

## Manufactured Homes (Residential Parks) Amendment Bill 2024

**Submission No:** 46  
**Submitted by:** Bruce and Lavinia Gregory  
**Publication:**  
**Attachments:** No attachment  
**Submitter Comments:**

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Housing, Big Build and Manufacturing Committee](#)  
**Cc:** [Pumicestone Electorate Office](#)  
**Subject:** Manufactured Homes Amendment Bill 2024  
**Date:** Wednesday, 10 April 2024 10:01:08 PM

---

Good evening,

I am writing in relation to the introduction of the Manufactured Homes Amendment Bill 2024 introduced last month to the Queensland Parliament.

My wife and I moved into an Over 50's Residential Resort last November operated under the Manufactured Homes Act located in Sandstone Point, in the Pumicestone Electorate.

I am appalled at the wording proposed covering the Site Rent Increases which states 'increases to be a maximum of 3.5% or CPI per year, whichever is **higher**'.

For almost 40 years of my working career, I had been involved in leasing of properties owned by some of the most difficult but professional property owners in Australia, including Westfield, Lend Lease and Stockland. Never in my career have I found that leases were ever agreed to which reflected the higher of CPI or a set percentage – agreements were always proposed and agreed to reflect the increase to be the **lower** of CPI or a stated percentage.

In a time of high inflation which we have experienced over the past few years (and there is no guarantee that these will not continue into the future), with such a clause in place the park owners would be rubbing their hands with glee at the prospect of being able to increase rent greater than 3.5%.

Not since the calendar year ending December 2020 has Australia experienced an annualized All Capital Cities CPI of less than 3.5%.

And in the most recent 12 months to year ending Dec 23, the CPI rate was +4.1% (Source ABS - All Capital Cities) so even with all levels of Government addressing Cost of living pressures (or at least claiming to) the most recent calendar year saw a CPI rate which would make such a clause advantageous to the park owners and would leave residents all the poorer and with no comeback.

I implore you to consider these facts and the impact of the current proposed wording very long and hard as you review the Amendment Bill and to reverse the wording from 'higher' to 'lower', which, after all, is the normal reality in a commercial world/environment.

Again, the fact is that the current wording of 'greater' is very advantageous to Owners of the parks covered by this Act and very detrimental to resident owners of the houses within them, many of whom rely on fixed or minimal income.

I am happy to provide more information and can be contacted on the email address or by mobile phone as shown below.

I look forward to hearing of a positive response to my submission.

Kind regards

Bruce Gregory  
[REDACTED]