

This document has been proactively released. Any redactions made to the document have been made consistent with the provisions of the Official Information Act 1982

**From:** s 9(2)(a)  
**To:** [UTAreview2016](#)  
**Subject:** Fwd: UTA Review - Invitation to attend stakeholder workshops [IN-CONFIDENCE:RELEASE EXTERNAL]  
**Date:** Thursday, 2 March 2017 2:44:36 a.m.

---

Hi,

Do you know what do I need to do in order to get the new legislation better attend issue like this:?

s 9(2)(a)

*I could give more and more example of all sorts of work that it being done to the building for which I need to pay much more (some time more than twice then other neighbours), just because I live in a larger apartment.*

*I had previously lived for almost 10 years in apartments at my homeland and the rules we had were very much different, so I would like to share it with you: we did pay more to the council, because they charge you by the size of the apartment - it's the same in NZ and it is fair. And yes, all building costs are shared equally by all the tenants - but if a certain fix benefits only some apartments, the cost is not shared by all. For example, when we had to fix the elevator, we did not charge the neighbour living on the street level for that work, because they did not use the elevator. I just offer this as an example to suggest other ways of looking at body corporate fees.*

*I have suggested all of this to our body chairperson, and have expressed my discomfort with the way fees are handled now, but I was told that by joying the building I had accepted the existing agreement that was set long time ago and that I cannot change it.*

*My suggestion would be to use more common sense and appraise by default that most repairs and maintenance serves all the building and to decide on the exceptional work that serve only few members, and those cost are shared relatively to the size of the apartments, while the rest of costs are shared equally. We pay for professional bodies to manage our building, and such calculation are not so complicated.*

*I hope that maybe the new rule can do more justice with my view on this.*

s 9(2)(a)