

Body Corporate and Community Management and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2023

Submission No: 56
Submitted by: [REDACTED]
Publication: Making the submission public but withholding your name
Attachments: See attachment
Submitter Comments:



September 01, 2023

I would like to make a submission in regards to the BODY CORPORATE AND COMMUNITY MANAGEMENT AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL 2023.

I DO NOT agree with the rationale in regards to NOT adopting the QUT Property Law Review about the Keeping or bringing of animals on a lot or on common property.

· The QUT Property Law Review was open to ALL residents for input and from that input they have recommended to allow a 'no pet' by-law by resolution without dissent be allowed. If a review open to ALL residents recommended this, how can the CTL Working Group, which consists of only key stakeholders from the community titles sector, say that it would be out of step with community attitudes and expectations about the keeping of pets. I would then argue that if they do not accept the recommendation (which was open to ALL residents) the CTL Working Group is out of step with real community attitudes and expectations about the keeping of pets.

I do not agree that owners should not have the right to ban the keeping of animals.

· I am a unit owner occupier, but the majority of units are rented out and therefore are not owner occupiers.

· There is no onsite manager to sort issues that arise and therefore it is left to the committee which is a group of volunteer, with the majority of owners not living in the area.

· The volunteers do not have the time, nor the expertise to deal with issues that arise from pet ownership and therefore have to pay Body Corp managers.

· Paying Body Corp managers and having to take irresponsible animal owners to QCAT then increases the administration costs which in turn is then passed onto tenants.

· Noise is not the only factor that concerns owners when it comes to the keeping of animals. Allergies are also an important consideration in our building especially when the majority of units are rented.

· I feel I have a right to have a no pets building if this is the majority expectation.

· The recommendation from the QUT Property Law Review suits all owners – pet friendly people would live together and deal with any issues that arise from that, and those who prefer to live without pets would live together without any issues and the added costs. I bought this unit with the understanding that it was a no pet building and the majority of the owners in our complex are of the same understanding: it is unlikely that this mindset should change so I make reference to the above recommendation regarding those who prefer to live without pets should be able to live without issues and costs associated with having pets.

I feel very strongly that the QUT Property Law Review recommendation to allow a "no pet' by-law by resolution without dissent be allowed.