

Rental for domestic waterfront tenancies.

Submission by Julia and Peter Garnett, (address deleted).

This review was brought to our attention by neighbours very recently so this is a rushed submission. More time would be appreciated. Many leaseholders, like ourselves, would not have seen the one advertisement in the newspaper. Surely, leaseholders could be notified by post for such an important review?

My husband and I acquired our boatshed and Waterways lease, T2571, on purchase of our house nine years ago. We worked hard all our lives in the Public Service and school teaching to eventually buy here. Our property is a "poor man's waterfront", ie a very small block of 400 sq meters separated from the water by a road and car park ..

We are primarily concerned with our ability to pay an increased rental as we are 64 and 68, retired and self funded. Our allocated pension fund took a battering over the two years since our retirement. We currently pay two annual fees for our boatshed, one to Waterways, the other to Lane Cove Council for the portion of dry land in front of the boatshed (although this dry land is used for free by everyone else who parks their dinghies here). The two fees are around \$800 annually.

We do not own a boat, but we use the boatshed to store kayaks, which we use on the Lane Cove River, a very enjoyable, quiet, environmentally friendly way to enjoy the water. Our extended family and friends also use our kayaks.

The Waterways Department's proposal to link the cost of leases to dry land house rentals is very flawed.

The suggested 6% is not a realistic return on house rental property. A contact in Real Estate has said owners are lucky to get 3 percent. When we considered renting our house while we were to be away for some months we were told by Real Estate agents in Lane Cove that we could expect no more than \$600 per week. As our house is valued at about 1.5 m, that is a return of barely 2%. When the ongoing rates and utilities charges are subtracted it is even less.

A few other reasons why this comparison with "Dry Land" house rentals does not work:-

- "Dry Land" properties have security of tenure, which we do not have with our Waterways lease. It is distressing to us that we do not have security of tenure of our boatshed.
- "Dry Land" properties have the benefit of electricity, lights, piped water etc which our boatshed does not.
- You can live in dry land properties; you are not permitted to reside in a boat shed.
- "Dry Land" property is privately used by the tenant; our boatshed skip is quite public.
- When a "Dry Land" property is leased, the house is provided and maintained by the landlord. As Waterways lease holders we have to provide and maintain the building on the leased land at our own expense..

. GST does not apply to residential rents. Why is the Waterways Authority applying it if it is equating its leases with residential leases? In fact, the only use permitted by the Waterways Authority is for the storage of boats. It is a garage for boats. Why not compare the cost of the water lease used for a boat shed with the cost of leasing dry land occupied by a similarly sized garage?

State Government policies that are detrimental to Sydney Harbour

We have already seen the disappearance from Sydney Harbour of much of the heritage of the "working harbour". The Boatbuilding industry has largely disappeared.. Instead, we have increasing numbers of over large housing developments with blocks of units right down to the water's edge, as at Balmain.

Long term residents happy to preserve the bush and angophora forest of Woodford Bay have been forced out by the iniquitous new State Govt land tax; their properties have been bought by developers, subdivided, and the forest decimated. This is happening in all harbourside suburbs. Are boat sheds next?

The dozen or so boat sheds around Woodford Bay are an attractive and historical feature of this part of the Harbour, beloved of artists who have painted them since the time of Lloyd Rees and earlier.

They are attractive and picturesque and should be recognized as such. They are part of our heritage and should be preserved.

Please don't increase the cost of leases to the extent that owners will demolish rather than renew.