

Jenny Mannering

From: Marshall, Kristy L (DoE) <kristy.marshall@education.tas.gov.au>
Sent: Friday, 10 August 2018 10:34 AM
To: SSA
Subject: FW: SUBMISSION: Legislative Council Select Committee Short Stay Accommodation in Tasmania

The Secretary,
 Short Stay Accommodation Select Committee
 Parliament of Tasmania

SUBMISSION

I make the following points:

The AIR BNB type short stay model is a multi-million dollar business in Tasmania that requires no Government assistance or rates holiday or relief from head works charges. In fact, it requires nothing of Government at all... unlike Forestry, Myers or the Taste of Tasmania. So why restrict a proven growth industry that directly benefits Tasmanians all around the State and is a catalyst for upgrading existing housing stock?

The AIR BNB model captures the Tourist dollar and keeps the bulk of that dollar in Tasmania. Firstly in the pockets of Tasmanians right around the State who in turn spend that dollar in Tasmania creating employment for Tasmanians. Why on earth would any patriotic Tasmanian prefer to quarantine that dollar to be spent in a select elite few mainland and multi-national chain hotels/motels where the bulk of the Tourist dollar is exported to the mainland or overseas to benefit a foreign economy?

It is a model that can be as simple as providing the 'grey nomad' a place to park the RV and use the toilet/ablutions/laundry facilities or as complex as a full on luxury five star experience. This allows participation at all levels and meets the demands of the Tourist market. Why would anyone want to strangle with restrictions a successful market orientated industry that does not need skyscraper type buildings in congested areas geared to the fly in fly out tourist?

The AIR BNB type model introduces back into the economy the 'second job'; the job one has before or after the 9 to 5 job that enables young first home buyers to earn additional income to help pay off their mortgages,

meet family expenses etc. It used to be mowing lawns, cleaning the local pub or the like. Now it is the sharing economy of AIR BNB, Uber and so on. Why screw down young go ahead home owners who are using their initiative with meritless restrictions?

It is a model that gets empty nesters, retirees, women who have been out of the work force raising families back into the productive work force. So why screw down those people, marginalise them from the work force particularly when the aging of the population means Tasmania will be scratching around for workers just to keep the ship of state afloat?

If houses are safe for Tasmanians and their families and their guests to live in at present then it follows those same houses are safe for tourists to live in without restrictions or modifications. To be otherwise is to say all Tasmanian houses resided in by Tasmanians are unsafe and if that is the situation then the Government has been criminally negligent in not making laws to make all Tasmanians safe at home. In that case Tasmanian citizens would be well advised to lawyer up and sue the Tasmanian Government on that scenario!

Restricting the AIR BNB model is a direct attack on women inhibiting them from joining the sharing economy, deriving income and fulfilling their potential to make real and significant contributions to the economy. It is an attack on the worth of home making skills and an attack on the striving for financial independence by women presently marginalised from the workforce.

Getting ordinary Tasmanians involved in the Tourist industry all around the State makes for a wealthier, more tolerant outward looking community. Tasmanians have had enough of being the poor cousins to mainland folk; enough of enduring the lack of opportunity for their children and enough of watching their children being forced to flee the State to find employment. The sharing economy in all its forms, be it transport, tour guides or short stay homing of tourists, is Tasmania's 21st Century escape to prosperity, increased sophistication and a more fulfilled generous society. Tasmanians in large numbers have voted with their feet in embracing the shared economy. Why would the government deliberately impose restrictions or do any other thing to frustrate the aspirations of Tasmanians?

The Air BNB type short stay model has personal, social and economic benefits:

Personal;

1. It allows the individual an opportunity to create a business using just a home
2. Supplement an existing income derived from social welfare or personal exertion
3. Rewards initiative and helps develop independence from welfare
4. Allows women who wish to nurture children at home the opportunity to derive income
5. Allows those individuals who cannot fit the 9 to 5 work pattern to create income.

6. Allows those who cannot leave their homes (because they are carers etc) to create income
7. Encourages improvement in inter-personal skills
8. Encourages individuals to learn and expand commercial skills
9. Creates the opportunity for improved lifestyle and life choices through generation of income
10. The satisfaction of bettering oneself by one's own efforts rather than from a handout.

