

Manufactured Homes (Residential Parks) Amendment Bill 2024

Submission No: 10
Submitted by: Betty Blythe
Publication: Making the submission and your name public
Attachments: No attachment

Submitter Comments:

1. In response to the changes of s4 (Objects of Act), I agree that the insertions are needed.2. Amendment of s14A (What is a residential park dispute), I accept the inclusions.3. Insertion of new s35A, I accept the inclusions.4. Amendment of s38 (Termination of site agreement by tribunal), I accept.5. Replacement of s39 and 40 (Termination of site agreement by tribunal - residential land to be used for other purpose), The wording is acceptable and covers most bases, however, the reason for the repurpose of the land would need to be explicit, and not just an out for a park owner to get himself out of debt etc.6. Amendment of s54 (Proceeds of sale) I accept.7. Buyback and Rent reduction scheme, I disagree with this clause. a. The scheme removes the choice of selling agent b. The decrease in site rent after 6 months is only 25% c. To wait 18 months before a buy back is too long. d. If an homeowner dies or goes into care, this puts a massive financial burden on family. e. If the rent was held and paid up when the home is sold, park owners would have the incentive to push the sale.8. Amendment of s69B (Restrictions on increasing site rent under site agreement). I disagree with this completely. a. site rents need to be capped. Why add 69B (1A) (a) CPI and (b) 3.5% the greater of the two. makes no sense when CPI can reach 7 - 9 %. There is no safety guard there. Should it be the lesser of the two, makes more sense. b. Why 3.5%, when our pensions rarely increase more than 2%. c. For years we have had our rents raised explosively due to Market Rent Reviews, park owners increasing rents on new purchases, to the point that we are now paying approximately \$100 a week to much. Where is your base line? There are more than 7 levels of rent in this park at the moment due to rent increases to new residents, which is causing angst among the residents when they learn they are paying more than the next. d. Site rents should be no more than 30% of a single pension - as it is in NSW.9. Omission off 69D, 69E and 69F Market Rent Reviews. Thank you, I am so grateful that this has been abolished.10. QCAT is not the right forum for disputes and an Ombudsman must be appointed.Section 99A - needs to be clarified - renters should only be paying for usage - not infrastructure eg service and access fees. Some parks do not display utility bills and refuse to allow homeowners to view them, so how are homeowners to know that the park owner is not over charging them.