

Dear sir/madam

This submission arises from my concern of a new charge of \$2059.00 per annum for an existing fire hydrant on the Church property of which I am the treasurer located on 2-4 Main Road Penguin.

When I questioned Taswater on this outrageous additional charge I was told it was to recover additional cost to Taswater to provide this service which I strongly dispute as an experienced Civil Engineer with over forty years of experience in Local Government in both management and construction of many water schemes on the following grounds.

- (a) The original fire service was originally installed and paid for by the then owner of the property more than 50 years ago.
- (b) Should the reticulation need replacing Taswater would only be responsible to replace section in the road reservation at a max cost of \$5000
- (c) The service does not consume any water except in the case of a fire but this is no different then any other user supplied through a street fire plug.
- (d) The sizing of the street reticulation is generally based on consumer demand but is sized as a minimum to provide fire coverage for all users connected to the reticulation.
- (e) There is a fire plug located 600 meters beyond our church property to provide a fire service to the last few properties on West Ridge road who pay no fire service charge
- (f) The life of a reticulation main is considered a minimum of 80 years (very conservative) and more likely 100 to 120 years
- (g) The Church in this period of time would pay more then enough to replace the whole of the reticulation servicing some 40 residences beyond the churches property, The cost to replace the 900m of main is less then \$200 per meter for either a 100 or 150mm diameter main.
- (h) The fire main at the Church was probably installed when the Church complex was still a small maternity hospital or a camp site (both long gone) but the location of the hydrant some 40 or 50 meters from the street boundary is well located (considering the steep bank on the street frontage opposite the fireplug) to service the Church the Hall and the Manse but certainly does not justify the \$2059 annual present charge which goes up annually.
- (i) The church complex is serviced by a separate 30 mm metered connection from Deviation Crescent.

Other matters

Before Cradle Coast Water took over the Annual charge for water including a 400 or 500 kl allowance was \$300

My latest bill was \$632 pa plus a little over a dollar for each kilo litre used the average water bill would now be in excess of \$900 pa a 3 fold increase in 10 years and probably more for Burnie users as Burnie had one of the lowest annual charges in Tasmania.

My other concern is the dividend paid to Councils. Councils never owned the water schemes, it was paid for by its users. Councils were only facilitators. It is ridiculous to charge the users of a scheme to pay a dividend to a corporation who never paid for it. The water schemes in Tasmania were funded by its users and sometimes partially funded by a government grant. Publicly owned corporation do not need to pay large dividends to others, In this case for Councils for them to look good when water and sewerage users subsidise all Council rate payers.

Yours faithfully

Bob Harder