

Dear Sir

Infrastructure Pricing at Perisher issues paper

In relation to the current IPART inquiry, I would like to make the following submissions as a member of a lodge at Perisher (Lampada):

Costs for lodges have risen heavily over the last 10 years, and the proportion of lodge income that now goes to rental and MSU and insurance and fire protection does not leave room for further increases. Lodges get old and have to be heavily maintained and reserves have to be built up to allow for this. These are not profits, but just keep our premises usable in the long term.

The lodge that I am a member of was established in the 1960's. It has provided many families over nearly 40 years with wonderful holidays. The ever increasing costs make the provision of such family holidays more and more difficult.

Lodges pay a disproportionate share of the total costs of running the valley, whereas day trippers just pay their entry fee, and none of this goes to the MSU costs.

A significant problem is that not all money raised from Perisher goes to Perisher development. In Victoria all income goes to the snow area. Rents, access gate fees, MSU charges, in total go to the area for development. Some \$6-9m per year. At Thredbo, all rent, MSU charges, go to the operator, Kosciusko Thredbo: some \$4m per year. Gate fees however go to the Government. In Perisher, only MSU charges go to the development of the area. Some \$2.5m per year paid for by the lodges. The rest, rent and gate fees adding up to \$5m/yr, go to the Government/NPWS. Add up the differences over 30 years and you have a lot of money that has been treated by NPWS as revenue and diverted to other NSW Parks. The Victorian model should be adopted.

Lodges have been paying rent at 6% a year on land that was supposedly fit for use, with services provided. But now the lodges have to pay for roads, water supplies, sewage plants etc which means that the capital services were not actually provided. i.e. the model should be that all funds raised from Perisher should be used at Perisher, not just go to consolidated revenue.

Capital costs are for the benefit of the land owners, the government, and should be paid by the government, not the current users

Thank you for your consideration of this matter.

Yours faithfully,

D. B. Studdy