

Submitted on Wednesday, November 14, 2018 - 03:48

DETAILS

Company: [REDACTED]
First name: Jon
Last name: Griffiths
Address: [REDACTED]
Suburb: [REDACTED]
State: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]
Phone: [REDACTED]
Email: [REDACTED]
Sector: Agriculture

NATIVE VEGETATION CLEARING

1 . Would a strategic approach to clearing, through a strategic purpose permit, benefit you?

Response: no
Comments:

2. Is the 'purpose component' reasonable to apply considering the added complexity of assessing this type of clearing permit?

Response: unsure
Comments:

3. Is the proposed fee structure fair and does it adequately reflect differences in the financial capacity of clearing permit applicants?

Response: unsure
Comments:

4. What is the likely impact on your business or industry of the proposed clearing fee structure?

Comments:

no impact

5. Additional comments regarding Native Vegetation Clearing not addressed in the questions above.

Comments:

WATER

6. Do you consider it reasonable for taxpayers to pay 100 per cent of the cost of assessing water licence and permit applications and if so, why?

Response: no

Comments:

ground water is a community asset allocated to users for a community benefit (eg such as producing food) That is the community benefits from the strategic allocation of water resources therefore the community should meet the cost of the strategy and the allocation *7. If water licence and permit assessment fees were introduced, what do you consider to be an appropriate fee for a water licence or permit application?*

Comments:

The level of service that we receive from the department of water over 20 years is close to zero. The water we draw is no guaranteed so the right to draw it should not be charged. We can't see how small scale commercial users such as us who draw low rates of water from the surface aquifer should pay a fee, when many suburban landholders have similar rights with no licencing and no fees. If the water we are allocated was guaranteed that might be a different question *8. Would you consider a risk-based model for determining water licence and permit application fees to be appropriate? If not, what basis could the department use to structure fees?*

Response: unsure

Comments:

low level users access the surface aquifers in areas with low available water should not pay fees *9. What would be the likely impact on your business or industry if water licence and permit fees were introduced?*

Comments:

Our production costs are high and returns lows. We operate on the edge of commercial viability. Increased regulation and cost will have a negative impact and may well result in our operations becoming unviable *10. If water licence and permit assessment fees were introduced, how could the collection of fees be timed to better support your business or industry? For example, would you benefit from paying fees up front, at the end of a licence assessment or annualised over the term of the licence?*

Response: unsure

Comments

why would anyone think upfront was a good idea for any business? we don't support fees *11 . Additional comments regarding Water licences and permits not addressed in the questions above.*

Comments:

The Department of Water has failed over a number of years to adequately improve and modernise

ground water legislation. the Department has been ineffectual and unhelpful. The priority for the department should be to build a better framework for water rights, assisting water users, and managing access to water and water trading. It seems that the department should get it's own house in order before applying charges to users.

PS I did not answer all questions in the form as some did not apply or I had no opinion. Yet I can't submit the form without giving a response. This is typical - every time we deal with DOW things just become more complicated!. When this is not the case then your department is in a position to ask for a fee