Residential Tenancies and Rooming Accommodation and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2024

Submission No: 30

Submitted by:

Publication: Making the submission public but withholding your name

Attachments: No attachment

Submitter Comments:

I am making reference to the following points from the RTA website and these 3 are problematic for the reasons that appear underneath each point.1. Rent increase frequency will be tied to the property, instead of the tenancy. As owners, we use a break in tenancy to do improvements/repairs (sometimes due to bad tenants)/changes to update the property - the lack of ability to increase the rent means these changes are not being taken into account. Rent is usually reflected in the quality of the property so improving the property should be reflected in an option to increase/improve the rental income. This expenditure is not being taken into account.2. New framework for parties involved in a tenancy to agree on installation of minor modifications. This is problematic as many tenants already make these changes without any notice. Properties with some features eg asbestos require major education to tenants who think they can put holes anywhere! Even if a trade person were to make changes/modifications, we have found they are usually not well done and damage the property which in turn affects the long-term rental option/sale of a property. Who pays for that or the removal of the modification?3. Entry notice requirement to change from 24 hours to 48 hours' notice. As long as entry to do repairs can be in 24 hours as it is vital (if you can get a trade) to get them in when they are available. Qld has a lack of trades people as recent media reports have stated.NB. This is unclear with no detail on how this is proposed to work...- Limiting break lease/reletting fees based off time left on tenancy agreement. Recent rental changes have affected us as landlords. We are great landlords and 'mum and dad' investors who have worked hard to get an investment property and we work hard to look after our tenants. The focus on recent changes and on several of this current batch of proposed changes appear to make an assumption that landlords are monsters. This is untrue - our rental income does not cover the loan - our tenant lives in a better property than we can! The recent pet changes are an example of a change that has had unfair advantages to tenants - we had a tenant who said they had 1 cat, we spent money making sure that cat could be secure inside the house, meanwhile unknown to anyone, the tenants moved in with an additional dog and now have an extra 2 dogs!!! Our management company, can not do a thing!!! Neighbours have complained about noise etc to no avail. Polished floors will be damaged and who will pay for the thousands of dollars to get them sanded and recoated & the loss of rent? Nobody. Changes like these have us thinking we are now stuck - we may be forced to rent out a 'below standard' property which is not good for any future tenant. Please consider the long-term standard of rental properties and the long-term effects on hard-working families like ours.