

Publication Date: 22 August 2016
YSP Podcast Transcript: Episode 024. Short-Term Letting Following the Watergate Decision - with Robert Savage (references to VIC and NSW legislation)

Listen to this podcast episode [here](#).

Intro: Welcome to Your Strata Property. The podcast for property owners looking for reliable, accurate, and bite-sized information from an experienced and authoritative source. To access previous episodes and useful strata tips, go to www.yourstrataproperty.com.au.

Amanda Farmer: Hello and welcome. I'm Amanda Farmer and this is Your Strata Property.

Today we'll be revisiting one of the most popular topics on this podcast, that of short-term letting, and specifically you're going to be hearing from Robert Savage who is a Victorian strata manager and also a lawyer. I've asked Robert to come on the show to tell us all about that Victorian Supreme Court case that you may have heard a bit about, or you may have read a bit about in the paper – we're calling it the Watergate case – and it's the first time that a superior court has made a decision on short-term letting in strata here in Australia.

Now, I don't want to divulge too much more – I'll let Robert talk you through the effect of that case – but before we get stuck into that interview, I do want to take this opportunity to answer a listener question.

Now, this question is from Sean and he has posted on the website under Episode 20, which was my chat with Hallie Warnock about using recording devices in strata meetings, and Sean says: "I'm loving the podcast and I really appreciate your work in making it available." Thank you, Sean. It's my pleasure. Sean says that he's a little unclear on whether all meeting attendees, or just a majority, need to consent or not object to the audio recording of the meeting.

So, thank for that question Sean, that comes out of the discussion that Hallie and I were having, and we made the suggestion that if you do want to record a strata meeting, that you announce that to the meeting and you call for everyone to consent to that, and we also suggested that there indeed be a motion place on the agenda that's resolved to record the meeting. So Sean's question is essentially: do you need unanimous consent to the meeting being recorded?

Now, what I suggest is this Sean: if anybody objects to the meeting being recorded, say to that person "do you agree for the meeting to be recorded if whatever you say is not recorded? So if the recording is turned off whenever you speak or there is no record made of your part in the recordings."

So, for example, if there's going to be a transcription of the recording, then whatever that person says is then cut out and not recorded in the transcript, and I raise this simply because I've seen it happen before where that's been put to an objecting person, and they've said "fine, as long as it's turned off when I speak, or as long as there is no record made of my input into this meeting, then I'm happy for it to proceed."

So, I think that you can proceed with the recording in that circumstance. I don't think you can proceed with the recording if somebody says "no, I object to this and I don't consent to the meeting being recorded."

So, that's the long answer to your question perhaps Sean, if you do have somebody openly objecting and saying I don't consent, then no, you can't go ahead with the recording. Do try that option of suggesting that the recording be stopped whenever they speak, that might work out, otherwise no, don't go ahead in the face of an objection. But that's not to say that you need unanimous approval. I wouldn't go around asking every person in the meeting "do you consent?". As you put in your comment there Sean, it's a matter of having people not objecting, rather than everyone consenting.

Now, Sean also asks if I could suggest the wording for a motion to go on the agenda, dealing with whether or not the meeting should be recorded, and indeed I can. I have actually posted a copy of just such a motion on the website for you, and anyone else interested in obtaining a copy of this motion. Go to www.yourstrataproperty.com.au/motiontorecord – 'motion to record' is all one word – and you can grab yourself a copy of that sample motion and you can cut and paste that into the agenda of your next

Publication Date: 22 August 2016

YSP Podcast Transcript: Episode 024. Short-Term Letting Following the Watergate Decision - with Robert Savage (references to VIC and NSW legislation)

meeting, and yes, I do agree with Sean, he raises in his comment, “should this be the first item on the agenda?” Yup, absolutely that would make sense. So, if you are wanting to place a motion on your agendas to raise this issue at the beginning of the meeting, head on over to the website www.yourstrataproperty.com.au/motiontorecord and you can grab yourself a copy of my sample motion.

