

Submitted on Monday, November 12, 2018 - 09:18

-----  
DETAILS  
-----

Company: [REDACTED]  
First name: Luxmore  
Last name: Lethbridge  
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:

A purpose permit would be of benefit as it would have all guidelines outlined in the one application, and controlled by one body who oversees all other departments input into getting all approvals completed in a timely manner.

---

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

Response: yes

Comments:

Having a purpose component built into the permit would help with the approvals process as there would be clear directions of what is required. There should be a clause in the permit should the applicants situation change and there is a need to change the direction of the original application.

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

Response: unsure

Comments:

We as the applicant are already making a huge financial commitment to get the proposed project off the ground and up and running. Any other costs just add to the financial strain.

Once the permits are approved and activated our costs are continuous for example - our annual rents go up by almost 100% due to improvements. This alone is a big cost, with nothing in return for this money

spent.

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

Comments:

The impact is purely financial burden. The amount would have to be known to the applicant in the first instance as the cost and time frames could deter people from investing in the future of WA Agriculture.

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

Comments:

Somewhere we would hope that there is a recognition of people forging ahead with development.

Instead of taking all the time. We are all tax payers and the comment that the tax payers foot the bill is a

little unfair. We open up opportunity through Employment, eg road freight, fertilizer production,

machinery dealers, just to name a few. Maybe some wage incentives to help people get employed in the

Ag sector.

-----

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: yes

Comments:

We are all tax payers in the end. By adding another cost we have to pay more.

We open up more employment avenues across a whole range of industries once these developments get going.

\*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:

If a fee should be introduced it should be based around the amount of water applied for so as to be fair

on all applicants. The fee should be annualised so as to keep costs down. There could be a clause built in so people could pay the fee off in an annual repayment.

\*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: no

Comments:

Each application should be assessed on its merits and looking at positive outcomes. This would keep it fair for small to large applications.

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

Comments:

Same as for clearing applications - Another financial burden added to a 'process' that is already very expensive. May be enough to turn people away from future investment in WA Agriculture.

\*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

This would allow people to get their projects off the ground and possibly have some income to help with the financial burden.

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

Comments:

These permits all help WA Agriculture and employment into the future. Which I believe WA Government will recover with more employment equals more tax equals more income for Governments and a stable future for Northern WA Agriculture.