

[8]

- a) QCAT did not “reject” the department’s submission. The department withdrew its submission at this hearing, QCAT accepted that withdrawal and the matter was closed.
- b) There was no need to provide additional time to “improve the property condition”, as the condition of the property was “acceptable” to the department at the time of the hearing, which is why they withdrew the application. In any event, I did not receive any notification to this effect.

[9]

- a) No complaint was received by the department, yet “a complaint investigation was opened”?
- b) Once again, the department describes the material as “rubbish”, a material error of fact. This error is repeated in most (but not all) written correspondence to me.

[13]

- a) This point does not mention whether the items in question were in my front yard or elsewhere. I am not the only one storing items outside. See also [17] and [58] below.

[15]

- a) The first of 17 “home visits” between 10 August 2021 and 22 March 2022. On all but one of these occasions, departments staff observed the premises “unacceptable” or “unsatisfactory”. On the exception, 3 September 2021, the department considered the premises “satisfactory”. A video recording of a meeting with department staff at the time of this visit confirms this. The standard of the yard on 3 September 2021 had previously been considered “unacceptable” by the department in 2020.
- b) The majority of these “home visits” were “drive-by”, where a department staff member merely observed the front yard of the premises from the vehicle as they went past. This method does not allow for any observation of change in the yard, especially if vehicles are parked on the side of the road or other obstructions impede the view.
- c) Different staff members attended each of these “home visits”, therefore there is no continuity in objective assessment.

[17] and [58]

- a) It is not stated which “neighbour” this refers to, but perhaps it means 21 Waverley Road, in which case the items referred to were not placed there by me. The event referred to in [58] included items belonging to me, but I did not put them there and they were removed as soon as discovered them. I have my suspicion as to who the real culprit is, but there is no evidence to support this.

[32] and [47]

- a) The department has been previously notified multiple times that all communication with me must be in written form, either text message, email or letter. Phone calls and face-to-face meetings are not acceptable methods of communication because they cannot be recorded for evidentiary purposes. This is also the primary reason why I try to avoid being home when department staff visit and why I say as little as possible if “ambushed”.

[48]

- a) The letter described in the paragraph was not signed.

[52]

- a) Similar to [17] and [58], not everything that was removed belonged to me. The “broken washing machine” referred to was actually my dryer, which was working at the time, although it needs repair. The dryer was moved to a benevolent neighbour’s premises for the day and replaced back to the laundry that evening. I discovered the dryer on the footpath outside 21 Waverley Rd two weeks later, along with my washing machine and other items (including a 660L bin full of washed plastic bags, which would have taken a great deal of effort to move from where it was stored). I put both appliances back in the laundry but the next morning, the dryer was back on the footpath. I then took it back to the benevolent neighbour’s premises where it remains until now.

[55]

- a) Since I have lived at Waverley Road, I have never seen a single mouse, rat or any other creature that could be described as a “rodent” anywhere on the premises. This claim is spurious.

[61]

- a) This paragraph contradicts itself, in that it initially claims I “refused to engage” with Communify, then goes on to explain details of a conversation I had with Communify. It’s very easy to debunk the initial assertion, as I have a few emails from the Communify support worker, and there’s further evidence in [28].