

## Rental Law change submission

### Landlord Submission for no ground's evictions

I wish to oppose the removal of the no grounds evictions at the end of a lease agreement. I personally believe the tenants' representatives are not working in the best interest of the tenants regarding the push to remove this law. I will explain why below.

As often as landlords are smeared by the tenants' representatives and some media and minor political parties that dog whistle this issue for their own political interest, the reality is most mum and dad investors are not the evil heartless people that we are at times made out to be. My tenants are a 10 out of 10 and I feel there is mutual respect as I regularly improve the property and keep rent at a modest amount. We have an excellent tenant/landlord relationship. However, like many landlords I have not always been so lucky with tenants, with a number of tenants causing unreasonable amounts of wear and tear, damage, and breaking of tenancy agreement rules e.g. subletting to a relative with drug issues without permission.

My family has been renting property for 3 generations and I will say that the reality is that the overwhelmingly main reason for a no reason eviction is that it is for ongoing unacceptable tenant behaviour that is in breach of the agreement. However, like most mum and dad investors we do not like conflict and seek to avoid it where possible. If we can part ways with a poorly behaved tenant that is not showing respect for the agreement or property then by issuing a no grounds eviction at the end of an agreement then this is a preferred option and this is common for most landlords.

The no grounds eviction is in the best interest of the tenant in most cases as it does not record the many, many things that a landlord could say about the poorly behaved tenant. It does not record breaches and it does not put the tenant on a TICA list.

What it does do is allow the landlord and tenant to part ways without conflict, without reports to the tribunal and most importantly without damaging the rental history of the tenant. For many tenants this is a second chance to reflect on what they have done to the property or how they have breached the agreement. The no reason eviction gives these people a second chance to have more respect for the next property they rent and the agreement they sign.

However, if this no grounds eviction is abolished then like many landlords, we will be forced to record every minor breach, every minor amount of damage (beyond reasonable wear and tear) we will build the case to evict a tenant and every minor thing will be documented.

This will only greatly damage the tenant's rental history and chances of renting another property ever again and therefore will increase homelessness. This will increase unnecessary heated and dangerous conflicts between landlords and tenants and clog the Fair Trading tenancy tribunal with unnecessary disputes about who did what. This will result in more landlords giving up on their rental investments and selling to avoid conflict and loss of control of this expensive asset. It will reduce the already critically low number of rentals for lease in NSW causing an even greater number of families to become homeless.

If this change is introduced another thing landlords will need to do is stop taking chances with tenants that have less than perfect rental histories. Currently landlords can feel secure with a tenant application that is less than desirable provided we can end the lease without the hassle of a tribunal if they do not live up to their promises of caring for the property, abiding by the agreement and paying rent on time. Previously I have taken chances with renters that have had a slightly sketchy rental history, however if this change is introduced like most landlords this risk taking will no longer

happen. We will only accept applications that are amazing with a perfect history. I would, like many property owners, prefer to keep the property vacant for longer than to be stuck with or have difficulties trying to remove a bad tenant. Again, this will leave some tenants who have changed their poor behaviours never being given a second chance due to the increased risk to the landlord and the extra challenges to remove such a person if they break their promise to care for the property. Again, this change would leave many more families homeless and a substantially greater number of people will never be successful in finding a home in the private rental market. This will put great pressures on the government social housing system that is already massively over stretched and emergency charity accommodation that is already turning people away as well.

These above reasons are why the tenant advocacy groups are not working in the best interest of the tenants. The above reactions are how many fair and reasonable landlords will have to respond to the no ground eviction removal, and both tenant and landlords will be worse off if the removal of this clause was implemented. The tenant representatives need to stop and reflect on the flow-on effects of pushing for the removal of this predominantly beneficial clause for the tenant, and understand that home owners will implement new strategies to protect these extremely expensive assets and as a result many tenants that once had a second chance at rectifying poor behaviours when they apply for another property will now most likely find it almost impossible to rent again.

I believe in most cases removing the no grounds eviction will not benefit the tenant, neither the landlord.

Thank you for your considerations

Regards

██████████