Social :

1. Engages individuals with the concept and practice of customer service
2. Encourages tolerance of others
3. Encourages the individual to be nice to others as a matter of course
4. Opens the individual to broader horizons (eg: through dealing with foreigners etc)
5. Shifts the individual's focus from their needs to meeting the needs of others
6. Values home maker skills and values looking after one's home
7. Gives women who leave the workforce an opportunity to run a business from home
8. Gives retirees and empty nesters an opportunity to go back and engage in the workforce
9. Most importantly it is an instrument for closing the gap twixt rich and poor
10. Gives rise to the satisfaction of pulling oneself up by the bootstraps

Economic :

1. It spreads the Tourist dollar more evenly throughout the State
2. More Tasmanians both directly and indirectly share in the Tourist industry
3. Keeps the Tourist dollars in the State. Money that would otherwise be exported overseas
4. It is meeting the proven demand of Tourists
5. The AIR BNB model can be taken up by the working poor, those on welfare and retirees
6. The ancillary services & trades benefit (eg: local accountants, carpenters, cleaners etc)
7. Local shops and restaurants and the like benefit from the nearby AIR BNB
8. Has the potential to turn wage slaves into small business operators
9. Ability to shift welfare dependents into being partly or wholly financially independent
10. Reduces the demand on the public purse both directly and indirectly
11. Provides employment suitable for those presently marginalised from the workforce
12. Puts a positive commercial financial value on home maker skills
13. Gives empty nesters and retirees an opportunity to re-engage in the workforce
14. Gives rise to the 'second job' for first home owners to help pay off their mortgages
15. Major hotel chains are building new hotels alongside the AIR BNB model. Room for both.
16. Welfare housing can be provided with AIR BNB potential so that a house with the built in ability to earn income are provided as a package directed at retirees and empty nesters amongst others.
17. The existing private dwellings comprise a huge investment that is basically financially unproductive. AIR BNB turns those financially unproductive houses into income generating investments that contribute to the economy of the State.
18. With the reporting strictures of AIR BNB model existing housing is maintained at a better standard

In conclusion it is suggested that AIR BNB type short stay is all about empowering the individual even at the lowest income levels and promoting the qualities of self reliance, independence, tolerance of others and initiative with the opportunity to improve the individual's station in life. It is a no cost hand up tool that respects the dignity of the individual, not a hand out drag on the public purse forelock tugging program. The AIR BNB model is a very good thing for both the individual and society in general.

The choice today is to join and embrace the sharing economy or stand, like Canute, endeavouring to turn back a tide of change.

Those that oppose the sharing economy which is spear headed by the AIR BNB model are those who would encourage a socialist communal existence where the individual is subsumed to the community – a Marxist model that has been a proven economic, social and political abject failure.

It is not the function of private enterprise to provide welfare or university student housing – that is the function of Government and UTAS respectively. UTAS has apparently enrolled some 6000 foreign students but has only provided housing for about a thousand of those students.

The properties available at present for AIR BNB short stay are not properties that would be affordable to welfare recipients or working poor in a long term rental market.

The private rental market is about profit maximisation just like the supermarket, corner store and the dentist. It is not a charitable institution and should not be expected to take up a burden because UTAS and or the Government choose to abdicate responsibility.

What has occurred is the renovation and re-purposing of what was existing run down sub-standard housing into modern functional accommodation. The economic benefits of that investment into existing housing stock should not be under-estimated nor deterred by regulation but rather encouraged. At the end of the day the tourist market will determine the amount and level of service required. A distinct change from the past where the hotel/motel providers dictated what the tourist would receive in terms of quality, service level and availability.

Finally, because the short stay accommodation industry is both a major economic contributor to Tasmania (around \$90 million dollars per year and growing) and because it is clearly meeting the demands of tourists giving any regulatory control over short term visitor accommodation to local councils would be like putting a drunk in charge of a distillery. It is a far too important an industry to allow councils to block or handicap development, particularly on the grounds of ideology or populist nonsense.

Yours faithfully,

Kristy Marshall