

IPART
8VB P.O. Box 2290
NSW 1230

Water - Access - Only - Properties (Domestic)

Dear Sir,

I live on a water access only property for which boat access is essential. I am not wealthy but it should not matter if I were. I make the following comments on the IPART paper.

- (1) The current administration by two separate departments guarantees unequal outcomes. It would be better looked after by one department.
- (2) The number of water access only properties is relatively small but we should not be included in the same category as properties with land access also. The Crown Land Act should be updated to cover our special circumstance.
- (3) Concerning the formula, the use of the value of one's land is tantamount to a wealth tax. All Sydney land has become expensive and the presumption that waterfront owners are automatically wealthy is a flawed presumption.

(4) There is no equity in charging us for access while ever suburban Sydney is not charged in the same way. As it stands now, anybody can drive home and park near their home, but if you drive home on the river, a "road" which costs the government nothing, you will be the party discriminated against when you need to access your home.

PTB

My desired outcome would be a lease (long term) as opposed to a licence. The longest lease period available in the ELA is 99 years. These fees should be paid up front and I suggest a nominal \$1 per year to satisfy government requirements to impose a charge. This idea would largely reduce management costs and remove WARP from the dissimilar group of properties with road access also.

Our facilities are not for recreational use but are for essential access. The access is usually on to privately owned land, so impact on public usage is minimal. Because public authorities (police, ambulance etc) can use such facilities without permission or fee, absolute exclusivity is not truly the case.

Yours faithfully,

Jacqueline Morgan

(Jacqueline Morgan)