

## **Submission to the Commission of Enquiry Into Brisbane Flood**

I have two issues that concern me:

### ***Development Approvals***

316 Long Street East in Graceville is a gated complex of 90, 3 bedroom townhouses.

Approval was given to build in about 1990 and the development commenced in about 2001.

The land was well known to have flooded in 1974 and has been listed on the 100 year flood risk.

When buying, I was advised the entire area had been built up to deal with the flood risk.

In January 2011, my townhouse and 81 others in the complex went under to at least a metre above the second floor.

To reach this level, the water rose approximately 35 feet from the road surface to enter my dwelling..

My questions are:

- Why development approval (for such a large complex) was given when this level of flooding (and reportedly lower than the 1974 flood) was known to have happened previously, and
- Given the level of inundation, it seems almost impossible to protect this complex in future floods, what is proposed for us in the future. It seems almost futile to rebuild and the value of our properties will be affected accordingly.

### ***Insurance Cover***

It came as a surprise to most owners in our complex (ie 90 townhouses) that we had a Body Corporate insurance policy that did not have flood cover. Most owners were under the impression flood cover existed – as it had when first purchased – but had somehow disappear when the policy was renewed in 2010 without advice to the owners.

When I first moved in, I sought to take out my own (additional) cover, including flood, for the building and was told by insurers I could not insure the building either internally or externally, because I had no insurable interest – it was the Body Corporate that had the insurable interest.

This does not sit well with the fact that I have a loan that says I own something at the complex.

Now, being in a position, where I will have to pay for all the internal repairs to my property (est \$100,000) I really fail to see how I do not have an insurable interest.

There needs to be a change to this approach and there needs to be more clarity specifically about which parts of each building are the Body Corporate's responsibility and which are not.

With our policy, the Body Corporate insures the 'owners responsibilities' for \$250,000, but there was no flood cover, so we all went down. I would prefer to be responsible for myself and not be left to the potential failings of communication that have clearly arisen. The fact is at the end of the day when it all goes wrong, I am the one who wears the consequences, so I would prefer to be responsible and in control of my own risk management.

I argue I do have an insurable interest and if I chose to 'double up' on the insurance to protect my financial position, then that is my decision. I would do it in the full knowledge that I can't be reimbursed twice, but at least I have the peace of mind that I will be covered to a level I am happy with.