

SUBMISSION ON POLICY ISSUES RAISED IN ROUND 6

Submitted By: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Submission for: My Self

Name of other person, business or organisation:

Do you agree to your submission being published: Yes

Do you agree to your full name being published: No

Your submission:

My submission is in relations to Building insurance.

Product Design:

- My recommendation is that by default "Investment Building insurance" must cover malicious damage by Tenant (long term or short term), the very definition that makes a property an investment.
- The ability to remove or add in malicious damage by Tenant to an investment insurance product is misleading and does not benefit the policy holder. The option to remove tenant damage cover, the Investment building insurance essentially becomes owner occupier insurance and risk rated pricing should also be adjusted accordingly, however it isn't. This means insurance companies are a charging customer additional risk premiums without providing the additional coverage.
- My circumstance is that I was recommended to purchase a specific insurance product that is mandated by an investment mortgage condition, investment building insurance. In a bid to showcase competitiveness in pricing, the investment insurance sold to me by the bank/insurance representative did not cover malicious damage by tenant or anyone associated with the tenant. I was left to cover the repair bill of approximately 60k and unable to file a lawsuit against the tenant as they have been placed in jail.
- I would like other policy purchasers in the future to avoid being misled and make a purchase with ease and with little confusion.