



A.C.T. LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE OFFICE	
SUBMISSION NUMBER	30
DATE AUTH'D FOR PUBLICATION	27/11/14

**From:** Smith [ ]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, 26 November 2014 1:54 PM  
**To:** Committees  
**Subject:** Inquiry into the proposed Appropriation (Loose-fill Asbestos Insulation Eradication) Bill 2014-15 - Submission

To The Secretary, Standing Committee on Public Accounts, Legislative Assembly for the ACT,

The proposed buyback and demolition scheme does not adequately take account of the situation of all affected home owners.

People who have purchased their homes within the last two years or so, have not yet realised an increase in the value of their property sufficient to offset the costs of purchasing and taking up residence. This is normal. Whilst a home in Canberra is a sound investment it is one for the longer rather than shorter term. People affected by the 'Mr Fluffy' disaster who purchased their homes in the last two years or so are now in a situation where they stand to lose considerably on their investment as a result of a forced early sale. The scheme as it stands may well see families in this situation left without sufficient financial resources to replace their home, particularly as the price capping involved results in an ever widening gap between the price offered for their affected home and the cost of a replacement.

Take the example of a young couple who worked hard to save a deposit, took care to ensure their new home was inspected and passed as OK prior to exchanging contracts and moving in. Having planned and managed their circumstances carefully, one partner took time out of the workforce to take on the task of raising an expanding family, whilst the other continued working to pay down the mortgage and meet all of the other costs of being a home-owner and parent.

Things were going well for them until the 'Mr Fluffy' disaster. Now, with the offer of a 'buy-back' at October 28 pricing they find themselves in a situation where they will lose their home, have little to no deposit (depending on the, as yet unknown, valuation), no access to a first home owners grant, (used up on the property they are now forced to leave) and, unable to secure a loan sufficient to purchase a replacement home.

This young couple, through hard work and careful planning purchased a home in which to raise their children and have been making a success of that. Now, as a result of the 'Mr Fluffy' situation they will become homeless with nothing to show for the years of hard work that went into becoming home-owners.

They currently live in their own home, close to family, raising their young sons and making ends meet successfully. Reparation of the Mr Fluffy disaster will cause inconvenience and some hardship as they have to uproot from their home and relocate but surely it should not also impose financial damage that leaves them unable to remain home-owners?

There must be a better, fairer way than that currently being imposed.

Kind regards  
Smith