

Submitted on Friday, November 2, 2018 - 00:08

DETAILS

Company: [REDACTED]
First name: Kim (Mick)
Last name: Mann
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: unsure
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:
Unsure

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:

Those applying for a water licence or permit have effectively generated this cost. The fees should be equitably distributed across all water uses of a water recourse.

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 fee should be reflective of the cost of assessing and issuing the water licence and permit but should also consider the contribution made by the applicants towards the ongoing maintenance of the water resource.i.e. data obtained from and collected from active bores by the applicants.

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:

I agree with a risk based model but applied not to volume of a water license but to the volume of water (kL) used. It is my understanding that by 31 December 2020 water licences with a entitlement of 10,000 kL and above will be metered.

Fees applied to actual water use encourages water conservation. The proposed risk matrix for licence and permit applications is very limited and not equitable. It is unlikely that a 50,000kl application would pose the same risk as a 500,000kL application. To some degree this matrix encourages excessive water use because the fees are the same for 50,00kL or 500,000kL.

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

Comments:

Although it is not particularly clear in the discussion paper, if the fees suggested were applied annually to a 10 yr licence, then the impact would not be significant.

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

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

Comments:

In a drying climate the value of a water resource should be acknowledged and recognised. Fees applied to water license and permit applications will encourage this recognition. Provided that the fees are applied in the most equitable manner i.e. per kL of water used, then greater water conservation can be expected.