

NSW

Review of Rental for Domestic Waterfront Tenancies

Independent Pricing and Regulatory Tribunal

G day review people. Page 1 of 2

This submission is regarding some principals regarding Water Access Only Properties "WAOP"

Please be aware a large number of submissions on WAOP will be inspired by a pressure group WEAR Inc started by a real estate agent and run by real estate agents who claim much as a right ~~not~~ a privilege.

To have a WAOP is definatly a privilege. These properties are chosen by the purchaser with awareness of the pros and cons involved including the realities of access. To buy and then demand a right to public space is as much an ambit claim as their claim ~~to~~ for the public purse to build and maintain their wharfs

Wharfs and Jetties are not necessary for accessing WAOP unless one includes the phrase "in the style ~~to~~ we have become accustomed to". These people are demanding a right to the same ease of access for WAOP as a city unit dweller which is ludicrous and unavailable until we fill in the river and give them a road to their door.

A danger of accepting this demanded right is spelled out in associated demand for road accessable reserved parking for several cars and boats per house on public foreshore land of which land there is not enough to go around. So it is equitable for WAOP owners to enjoy their privilege of river life, with its pros and cons, and PRO

SRuff

Review of Rental for Domestic Waterfront Tenancies NSW
Independent Pricing and Regulatory Tribunal

Page 2 of 2

and leave public foreshore for the
public less privileged.

I Believe in paying a fair price
for occupying public space attached to
WAOP and in denying the exclusive
use of any road accessible public land
or water space for the ease of WAOP
owners.

S Rorff