

INDEPENDENT PRICING AND REGULATORY TRIBUNAL  
P O BOX Q290  
QVB POST OFFICE NSW 1230

30TH NOVEMBER 2003

**RE: REVIEW OF RENTAL FOR DOMESTIC WATERFRONT  
TENANCIES IN NSW**

Mr Bob Burford

Dear Sir

Today I attended the W.E.A.R. meeting at Mooney Mooney Workers Club and am horrified at what was discussed.

I wish to inform you that I am not a millionaire living on the Hawkesbury River. Over twenty (20) years ago, my husband and I bought at Little Wobby because that is what we could afford. At the time we were both employees doing an honest day's work for a salary. Very sadly my husband passed away a little over two (2) years ago, and I ~~am~~ still an employee working very hard for a salary.

I would like to point out that:

- 1) WAO property is clearly distinct from other waterfront property **WITH** road access, in that waterfront structures adjoining WAO property are our **ONLY** means of access.
- 2) The right to access our properties across the river (Crown Land) was implicit in the original Crown Land subdivision. It **IS** a **RIGHT** and **NOT** a **PRIVILEGE** which should incur **NO** financial penalty.
- 3) The river is our road, the boat is our car and the pontoon (in my case) is where I park/moor my commuter boat.

I believe:

- 1) WAO property owners should **NOT** be subject to **ANY** rental fees, costs or charges based on valuation of adjoining land.
- 2) There is only one potential tenant so the concept of market rent does not exist in relation to WAO properties.
- 3) There should be **NO** on-going rental fees or charges for safety access structures attaching to WAO properties. Any associated fees or charges

should be nominal and designed to **ONLY** cover administrative costs associated with preparation of any documentation.

- 4) There should be **NO** wet berthing fee in order to moor my commuter boat at my pontoon nor at pontoons which offer an essential facility on the "mainland", that have been in existence for twenty (20) years paid for and maintained by us, the members.
- 5) The PO and present licence system which offer **NO** security of tenure be replaced by any of the following:

- a) **A permanent easement attached to a title**

**OR**

- b) **A 99-year lease which automatically transfers to heirs, executors and assigns and to incoming purchasers when a property is sold.**

**OR**

- c) **Conversion to freehold title.**

I ask you to reconsider what you appear to have in mind for WAO residents and to put yourself in our position.

PLEASE RECONSIDER.

Yours faithfully



**RHONDA N PURVIS JP**  
A MUS A; DIP T G, Member IEU