellifera</i> & <i>Acacia cyclops</i> thicket".</p>
---	---

Site Vegetation Condition:	Completely Degraded to Degraded																				
Pre-European Extent Remaining (%):	<u>Vegetation Associations</u>																				
	Vegetation association SPEARWOOD_1007 is not constrained at the state, Bioregion or sub-bioregion level but is constrained locally.																				
	<table><tr><th>Scale</th><th>Pre-European extent</th><th>Current Extent</th><th>% remaining (% in DBCA land)</th></tr><tr><td>Statewide</td><td>30,407.75</td><td>20,691.11</td><td>68.05 (10.04)</td></tr><tr><td>IBRA Bioregion</td><td>30,109.89</td><td>20,679.62</td><td>68.68 (10.13)</td></tr><tr><td>IBRA Sub-region</td><td>30,109.89</td><td>20,679.62</td><td>68.68 (10.13)</td></tr><tr><td>LGA</td><td>286.11</td><td>7.22</td><td>2.52</td></tr></table>	Scale	Pre-European extent	Current Extent	% remaining (% in DBCA land)	Statewide	30,407.75	20,691.11	68.05 (10.04)	IBRA Bioregion	30,109.89	20,679.62	68.68 (10.13)	IBRA Sub-region	30,109.89	20,679.62	68.68 (10.13)	LGA	286.11	7.22	2.52
	Scale	Pre-European extent	Current Extent	% remaining (% in DBCA land)																	
	Statewide	30,407.75	20,691.11	68.05 (10.04)																	
	IBRA Bioregion	30,109.89	20,679.62	68.68 (10.13)																	
	IBRA Sub-region	30,109.89	20,679.62	68.68 (10.13)																	
	LGA	286.11	7.22	2.52																	
	<u>Vegetation Complexes</u>																				
	The proposal area is mapped as Cottesloe Complex-Central and South which is described as: Mosaic of woodland of <i>Eucalyptus gomphocephala</i> (Tuart) and open forest of <i>Eucalyptus gomphocephala</i> (Tuart) - <i>Eucalyptus marginata</i> (Jarrah) - <i>Corymbia calophylla</i> (Marri); closed heath on the Limestone outcrops.																				
Over 30% of this vegetation complex remains.																					
<table><tr><th>Hedde/Mattiske Veg Complex</th><th>Pre-European Extent (ha)</th><th>Current extent (ha)</th><th>% Remaining</th></tr><tr><td>Cottesloe Complex-Central and South</td><td>45,299.61</td><td>14,567.87</td><td>32.16</td></tr></table>	Hedde/Mattiske Veg Complex	Pre-European Extent (ha)	Current extent (ha)	% Remaining	Cottesloe Complex-Central and South	45,299.61	14,567.87	32.16													
Hedde/Mattiske Veg Complex	Pre-European Extent (ha)	Current extent (ha)	% Remaining																		
Cottesloe Complex-Central and South	45,299.61	14,567.87	32.16																		

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.	<p>The proposal area is located on a former industrial site that has historically been completely cleared and covered in infrastructure from at least the mid-1960's until early 2015. Since the removal of infrastructure in 2015, the site has been left clear and vegetation has regrown on site.</p> <p>The vegetation in the proposal area is in 'Completely Degraded' to 'Degraded' condition.</p> <p>No significant flora was recorded in the proposal area and the vegetation does not represent any Threatened or Priority ecological communities.</p> <p>One Threatened fauna species, the Fairy Tern (<i>Sternula nereis nereis</i>), is known to nest in the area with a breeding colony using land at Rous Head, approximately 1 km to the south of the proposal area. Although the sandy soils in the proposal area may provide some suitable habitat for the Fairy Tern, other important habitat features including the presence of low vegetation and grasses and a view of the ocean and areas of foraging habitat, are absent from the proposal area. It is unlikely this species would</p>

