

Submitted on Sunday, October 21, 2018 - 04:52

DETAILS

Company:
First name: Kate
Last name: Lane
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: yes

Comments:

The clearing of native vegetation in this area appears to be virtually unregulated - over the last ten years the amount of irrigated vegetable and fruit producing hectares in this area have mushroomed causing degradation to the water quality in the Gingin Brook / Moore River and allied water courses, this has a knock on effect with vegetation in other areas dying off and not re-growing.

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

Response: yes

Comments:

Permissions should not be granted to clear native vegetation where alternative - already cleared - areas of land are available in any area. We have tracts of previously cleared land fallen into disuse, where water licenses have been traded and are moved elsewhere, only to have land adjacent being cleared to grow produce. This is not acceptable.

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

Response: unsure

Comments:

Fees should reflect the actual cost of assessment and if the application is for business use it should reflect the "added value" any application will bring to the business. The situation of land being cleared

irrigation set up, used for a few years, then sold on at a profit, for the business then to go on and purchase uncleared land cheaply with a view to repeating the whole cycle is unacceptable.

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

Comments:

None - we do not intend to clear any of the remnant bush on our property.

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:

The applicant should pay for the cost entirely, it is outrageous that this has not been the case from the outset.

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 actual cost to the department plus an additional percentage for every kilolitre requested.

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: yes

Comments:

Water licensing as it stands is completely unfair and has proven to be something of a "gravity train" for those who have been issued with licenses.

9. What would be the likely impact on your business or industry if water licence and permit fees were introduced?

Comments:

None at all, I am 100% in favour.

*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: annual

Comments

Annual fees would bring in a quantifiable income for the Department.

11 . Additional comments regarding Water licences and permits not addressed in the questions above.

Comments:

Licenses - given "free of charge" to the original applicants - are sold on for huge amounts, they should NOT be able to be traded and should return to the Department of Water when the license holder sells his business / land.

It should be for the Dept. to consider re-issue and not do so if a reduction in irrigation would be of overall benefit to the area.

Licenses issued for one property are sold and moved elsewhere - resulting in overpumping in some areas - such as Neergabby, where the water table has dropped considerably affecting ALL the residents.

Licences should only be used on the land that the original application was made from.

License holders have been given massive amounts of water to use - regardless of what they actually require. Some license holders pump water they do not use so that they do not "lose" any of their "entitlement".

The water used for commerce should be paid for, currently all businesses that use irrigation are actually being subsidised by the whole community - they make the profits, the community picks up the bill and the health of the environment does not get a look in. In Perth desalination plants are being built at huge cost, whilst a few kilometers up the road vast amounts of water is being used - free of charge - by businesses who are profligate with this "free resource" rather than looking for ways of reducing the use of water to a minimum - which they would do so if they were being charged for what they use - like everyone else.

Businesses are making good profit exporting much of the produce grown with Australia's water - all fruit and vegetables are mostly composed of water (most containing over 85%) - the public would not be happy for tankers of our water to be shipped abroad, but off it goes - in the guise of "produce" with the water element being a "free gift" from the nation.