Sean also did ask whether the motion needs to reference the relevant act. The motion I've drafted doesn't reference any legislation and it's really up to you, I assume that you mean there Sean, the Surveillance Devices Act or whatever the similar act is in your state. I would suggest probably not, I don't think there's a need to over-complicate things. I think when you're putting a motion on the agenda that references things like the Surveillance Devices Act, you're immediately going to have people running a mile or being confused and wondering what that's all about. So let's keep it simple, I don't think there is a reason to reference any legislation.

So, thank you very much, that was a really great question Sean, and I hope that has helped a number of you out there who may have had a similar question. Please do feel free to send your questions in, there's a space for you to post them under each episode on the website. Just go off to the homepage www.yourstrataproperty.com.au, and you can click on 'Podcasts' in the top menu of the homepage, and the web address again for those of you who want to download a copy of my suggested motion if you want to record your meetings: www.yourstrataproperty.com.au/motiontorecord. Moving on to my interview with Robert Savage, enjoy!

Robert Savage is a senior strata manager with Owners Corporation Management in Melbourne. He is also a lawyer with an extensive background in strata law, previously practicing in both Queensland and Victoria, advising owners corporations and body corporates on a range of matters including contract disputes, debt recovery, interpretation of plans, property development, building water disputes, enforcement of rules and management rights.

In his role as an owners corporation manager, he manages a number of large mixed-use developments in Melbourne, ranging in size from 200 to 800 lots. Wow, that is huge!

Robert is able to combine his knowledge and understanding of the law with the practical knowledge expected of a manager to provide quick and pragmatic advice to lot owners, residents, committees and developers. Today, I am delighted to welcome, Robert Savage from Owners Corporation Management. Welcome, Robert.

Robert Savage: Wonderful! Thank you very much Amanda, and thank you to all of the listeners out there.

Amanda Farmer: They are very lucky to have you indeed. Now, as a lawyer and a strata manager, you are uniquely placed to discuss today's topic with us. We're talking about short-term letting in the aftermath of the Watergate decision from the Victorian Supreme Court.

So, the first thing I'll ask you Robert, if at all possible, could you give us a layperson's guide – I won't say idiot's guide because there's no idiots listening, of course – a layperson's summary to this case and what is it exactly that the Victorian Supreme Court has decided about short-term letting in Victoria?

Robert Savage: Excellent. Well, long and short of it, many Victorian residents would be aware of the Watergate case, it's been in the news frequently over the last 2 – 3 years, but the dispute between the owners corporation and the operators of the Docklands Executive Apartments has been ongoing for a number of years.

Just by way of background, for the listeners outside of Victoria, Watergate is an apartment building in Melbourne's Docklands, just behind Etihad stadium, with over 349 residential apartments over 2 towers and some retail lots on the ground floor.

A plan of subdivision was registered back in 2004 and the majority of occupancy permits were issued for the apartments as Class 2 under the Building Code. 14 apartments were utilised by the respondents to the case, Salter and Balcombe, to operate their short-term letting business, known as Dockland Executive Apartments.

Publication Date: 22 August 2016
YSP Podcast Transcript: Episode 024. Short-Term Letting Following the Watergate Decision - with Robert Savage (references to VIC and NSW legislation)

Dockland Executive Apartments has been operating for over 8 years and received approximately 3,500 thousand bookings and over 10,000 guests over that time. Salter and Balcombe actually own one of the apartments and live on-site to facilitate the operation of their business and, in the evidence they gave in the proceedings, they put forward that they charged executive pricing, had a policy of a minimum of 7 days stay, obtained photo identification and credit card details of the guests, and had a zero tolerance of poor behaviour and would immediately evict troublesome guests.

At the inaugural meeting in August 2004, by special resolution, the developer at the time resolved to register additional rules in the Victorian Titles office. Those additional rules included the dispute of Rule 34, which basically prohibited short-stay for any length of time less than one month.

Many Victorian readers and listeners would recall that in 2011 was when Watergate first started making the news down here. The City of Melbourne issued building orders to approximately 42 lot owners who were operating apartments within Watergate as short-term stay, thereby rendering the apartments as a Class 3 under the Building Code. Class 3 is generally your hotel style operation.

Council claimed that the use of the apartments for commercial short-stay was not permitted under the existing Class 2 Occupancy permits.

After a visit to the Supreme Court in December 2013, the matter was referred back to the Building Appeals Board which was under the building orders that were issued, and in October 2014 the owners corporation and Salter and Balcombe agreed to consent orders and I will just quickly summarise them for you.

