



Guide to How QMHOA Would Complete the C-RIS Feedback Form

Causes of problems

QMHOA strongly agree with all six points but would add a 7th

the current Act and regulatory systems

- a) fails to provide adequate consumer protection to home owners,
- b) fails to mitigate the effects of an imbalance in power between individual home owners and park owners; and
- c) fails to ensure the ongoing affordability of retirement living in residential parks.

Policy objectives

We strongly agree with all 3 points but would add a comment

- a) We wish to see ensuring the affordability of life in residential parks given equal emphasis to ensuring the financial viability of parks and profits of park owners

C-RIS Preferred options

This C-RIS preferred options will be considered first and the non-preferred options will be discussed later in this document

Option 2 Require residential parks to publish a comparison document

We support this option

Our considered response to the 3 points.

- a) Somewhat positive for current owners
- b) Very positive impact for future owners
- c) Somewhat negative impact for Park Owners.

Choose Yes

Option 3 Simplify the sales and assignment process

We support this Option

Our considered response to the 3 points.

- a) Somewhat positive for current owners
- b) Very positive impact for future owners
- c) Positive impact for Park Owners.

Choose Yes

Option 4 Limit site rent increases to a prescribed basis

Our preferred position is to develop a Price Index for Residential parks and will be strongly advocating for this change. However we would support CPI if it is indexed to the age pension by using the Australian index (CPI) and NOT the Queensland index (CPI)

Our considered response to the 3 points.

- a) No impact for current owners
- b) Very positive impact for future owners
- c) Somewhat negative impact for Park Owners.

Choose No to “accurately described impacts” and include a comment

Option 6 Prohibit Market Reviews

We strongly support this option

Our considered response to the 3 points.

- a) Very positive impact for current owners
- b) Very positive impact for future owners
- c) Very positive impact for Park Owners.

Choose Yes

Option 7 Limit site rent to the higher of CPI or a fixed percentage

Note – Please see the QMHOA Draft Response document. Our support of a Cap depends on the way it is set. We believe that if the Cap is set as currently outlined it will lead to the Park Owner profits increasing at the expense of home owners

We do not support this option as it is currently described in the C-RIS. We would support it if the Cap is set appropriately.

Our considered response to the 3 points.

- a) Very Negative for current owners
- b) Very negative impact for future owners
- c) Very positive impact for Park Owners.

Choose No to “accurately described impacts” and include a comment

Option 10 Require maintenance and capital replacement plans

We strongly support this option.

Our considered response to the 3 points.

- a) Very positive impact for current owners
- b) Very positive impact for future owners
- c) Somewhat negative impact for Park Owners.

Choose Yes

Option 11 Establish a limited buyback and site rent reduction plan.

Note – Please see the QMHOA Draft Response document. We support the concept of this option but not the timeframes or % reductions.

Our considered response to the 3 points.

- a) Very positive impact for current owners
- b) Very positive impact for future owners
- c) Somewhat negative impact for Park Owners.

Choose - No to “accurately described impacts” and include a comment This should be aimed at

- a) Deceased estates
- b) Vacant home due to the resident(s) being moved to care
- c) Failure of the Park Owner to secure a sale within 18 months

(C-RIS) Preferred options package: how might it affect you or your residential park or both

Our considered response to the 7 C-RIS preferred options are

- Option 2 – Strongly support
- Option 3 – Strongly support
- Option 4 – Somewhat support
- Option 6 – Strongly support
- Option 7 – Strongly oppose
- Option 10 – Strongly Support
- Option 11 – Somewhat support

Choose Disagree, the options are balanced too far in favour of park owners
Choose Somewhat positive impact.

Other reform options

Do you support any of the non-preferred options?

Our considered response to the C-RIS non-preferred options are

- a) Option 1: Status quo Strongly oppose
- b) Option 5: Improve the market review process Strongly oppose
- c) Option 8: Limit site rent increases to CPI Somewhat oppose
- d) Option 9: Require expense-based calculations for increases above CPI Somewhat oppose

Choose Yes
Choose Option 9

Additional recommendations

Do you support each of the additional recommendations?

We agree with all 10 additional recommendations

Choose Yes for each option

Please see the QMHOA Draft Response document and make comments on some of the additional recommendations.