

**From:** [N BLAIR](#)  
**To:** [Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee](#)  
**Subject:** Changes to lot entitlements  
**Date:** Monday, 22 October 2012 10:02:55 AM

---

The Research Director,  
Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee,  
Parliament House, George Street,  
Brisbane, Qld 4000

Dear Sir, Following a discussion with my member Aaron Dillaway on Saturday morning, I am making this submission.

1. My name is Nannette Blair and I reside at [REDACTED]
- 2 I have been the owner of lot [REDACTED] at Paloma CTS 5924 since 1987. The building is located 93-97 Albatross Avenue, Mermaid Beach Q.
3. The beach front building consists of 12 units . The top four units are penthouse units.
4. The building was build in 1981
5. When I purchased my unit 25 years ago, my Contribution Lot Entitlement was 82/1200
6. This Contribution Lot Entitlement was subsequently order to be changed consequently upon a decision the Commercial and Consumer Tribunal on 29 October, 2009. As a result of that decision, my Contribution Lot Entitlement was altered to 81/1003.

There were also changes made to the Contribution Lot Entitlements of the other seven units. The four Penthouse units received an advantage. Their Contribution Lot Entitlements changed from 136/1200 to 88/1003.

- 7 The consequences of this is that the expenses that I have had to pay since then have significantly increased.
- 8 The expenses will substantially increase given that the building will be undergoing high maintenance costs in the very near future due to the age and its condition being on the beach front.
9. I consider that it is only fair and reasonable that my Contribution Lot entitlement should be reverted back to what it was when I purchased my unit so 25 years ago. I consider that I will be significantly disadvantaged if the current position is allowed to continue and the proposed Bill becomes law,.
- 10 There has already been a motion passed to revert the Contribution Lot Entitlement to what they previously were when I purchased my unit, which motion has recently been decided a valid motion by QCAT.
- 11 Further, it is not fair and equitable that the proposed Bill, if passed, be given retrospective effect to the 14 September, 2012.
- 12 In summary, I consider that each unit owners would have know they were acquiring when the purchased units. When I purchased my unit, the Contribution Lot Entitlement was 82/1200 and I believe that it is only fair and equitable that the position should be restored.
- 13 The building was created under the previous Building Units and Group Titles Legislation which did not incorporate any principles concerning relativity or equality. The developer of this building was entitled under that legislation to determine for various units. The developer did so. That position should never have been allowed to change.

Subsequently amendments to the BCCM legislation should never have been applied to buildings constructed under UGTA legislation

Sincerely,  
Nannette Blair