

Submitted on Sunday, November 11, 2018 - 03:30

-----  
DETAILS  
-----

Company: WA NATIVE ORCHID STUDY AND CONSERVATION GROUP  
Inc.  
First name: Tim  
Last name: Hodgkins  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Suburb: [REDACTED]  
State: [REDACTED]  
Postcode: [REDACTED]  
Phone: [REDACTED]  
Email: [REDACTED]  
Sector: Conservation

-----  
NATIVE VEGETATION CLEARING  
-----

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

Response: yes

Comments:

The Group shares the Department's concern about excessive clearing particularly on the Swan Coastal Plain and supports all efforts including a more strategic approach, to control and minimise impacts on the environment, especially native orchids.

---

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

Response: yes

Comments:

We support this strategic approach but see it only as a first step to refine and re-assess the process.

Continued consultation is encouraged. The Department is to be congratulated for committing time and effort in the consultative process so far.

\*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 see anything less than 50% recovery as unsustainable and whilst supporting the current plan that shows 25% recovery, we want it to be only the start of the ultimate goal of higher recovery rates. 50/50 sharing of the costs promotes the commitment of both Government agency and applicant working together for a mutually beneficial outcome.

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

Comments:

N/A

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

Comments:

The importance of conserving the remaining remnant native vegetation in the South West of the State cannot be underestimated. We all have a responsibility to preserve it for future generations, and contribute to the welfare of all who live in WA and will be here in the future.

-----

**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: unsure

Comments:

WANOSCG does not wish to make a submission on the WATER issue.

\*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:

WANOSCG does not wish to make a submission on the WATER issue.

\*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:

WANOSCG does not wish to make a submission on the WATER issue.

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

Comments:

WANOSCG does not wish to make a submission on the WATER issue.

\*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

WANOSCG does not wish to make a submission on the WATER issue.

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

above.\*

Comments:

WANOSCG does not wish to make a submission on the WATER issue.