The owners of the lots, those 42 lots, agreed to install specific smoke alarms, a fixed emergency evacuation plan to the rear of the apartment doors, and provide necessary certificates of compliance to council.

The OC agreed to review exit signage in the residential corridors to ensure compliance to the council's satisfaction, and it was requested that written records of tenants acknowledging the receipt of safety evacuation inductions be provided or carried out.

Watergate fell off the radar for about a period of 12-months, until the VCAT decision and member Rowland, an experienced member in VCAT down here, handed down her judgment in June last year, and basically that judgment was to the effect that the owners corporation did not have powers conferred on it by the owners corporation Act, the prior subdivision Act and the regulations, to make such a law to prohibit short-term accommodation.

So, the owners corporation could only make a rule preventing nuisance, hazard or noise with respect to the permitted use of a lot. It was not a rule with respect to preventing nuisance, hazard or noise, and accordingly she found that it was beyond the owners corporation's ability to prohibit short-stay.

This matter then went on appeal and it was heard middle of this year before Justice Riordan in the Supreme Court of Victoria, and that decision as we all know was handed down in late July, and basically Justice Riordan found likewise that Rule 34 was invalid and he has given them about an 82-page judgment, off the top of my head.

I wouldn't mind saying to readers if you'd like a history of Victorian and New South Wales strata community title legislation from the 1950s onwards, he gives a wonderful short summary of each, and it's a very well written judgment. Don't be off-put by the 82 pages.

Amanda Farmer: Yes. I have to confess that I started to look at it and then I saw the length of it, and then I decided "no, I'll just talk to Robert about it" [laughing].

Robert Savage: I've read it a couple of times now and it's a very good judgment but if you're only interested in how it affects owners corporations, or more interested after listening to this podcast, then you can skip some of the sections obviously... the history of community title may not be attractive to you.

Publication Date: 22 August 2016
YSP Podcast Transcript: Episode 024. Short-Term Letting Following the Watergate Decision - with Robert Savage (references to VIC and NSW legislation)

Amanda Farmer: Okay. So the Supreme Court has said we agree with VCAT?

Robert Savage: With member Rowland in VCAT. I've got the 5 main points down here from the judgement.

Amanda Farmer: Yes, go for it.

Robert Savage: So Justice Riordan reinforced that the function of the OC, which is predominantly set out in Section 4 of our Owners Corporation Act in Victoria, is to manage and administer common property, repair and maintain common property, maintain strata insurance, keep records and issue certificates, and provide mechanisms to resolve disputes.

The powers of the OC to make rules are set out in, as I said, Section 138 of the Act, and relate mainly to the health, safety and security of lot owners, occupiers and invitees; how a change of use of lots may affect things like the payment of premiums, and the behavior of owners, occupiers and invitees on common property, including noise and nuisance control.

He also went on to say that the rule exceeded the power of the owners corporation, as did member Rowland, and interfered with the proprietary rights of lot owners to use their lots as legally they are able to do... and that's about all.

Amanda Farmer: Thank you for that Robert, that's a really good summary. This, I think, coming from someone who hasn't read the case, I think that's a really good summary. This decision has had quite a bit of impact here in New South Wales as well, and certainly we as lawyers are getting phone calls from lot owners and strata managers who either have by-laws that deal with short-term letting, or want by-laws that deal with short-term letting, and are quite concerned about what this decision means.

I think it's an interesting decision. First of all, I'll ask you: what do you think it means for owners corporations in Victoria who are dealing with short-term letting? And then maybe I can tack onto that what I think it means for owners corporations in New South Wales.

Robert Savage: What it means is that the owners corporation can't enforce a rule that aims to prohibit AirBNB short-stay accommodation.

That power rests solely with either your local council, under their planning regulations, or the Victorian government under their wider planning controls. So, it's not for – and Justice Riordan went into this in certain sections of his judgment – it's not for a group of owners to determine how a lot may be used. It was not the intention of parliament to allow the owners as a collective to determine what may or may not be an appropriate use of the lot on a whim, so to speak.