	<p>utilise the proposal area based on the absence of key habitat features while available preferred habitat is located in proximity. Additionally, this species is sensitive to disturbance in breeding locations and the proposal area is subject to ongoing disturbance. No impacts on this species are likely.</p> <p>Based on the above, the proposal area does not represent an area containing a high level of biological diversity.</p> <p>The proposed clearing is not at variance to this Principle.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>A total of 14 Threatened fauna species were recorded within 5 km of the proposal area (DBCA). All species were either marine or avian. The proposal area is not located in a marine or shoreline environment, therefore marine species have not been further assessed.</p> <p>A likelihood of occurrence assessment for the remaining nine Threatened avian species indicates one species may occur in the proposal area.</p> <p>The Fairy Tern (<i>Sternula nereis nereis</i>), is known to nest in the area with a breeding colony using land at Rous Head, approximately 1 km to the south of the proposal area. Although the sandy soils in the proposal area may provide some suitable habitat for the Fairy Tern, other important habitat features including the presence of low vegetation and grasses and a view of the ocean and areas of foraging habitat, are absent from the proposal area. It is unlikely this species would utilise the proposal area based on the absence of key habitat features while available preferred habitat is located in proximity. Additionally, this species is sensitive to disturbance in breeding locations and the proposal area is subject to ongoing disturbance. No impacts on this species are likely.</p> <p>Several records of Carnaby's Cockatoo (<i>Zanda latirostris</i>, EN) and Forest Red-tailed Black Cockatoo (<i>Calyptorhynchus banksii naso</i>, VU) have been recorded within 5 km of the proposal area, including three records of Carnaby's Cockatoo within 1km of the proposal area. Vegetation proposed to be cleared is not suitable to support black cockatoo breeding or roosting based on the species present. <i>Acacia</i> spp. provide only low quality foraging habitat for black cockatoos. The limited availability of foraging habitat in the proposal area is unlikely to support black cockatoo foraging, and the proposed clearing will not significantly impact black cockatoos.</p> <p>The remaining Threatened species are considered unlikely to occur due to the absence of key habitat features in the proposal area. These species are all coastal or marine bird species that may occasionally visit or traverse the proposal area, however would not be reliant on habitat in the proposal area.</p> <p>The proposal area does not comprise the whole or a part of, and is not necessary for the maintenance of a significant habitat for fauna indigenous to Western Australia.</p> <p>The proposed clearing is not likely to be at variance to this Principle.</p>

<p>Principle (c) – Native vegetation should not be cleared if it includes, or is necessary for the continued existence of, threatened flora.</p>	<p>A likelihood of occurrence assessment for Threatened flora was undertaken noting no Threatened flora species were recorded as occurring in the proposal area.</p> <p>Due to the previous use and ongoing high level of disturbance in the proposal area and surrounding areas, no Threatened species were considered likely to occur.</p> <p>Based on the absence of species, the proposal area does not include and is not necessary for the continued existence of Threatened flora.</p> <p>The proposed clearing is not at variance to this Principle.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>No Threatened ecological communities (TEC) are mapped as occurring within or adjacent to the proposal area (DBCA). The nearest mapped occurrences are approximately 700m north of the site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SCP26a - <i>Melaleuca huegelii</i> - <i>M. systena</i> shrublands of limestone ridges (floristic community type 26a as originally described in Gibson et al. 1994) [CE]. • SCP30a - <i>Callitris preissii</i> (or <i>Melaleuca lanceolata</i>) forests and woodlands of the Swan Coastal Plain (floristic community type 30a as originally described in Gibson et al. 1994) [CE]. <p>The proposal area does not contain species that are representative of these TECs, and the Completely Degraded to Degraded condition of the proposal area would not support the occurrence of any TEC.</p> <p>Native vegetation proposed to be cleared does not comprise the whole or a part of, and is not necessary for the maintenance of a TEC.</p> <p>The proposed clearing is not at variance to this Principle.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>The assessment area is mapped as vegetation association SPEARWOOD_1007 which is not constrained at the state, Bioregion or sub-bioregion level but is constrained locally. The vegetation complex is Cottesloe Complex-Central and South which has 32.16% of its pre-European extent remaining.</p> <p>Although the vegetation association is constrained within the Fremantle Local Government Area, the proposed clearing is regrowth vegetation in an area that has been previously cleared to support infrastructure for a significant period of time and therefore, does not constitute remnant vegetation. The vegetation does not form part of a recognised regional ecological linkage (WALGA) or a local ecological link (City of Fremantle Greening Fremantle: Strategy 2020).</p> <p>The proposed clearing is not at variance to this Principle.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>No surface water features have been mapped in the proposal area and the nearest watercourses are the Indian Ocean located approximately 200m to the west of the proposal area, and the Swan River located approximately 600m and 700 m to the east and south respectively (DBCA-011, DPLH-019). The vegetation</p>

