

## Residential Tenancies and Rooming Accommodation and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2024

**Submission No:** 2  
**Submitted by:** Geoffrey Auckland  
**Publication:**  
**Attachments:** No attachment  
**Submitter Comments:**

## RENTAL LAW REFORMS

Geoffrey Auckland

I'd present the thoughts/opinions below for the committee considering rental law reforms.

I work within the rental industry as a property manager. I've managed a range of properties from many units in large complexes (60 of 80), through to very old "Six packs" that are re-development prospects and Rooming Accom (students and refugees).

I managed 50 units that were in the NRAS program and witnessed the mass exodus of investors / owners when those properties expired from the NRAS scheme, so I am acutely aware that there need to be a great appreciation of not providing dis-incentives to investors in the property market or they will simply exit to Index Share funds that do not draw this level of interference.

	TOPIC	RESPONSE
	better rent protections – banning all forms of rent bidding and limiting rent increases to 12-months, attached to the property instead of the tenancy	DISAGREE Limit to rent increases should NOT attach to a property. Most owners accept lower than market rents for existing tenants, then catch up to market when there is a change of tenant. In that environment the incoming tenant is applying based on the listed rent, so making their own decision.  Attempting to regulate the market for re-listing based on the property will only distort the market and disadvantage the owner (investor) providing one more reason to exit property as an investment and add to the general rental stress.

		<p>This will also distort that properties that are under the market rent, when re-listed, may rent for less than other units in the same complexes becoming unfair outcome for both owners and renters. (In large complexes the “market rent” becomes quite predictable, and in my experience works best to leave the property managers to work toward market rents at change overs).</p>
	<p>fairer fees and charges – offering tenants a fee-free option to pay rent,</p> <p>ensuring any financial benefits received by rental property owners/managers are disclosed, capping re-letting costs and defining a timeframe that a tenant must receive utility bills within</p>	<p>AGREE – the rent should be the rent and any fees should be a matter for owner / property manager. Some rent collections systems are presented to save time and money in the process – so the cost of these should not be passed on.</p> <p>NEUTRAL</p>
	<p>making it easier for renters to modify and personalise their home</p>	<p>DISAGREE – Renters are renting a property and owners fairly expect it to be returned in the same format as it was (subject to fair wear and tear). Tenants do seek modifications and personalisation currently and owners can approve or not – as should be their right as the OWNERS of the property.</p> <p>Owners already give consideration to issues like tenure of the tenant and age of the property – and I don’t see regulation being able to deal adequately with the variety of factors that would need to be considered.</p>

		Enhancing tenant rights beyond owners will provide one more reason for owners (investors) to leave the market.
<p>protecting renter's privacy – extending entry notice periods from 24 to 48 hours,</p> <p>limiting frequent entry to a property at the end of a tenancy, offering a choice about how rental applications are submitted,</p> <p>creation of a prescribed application form,</p> <p>limiting the personal information that can be requested and collected</p>	<p>NEUTRAL - The tenants I work with do not appear to have any issue with 24 hours notice, however increasing to 48 hours will remain workable for me as a property manager. I don't think it is broken so would not advocate for the change, but would not oppose it.</p> <p>CAUTION – anything that increases vacancy periods between tenants leaving and occupying increases the cost. Probably not passed on the tenants, but one more dis-incentive to be a property investor.</p> <p>DISAGREE – this is not a current problem and the market should be free to manage this. We have managed different levels of property so use different forms for say Rooming Accom compared to new Units. Property Managers need room to tailor application form/processes up or down to suit.</p> <p>AGREE – the 100 points ID is already more than I would like to hold. If I have a photo drivers licence, I don't believe I need passports, medicare, etc etc.</p>	
<p>improving the rental bond process – any claim on a bond will be required to be supported by evidence,</p>	<p>DISAGREE – bond claims already have a dispute process where a lack of evidence would work in the favour of the tenant.</p>	

	<p>a portable bond scheme will be established, maximum bond requested will be no more than four weeks rent</p>	<p>DISAGREE – portability will not work as most times, a tenant will be in a new property before they have vacated and cleaned one they are leaving, so timing and uncertainty of the value fights against portability.</p> <p>I would support extension / usability of the Bond Loan scheme in place of portability.</p>
	<p>code of conduct – a Rental Sector Code of Conduct will be developed</p>	<p>NEUTRAL</p>