Amanda Farmer: What I find interesting about this case Robert, first of all, I'll say is that it's not binding on the New South Wales judicial system. It's a case that's been decided in Victoria by the Victorian Supreme Court and, whilst it's very interesting, where we have the same issue coming up in our tribunal or in our supreme court, which hasn't happened yet, this isn't a case that our courts are bound to follow – I'll just say that for the benefit of the listeners – and it's certainly a question that I've been getting in the last few weeks.

What I find interesting about this case is that the courts found that the owners corporation has exceeded its power. It has interfered with proprietary rights of lot owners by making this rule – and not practicing in Victoria, I'm not sure exactly of the ins and outs of the Act – but certainly in New South Wales our strata titles legislation is very broad and has been interpreted very broadly by our courts, not every case, but a lot of cases, and it is interpreted on the basis that owners corporations have a broad power to make rules about broad things, even if they interfere with proprietary rights, which is kind of this anathema in property law, and lawyers who practice in this area are constantly frustrated by this because we think “well there has got to be some limits, there has got to be some limits on the power of these owners corporations to make their own rules and to interfere with the way people live their daily lives.”

But there really isn't, and that's certainly my view and my interpretation of the legislation, and also how some Supreme Court

Publication Date: 22 August 2016
YSP Podcast Transcript: Episode 024. Short-Term Letting Following the Watergate Decision - with Robert Savage (references to VIC and NSW legislation)

judges have taken the same view and seen the legislation.

But I found it interesting that the Victorian Supreme Court said, with quite a bit of certainty, that there are certainly limits and this one of them and there shouldn't be this kind of interference. I wonder whether faced with the same factual circumstances, a New South Wales judge would have come to the same decision. I'm not sure that they would have.

Robert Savage: It's interesting, and I do love to read about what happens in New South Wales, and obviously having previously practiced up in Queensland as a lawyer I'm very interested. There are a few other cases that I know of, there was one in Brisbane: the Quest underneath the Story Bridge.

It was almost a reverse scenario where council issued notices against a small group of owners living in a Quest Hotel, basically saying that the planning controls over that area did not allow you to stay on a permanent basis.

There's also a decision, I think it was the Casuarina decision in New South Wales...

Amanda Farmer: Yes, Casuarina Rec Club. That's a Court of Appeal decision and it's the one that I'm thinking of when I talk about that.

Robert Savage: Yes, and Justice Riordan did briefly touch on that in his judgment, but I've always found that one interesting in that – correct me if I'm wrong Amanda – basically everyone signed the contracts off-the-plan knowing the rules, and those same rules were registered and they were able to be reinforced.

In Victoria if you buy into an off-the-plan development and it says that no short-term stay is permitted or that stays must be greater than 30 or 60 or 90 days, there's a reasonable assumption for the buyer that that's going to be the nature of the development. So whether or not in the long-term this is the right decision – I think it's a right decision in that it gives us clarity as to how the judiciary will view these rules – but there is a lot of angst amongst a lot of owners for good reason. There are incidents where there are a number of short-term apartments and the guests do affect the other owners use and enjoyment of common property, and certain places have become party central, so to speak. So where we go as a community, as a wider community, we still need to resolve this. As an industry we need more guidance from parliament.

Amanda Farmer: Yes, and I think when the courts are looking at this legislation, they do look to what the parliament's intention was, and they say things like “well if the parliament intended for owners corporations to have such broad and wide ranging powers then they would have used express language and put that into the legislation.”

Robert Savage: Exactly.

Amanda Farmer: We read that, as lawyers, as a bit of pitch to the legislators. The judge is saying “hey guys can you please step in here and fix this up” which is something that you might see in Victoria.

Robert Savage: The wheels are turning I think across Australia and we are slowly coming up and grappling with these decisions.

Amanda Farmer: Yes, and I think something else to bear in mind for all of our listeners is that when we talk about these cases where by-laws are being challenged, and rules are being challenged in their validity, in every circumstance it comes down to the wording of that particular rule, the wording of that particular by-law.

Robert Savage: Yes.

Amanda Farmer: And that's something important to remember. We can get into a panic about a case that's just been determined a certain way, but your rule or by-law that you have for short-term letting might be worded quite differently to the one in this case.

