

## **Appendix D**

### **Park Home Site Owner Engagement Event – 30<sup>th</sup> September 2013**

Feedback from the above event was as follows:

#### **1) Implications for Site Owners - How can these be overcome?**

- The resident should be put on notice by way of a letter for any breach.
- Implication – The owner should not be held responsible in any way for any breaches not passed on, transfer of home.
- No Land Registry requirement, again responsibility is always with the owner of the park – very unreasonable.
- Appears as park owner this new legislation is victimising us.
- Sales process needs better definitive clarification – because a gap in the information required by the vendor to the purchaser. Info Pack?
- Too much responsibility put on site owner – taken the involvement of the owner from the sales process but put the entire onus on the park owner for breaches etc.
- Purchasers not getting correct information from sellers
- Estate agents, lawyers, sellers – not understanding the process (and asking the park owner for guidance).
- Peculiarities of individual pitches “nuances” not passed on.
- No guidance on what might constitute ‘Sale Blocking’.
- Inability to remedy historic breaches - no duty on sellers to notify buyers – no ability for park owners to warn buyers, could be addressed by information to residents?
- Inability to stop “undesirable” residents from buying.
- Need to protect majority of occupiers.
- Increased cost/time to apply to FTT.
- Risk of park owner being misled/defrauded out of commission on sales, i.e. if sale price incorrectly advertised to park.

#### **2) Implications for Residents - How can these be overcome?**

- Suitability of new resident.
- Interference from new residents who are in breach.
- New p/fee and cost of the licensing and how these residents are going to react to the increased cost of p/fee.
- Remaining residents unsettled by lack of knowledge of who will be joining the community.
- New homeowner in clear contravention of park rules (e.g. under 55, dogs) has to be challenged at the park owners expense.

- Infiltration of an “undesired” element onto the park.
- Property investors not contributing to the residential community.
- Potential for money laundering.
- Questionable valuations by inexperienced estate agents.
- Historical breaches could remain.

### 3) What should a Park Homes Strategy cover?

- Cost of licenses
- Who's paying
- Redress – needs to be a fair and transparent balance for both sides – seems very one sided.
- Why Now?
- Rogue elements
- Ask the residents!
- Can 6m from adjacent caravan and 3m from site boundary be measured with preference to be less due to modern construction methods of new park homes?
- Review in general site licence conditions.
- Information being provided by the LA to purchasers/homeowners/park owners.
- Any future increases in fees should be limited to RPI so park owner can re-coup.
- Regular consultations with park owners.
- Consistent approach re historic breaches/enforcement
- One contact at council for all licensing issues.
- Register of approved advisors.