

Subject **Re: Warrant of Possession**
From d-Wizz <info@d-wizz.com>
To Maiwar Electorate Office <maiwar@parliament.qld.gov.au>
Copy TheGabba Ward Office <TheGabba.Ward@bcc.qld.gov.au>
Date 2022-06-07 14:24



Hello again,

I have sent an email to the Department of Housing suggesting we meet at Rob Wheeler's house 1030 tomorrow morning. Hopefully they will be OK with that and we can get some further information out of them.

Reading through the Department's email again, I note the following points about the Park Hotel (my emphasis in **bold**):

- **S t V i n c e n t d e P a u l** is the support provider for the site with 24 seven security and concierge in place.
- Entry to the Park is through a referral process with an assessment by a specialist homelessness service referral point with a decision based on the next highest need across all referrals and **s u b j e c t t o t h e r e b e i n g a c u r r e n t v a c a n c y**.
- **HART 4000** and **M i c a h P r o j e c t s** are both designated referral points.

Hart 4000 is linked with Communiy, which the Department referred me to in September 2021. The office of Communiy is in the same building as the Department's Fortitude Valley Service Centre at 515 St. Paul's Tce. As these two agencies are very close both operationally and physically, it stands to reason that, as Communiy knew that I was at risk of homelessness due to eviction that they should have informed me about the Park even before the hearing. After the hearing, Communiy should have really ramped up the support, without me having to request it. It is a common feature of people with Aspergers that they do not know when they need assistance and are reluctant to ask for it. We really do like to keep to ourselves. Both the Department and Communiy knew I had Aspergers; they should have known about these behavioural traits and understood the need for proactivity. Had I known more information earlier, I might have taken advantage of it. One can only speculate that, perhaps the reason Communiy did not take the initiative to ask if I'd like to be referred to the Park is because there were no vacancies available there.

If that indeed is the case, then it raises serious questions about the reason for QCAT's decision to approve the Department's application, because one of the major factors in making that decision was the Department's assurance that I would not be made homeless. The Department mentioned the Park in the QCAT hearing as their solution to prevent me becoming homeless. If the Park had no vacancy at the time (irrespective of whether the Department was aware of that fact or not), it may be submitted that the Department misled QCAT in their representation.

We still do not know the reasons for QCAT's decision on 26 April. I requested a copy of the reasons on 5 May 2022 and QCAT's 45-day period to respond expires on 19 June, so maybe we'll hear something soon.

I have thought about whether this evidence should be brought to QCAT's attention. A friend suggested that the information should not come from me but a third party. Perhaps your office might like to send something to both QCAT and the Minister for Housing outlining the information above and the unsuitability of this offer. You might have to dig through a few other emails as well to get information such as the Department's email of last Friday and John Araneda's terse missive last week. I don't know if it will make much impact, but we must try everything.

I also note that a room at the Park hotel is average \$140-\$150 *per night*. Who's paying for this?

I am going to write another email to the Minister myself in the next day or two, following up from my first letter on 10 May. I'll copy you in on that one when I send it.

Get the flyers to me when they're ready and I'll put them out immediately. If you have a map of any priority areas where they should go you can mark that also, otherwise I'll just put them anywhere I feel like it.