Publication Date: 22 August 2016

YSP Podcast Transcript: Episode 024. Short-Term Letting Following the Watergate Decision - with Robert Savage (references to VIC and NSW legislation)

And I expect that the Victorian Supreme Court judge who was looking at this case looked quite closely at the words of the by-law and made a decision based in that wording.

Robert Savage: Look, from the judgment he certainly did, and he went to great length to review the legislation and regulations that were in force back in 2004, and Victorian people would know that the owners corporation Act and regulations came into effect in 2008. At each, the justice applied the rule under the previous legislation and regulations to see if it was valid or not, and also the current ones.

So it was a very in-depth analysis of the rule, just like you said. Those with legal training will look to that particular wording and it should be pointed out that in this particular instance, the decision was that it wasn't valid.

Amanda Farmer: And just returning again to comparing this to the New South Wales situation, we have this section in our Act which basically says that you can make a by-law for the purpose of the control, management, use or enjoyment of lots and common property.

A by-law is valid if it relates to any of those things, the control, management, use or enjoyment of lots and common property, and there are lawyers and certainly academics in New South Wales who have expertise in this area, who say that because of the existence of that section, you can have by-laws in New South Wales that are incredibly broad and incredibly invasive, and I'm not sure if that's mirrored in the Victorian legislation.

I think, hearing what you said about the case where it came down to that you can have by-laws dealing with safety, nuisances, hazards and security. It sounds like your legislation points a little bit more to the kind of things you can have by-laws about. Ours does that a little bit, but it says that it's not limited to those things.

But because we have this express statement – which I think is what the judge was probably looking for, which didn't exist in the Victorian legislation – this express statement that we have this broad power, that's why I question whether we would have this kind of decision in New South Wales.

Robert Savage: Right. Well I think it's a lot clearer in Victoria now following this Watergate case.

Amanda Farmer: Yes, that's right, and planning instruments I always say – I've spoken about this on the podcast before, we've had episodes where we've spoken about short-term letting – and I've had a direct question “can we or can't we have by-laws?” and I always say your starting point is your planning instruments.

And that sounds like it might be the same case in Victoria. You want to look to what your council does permit and doesn't permit, and if the council is expressly saying short-term stays, serviced apartments are prohibited, they are not permitted, then I've always said that's pretty solid grounds to have a by-law that basically says the same thing.

So it's not the by-law that's outlawing the short-term stay, it's the council's planning instrument, and your by-law is just confirming that in a way that's easily accessible for owners and easy to read and understand.

Robert Savage: That certainly makes a lot of sense as well. If it's not approved by council, then the by-law is there as an extra level of enforcement to ensure that legal activities only occur in the development.

Amanda Farmer: Yes, okay. So look, we could keep going through this case for a while, you and I. So, what I want to ask you Robert is: what is your view as a strata manager... what should owners corporation's be doing to deal with this issue effectively from a management perspective?

Robert Savage: Look, from a management point of view, the main issue with short-stay is the trouble that it can bring to a building. So, your 2AM parties in the swimming pool, your possible impairment to your security at the building where fobs are left at the front

Publication Date: 22 August 2016
YSP Podcast Transcript: Episode 024. Short-Term Letting Following the Watergate Decision - with Robert Savage (references to VIC and NSW legislation)

door or in the letter box, so to speak. These are serious issues for all the other residents and owners of the development.

So, you still need to be aware that security of the building should be paramount. It's people's homes, it's everyone's castle. Noise, nuisance, swimming pool parties at 2AM in the morning, that can occur with long-term residents and it can in fact effect owners. You need to deal with these on a case by case basis, and it's aim should be applied to owner's long-term residents as it were to anyone causing trouble that may or may not be staying there for 1, 2 or 3 nights.

One issue that we are still grappling with down here is gym inductions. It's generally recommendation of most of our buildings' insurers that an induction process occurs, but how do you induct someone who is only there for 1 or 2 nights?

Amanda Farmer: Ahh, yes, indeed.

Robert Savage: So generally, in these larger buildings – and for larger buildings you would say about 300 apartments plus – as an owners corporation you would have an induction, either by appointment or say every 2nd Tuesday night come down to the gym at 8 o'clock at night, we'll get you to sign some paperwork and off you go.

