



IPART

Re: rental for domestic waterfront tenancies  
Dec 3 2003.

This submission reflects the following concerns that I and my family have regarding the pending review:

1. I, as a stakeholder, have not been personally informed of this review and have only recently been made aware of it by another affected tenant. You call for submissions in a whisper.

2. I feel rushed into this submission and can only imagine that many of the other 2000 odd stakeholders involved will have had no idea of the pending review. A lamentable situation.

3. I **do** not disagree that a rental fee be paid annually, however the Tribunal needs to understand the term "market value" on which rental calculations may be based. For example, should a ridiculous annual rental be levied and increased upon every five years, then the "market value" will greatly diminish as nobody will wish to rent the facility.

Similarly, only the very wealthy would be able to pay the rental creating class divisions in our society. We have a Labor ~~Party~~ in NSW working against class distinction, do we not?

4. Only a small proportion of waterfront dwellings actually utilize the foreshore on a regular basis.

This is beneficial to the local environment as the impact on nature is low grade.

The Tribunal must not overvalue the foreshore land in monetary terms. The "value" of the land is in the manner with which it is treated and respected.

May I propose the Review timetable as per item 2 be extended into **2004** to allow for more thorough "stakeholder consultation".

Conservatively yours, Jeff Smith.