



Speech by


**Michael Crandon**

**MEMBER FOR COOMERA**

Hansard Wednesday, 9 March 2011

---

## **SOLAR ENERGY, RESIDENTIAL PARKS**

 **Mr CRANDON** (Coomera—LNP) (9.01 pm): I refer to the Premier's answer to a question without notice asked this morning. The question was—

Can the Premier update the House on the significant increases in the uptake of solar energy throughout Queensland?

In her answer the Premier said—

Today, we are at 375 megawatts, with an astounding 63,000 solar PV systems on Queensland roofs.

She went on to say—

We put in place a Solar Bonus Scheme, where people who are generating power from their own roofs can actually be paid for the excess that goes back into the grid and there are many Queenslanders who are now receiving the benefit of that.

Let me tell you who is not benefiting from those rebates: people in residential parks. A letter I received from one of my constituents states—

The current Solar Bonus Scheme has allowed us to "fall through the cracks" because we don't export to the Qld Grid but to our Park Owners (PO) private grid. As a result we are left to negotiate with our own individual PO's—

park owners—

within the laws of the Manufactured Homes Act. This is proving to be very unsatisfactory with varying agreements being negotiated with PO's ... that will not necessarily apply to any other residential parks.

He goes on to say—

You can assist by making parliament aware of the anomalies in our situation and help to remove this unfairness because of where we live. We are not asking to earn large amounts for our exports like suburbia can achieve, only to reduce our power bills by receiving a fair price for them, and that isn't zero! After all, the PO—

park owner—

is currently onselling our exports to other residents for the same price charged for their normal usage provided by him, and that equals 100% profit. Please give this issue your urgent attention.

Under the Manufactured Homes (Residential Parks) Amendment Bill 2010, section 99A, 'Separate charge by park owner not to be more than cost of supply for use of utility', clearly states—

(2) The park owner must not charge the home owner an amount for the use of a utility that is more than the amount charged by the relevant supply authority for the quantity of the service supplied to, or used at, the site.

Maximum penalty—20 penalty units.

The explanatory notes state that this section clarifies that park owners must not charge homeowners more than the actual cost of providing a utility service. I call on the Premier to look at this growing group in our community—that is, homeowners in residential parks—who believe they are falling through the cracks and being done over by unscrupulous park owners.

*(Time expired)*