Some buildings in Victoria that I know of are using this to also limit the attractiveness of short-stay apartments, but of course once people have access and the security swipes, then they can still use the facilities.

Amanda Farmer: Yes.

Robert Savage: It's paramount on the building management – building management as in the concierges or building managers – to still ensure that the safety of anyone within the building is satisfied at that particular point in time. That's it, that's everyone's goal.

Amanda Farmer: Yes, I really like that point you make about inductions and some clever buildings out there who are using that as a way to lessen the attractiveness of short-term stay.

So, are you saying that any new tenants have to go through the induction in order to get their access to the building, in order to get their swipe card? Is that how it's working?

Robert Savage: Yes, in the buildings that I manage – and this is in consultation with the committees as well, I should say – we run a number of induction programs, and we generally allow people 2 weeks to partake in one of the induction programs before we limit their access to facilities.

So, this is just for people's own safety. We want people to, at least, have a very basic understanding of how to use gym equipment and swimming pools and not to stay in the sauna for 12 hours [laughing] as a protection mechanism and to increase their use and enjoyment of the facilities that we have on offer in the building. So, that's under committee direction.

Some of the other issues which I've heard of in relation to AirBNB short-stay type of accommodations is that I've heard of some owners just putting up a key safe at the front door without OC approval.

Amanda Farmer: Wow!

Robert Savage: For those of you that aren't aware, key safes are usually a little black box that you can key in a certain 4-6-8 digit code and it opens up and you get the keys and access to the apartment – high risk.

Amanda Farmer: Yes, definitely.

Robert Savage: That's probably more so an issue in the smaller buildings, but it's one that I've heard a number of times that people have just put in at the front door. Obviously, you know if you stay there once you might know the code and it may not have

Publication Date: 22 August 2016
YSP Podcast Transcript: Episode 024. Short-Term Letting Following the Watergate Decision - with Robert Savage (references to VIC and NSW legislation)

changed and you can go back and stay for free the next time.

Amanda Farmer: Yes, that is terrifying. I guess the lesson is that even though we might not have a short-stay by-law, or a by-law that prohibits short-term letting, or an enforceable by-law that prohibits short term-letting, there are a number of ways to deal with this issue by targeting those other infringements and disturbances on people's quiet enjoyment, so you're talking about things like noise, nuisance and hazards.

We can have by-laws about all of those things, so why not be creative about it and start enforcing those by-laws against the owners who are letting their apartments for short-term stays, and make life a bit of a headache for them so that they can rethink whether this is all worth it. Is that sort of your thoughts, along those lines?

Robert Savage: Yes, that's right. I might share with you a story from one of my colleagues actually.

Amanda Farmer: Yes, please do.

Robert Savage: Another practicing strata manager from another company here in Melbourne. He lives in Richmond, which is inner-city – most people know where Richmond is, it's on the other side of the MCG – and lived in a small scheme, I think of about 10 or 12 apartments, and one owner decided to list their apartment on one of the short-stay websites, so for a period of about 2 months they had a different person stay there every weekend.

So, what they did and it took about 2 to 3 months as I recall him telling me the story is that they spoke to the owner a number of times and they started taking photographs of some of the people that were coming through the apartment.

Amanda Farmer: Yes.

Robert Savage: And they said, "look we don't know who these people are, we all live here, we know you are still paying your levies, you're a good owner, but we are starting to feel unsafe with who is coming into this apartment block."

And after about 2 to 3 months the owner finally went "I'm sorry, I never saw it that way", it finally started to sink in and so they put it back onto long-term 6 or 12 month rental terms.

So the Watergate decision does not mean that through good communication and good neighborly relations that you may or may not be able to convince other people not to have their apartment in that short-term operation.

Amanda Farmer: Yes, yes, I like that. That's something that we too often overlook, I think, speaking to those owners when you can, and I know obviously in those larger buildings this happens on a much larger scale, and sometimes it's a corporate owner that's running an entire serviced apartment business, but where you do have those buildings where it is a one-off or two owners or a small group, why not sit down with them and have the conversation and say "hey, do you realise how this is affecting us not only financially due to the drain on our common facilities, but emotionally that we have to come home to a place where we've got strangers in and out and we feel unsafe?"