	<p>proposed to be cleared is not riparian and is not growing in or in association with a wetland or watercourse.</p> <p>The proposed clearing is not at variance to this Principle.</p>
<p>Principle (g) – Native vegetation should not be cleared if the clearing of the vegetation is likely to cause appreciable land degradation.</p>	<p>The soils in the proposal area are mapped as having a low risk of water erosion but are mapped as having a high to extreme risk of wind erosion (DPIRD NRInfo).</p> <p>The site is largely already cleared, and the proposed clearing is relatively small. Although the soils have a high risk of erosion, given the relatively small area of clearing for a short duration, it is unlikely to cause appreciable land degradation. The proposed clearing is not likely to be at variance to this Principle.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>The nearest conservation area is the Swan Canning River Reserve which is located approximately 600m and 700 m to the west and south respectively of the proposal area (DBCA-011, DPLH-019). The proposal area is separated from this conservation area by urban land and does not form part of an ecological linkage that connects to the conservation area. The proposed clearing will not have an impact on the environmental values of any conservation areas.</p> <p>The proposed clearing is not at variance to this Principle.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>The nearest surface water features are the Indian Ocean located approximately 200 m west of the proposal area, and the Swan River located approximately 600m and 700 m to the east and south respectively (DWER-031, DWER-019). The soils in the assessment area are mapped as having a low risk of water erosion (DPIRD NRInfo).</p> <p>The Perth groundwater map indicates that maximum groundwater levels are between 5.5-6.5 m below ground level. Soils are not mapped as having an acid sulphate soil (DWER-055) or salinity (DPIRD NRInfo) risk. The site has previously been completely cleared and the clearing of the small amount of regrowth vegetation is not likely to alter surface water or drainage patterns. It is unlikely the proposed clearing will cause deterioration in the quality of surface or groundwater.</p> <p>The proposed clearing is not at variance to this Principle.</p>
<p>Principle (j) – Native vegetation should not be cleared if clearing the vegetation is likely to cause, or exacerbate, the incidence or intensity of flooding.</p>	<p>The assessment area is in the 'Coastal' catchment of the 'Swan Coastal' basin. The sub catchment that contains the proposal area is 3757 ha, and the clearing area represents <0.01% of this area (DWER-030).</p> <p>The assessment area has not been mapped as having a water erosion hazard (DPIRD NRInfo). The proposal area is relatively flat terrain. Contour mapping (DPIRD-072) indicates approximate slopes of 4-8 %. There is no evidence of erosion occurring in the proposal area.</p> <p>Noting the small amount of clearing proposed, the low water erosion and runoff risk associated with the soils, and relatively flat terrain, it is unlikely the proposed clearing will cause or exacerbate the incidence or intensity of flooding.</p> <p>The proposed clearing is not at variance to this Principle.</p>

Methodology Used and References:	<p>Fremantle Bridge Alliance Site Inspection and map: 31/5/24 D24#838018</p> <p>Shapefile of clearing area/trees: D24#851221</p> <p>City of Fremantle, Greening Fremantle: Strategy 2020</p> <p>Low Impact Screening Checklist (D24#837977)</p> <p>Shapefiles and systems (Accessed 13/06/24):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DBCA Restricted Threatened and Priority Fauna Shapefile • DBCA Restricted WA Herbarium Flora • DBCA Restricted Threatened and Priority Flora • DBCA Restricted TEC PEC • DBCA-011 Legislated land and Water • DBCA-046 Vegetation Complexes – Swan Coastal Plain • DPIRD-006 Pre-European Vegetation • DPIRD-072 2 metre contours • DPIRD Natural Resources Information (NRInfo) website <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Land qualities - Salinity Hazard ○ Land qualities - Water Erosion Hazard ○ Land qualities - Wind Erosion Hazard • DWER-019 Geomorphic Wetlands – Swan Coastal Plain • DWER-030 Hydrographic sub-catchments • DWER-031 Hydrography Linear • DWER-046 Environmentally Sensitive Areas • DWER-055 Acid Sulfate Risk Map, Swan Coastal Plain • DPLH-019 Bush Forever Areas • WALGA Perth Regional Ecological Linkages Shapefile
---	---

9. REHABILITATION, REVEGETATION AND OFFSETS

Offset Proposal:	No offset proposal is required as the proposed clearing will not result in significant residual impacts to native vegetation within the region.
Revegetation and Rehabilitation:	No temporary clearing will be undertaken as part of the Proposal activities.

10. COMPLIANCE WITH CPS818

The clearing associated with the proposal is not at or not likely to be at variance with the Clearing Principles. Additional management actions under CPS 818 are detailed below.

Impact of Clearing	Yes/No or NA	Further Action Required
1. Proposal is within a Region that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • has rainfall greater than 400mm; and, • is South of the 26th parallel; and, • works are necessary in 'Other than dry conditions'; and, • works have potential for uninfested areas to be impacted. 	No	Standard Vehicle and Plant Management Actions from Annexure 204B (TABLE 204B.9.1), <u>Hygiene Checklists</u> (D17#859669) and <u>Vehicle, Plant and Machinery Hygiene Vehicle Register Template</u> (D23#179551) will be applied (which include relevant sections of Condition 10).
2. Do the proposed works require clearing within or adjacent to DBCA managed lands in non-dry conditions?	No	No further action required.

3. Main Roads has been notified by DWER or an environmental specialist that the area to be cleared is susceptible to a pathogen other than dieback.	No	No further action required.
4. Weeds are likely to spread to and result in environmental harm to adjacent areas of native vegetation that are in good or better condition.	No	No further action required.
Completed By:		
Name	REDACTED	
Signature	REDACTED	
Job Title	Environmental Contractor	
Date	13 June 2024	

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

DECISION ON CLEARING ASSESSMENT	
Name	REDACTED
Signature	REDACTED
Job Title	Senior Environment Officer
Date	14/06/2024



Figure 1: Proposed Clearing Area