Robert Savage: Yes, yes. We don't know who's walking past our front door at any given time now.

Amanda Farmer: Yes, I like that.

Robert Savage: Yes.

Amanda Farmer: Okay, the book question Robert: what books have had the greatest impact on you and why?

Robert Savage: The greatest impact on me... there's been quite a few biographies, more so from the sports scenario, guys like

Publication Date: 22 August 2016
YSP Podcast Transcript: Episode 024. Short-Term Letting Following the Watergate Decision - with Robert Savage (references to VIC and NSW legislation)

John Eels... Rod Macqueen was a great one.

Amanda Farmer: Yes.

Robert Savage: Many readers might know that he had polio when he was younger, but just the drive and determination, and then in the later years how he got the Manly rugby club from 1st through to 5th grade all on the same page, so to speak, and a large collective of people going for the one goal and how he achieved ultimate success with the Wallabies.

Amanda Farmer: Nice one.

Robert Savage: Those types of stories I like. I read a lot of...

Amanda Farmer: Supreme Court Cases?

Robert Savage: At the moment, yes. There's a few decisions going around here in Victoria. But look, be it say a short 1-page article on how to better use your time, or I've just recently started reading how to better run your meetings, so it was 'Death by a Thousand Meetings' I think it's called.

Amanda Farmer: Ohh, I like that one.

Robert Savage: I've got an online version, so maybe in a month or two we can check in and I might have a top 10 so to speak.

Amanda Farmer: Yes.

Robert Savage: I don't know if it's good or bad that it was given to me by a committee member.

Amanda Farmer: Well, it depends how those meetings are going.

Robert Savage: She found it very useful and she's an accountant, so I thanked her for handing it over to me.

Amanda Farmer: Oh good. If you have a link to that please let me know because I'm sure there are plenty of listeners out there who are on the edge of their seats saying "I want that!".

Robert Savage: And as we were discussing previously, my current reading list is mainly Peppa Pig and the exciting adventures that she gets herself into.

Amanda Farmer: Yes, little ones around.

Robert Savage: And Dory and Nemo are the flavour of the month in my house as well....I may read every night but...

Amanda Farmer: Maybe not what you're wanting to read.

Robert Savage: Some of the stories repeat themselves.

Amanda Farmer: Oh, yes. Well you know that I have a 3 ½ year old so we generally read the same book every night for about 2 weeks until we move on to the next ones, so they're burned into my brain too [laughing].

Robert Savage: That's right. That's right.

Amanda Farmer: Okay. Well, thank you so much for giving us your time today, Robert. I will make sure that there is a link to a

Publication Date: 22 August 2016
YSP Podcast Transcript: Episode 024. Short-Term Letting Following the Watergate Decision - with Robert Savage (references to VIC and NSW legislation)

copy of the Watergate Decision as part of the show notes for this episode.

So, anybody who does want to jump in there and get some light, or not so light, bed-time reading, please check it out and if you have specific questions for Robert or for myself about what that case means, and what's coming out of that case, please do put a comment under the episode on the website and I'll be sure to help address those and if I have to refer back to Robert for his assistance, I will on those questions.

So, before we wrap up Robert, how do the listeners find out more about you and is there anything else you want to add?

Robert Savage: Certainly. Listeners can contact me, I'm at Owners Corporation Management down here in Victoria, also on LinkedIn, I'm quite active on LinkedIn.

Amanda Farmer: Yes.

Robert Savage: Under Robert Savage. Just drop me a line, always happy to meet up to have a cup of coffee to have a chat about the Watergate Decision, to see how it affects other managers.

Amanda Farmer: Wonderful.

Robert Savage: More than available!

Amanda Farmer: Excellent. Thank you very much, Robert. I'll look forward to having you on a future episode of the podcast.

Robert Savage: Wonderful. Thanks for inviting me Amanda, and thank you to everyone out there.

Amanda Farmer: Bye.

Robert Savage: Bye.

Outro: Thank you for listening to Your Strata Property. The podcast which consistently delivers to property owners reliable and accurate information about their strata property. You can access all the information below this episode by the show notes at www.yourstrataproperty.com.au. You can also ask questions in the comment section which Amanda will answer in her upcoming episodes. How can Amanda help you today?