

5 March 2019

Ms Maddison Evans
Committee Clerk
Standing Committee on Legislation
Legislative Assembly of WA

Dear Maddison

Thank you for the uncorrected transcript of my answers to the Hearing re the RPLST Act on March 1st.

I have asked the advice of our older and wiser Board members about issues which I was unsure about in my answers – notably about SAT. I realise I made some errors and would like the corrections added to my evidence, or noted.

I was also dismayed to see that in my nervousness I made some slips-of-the-tongue. I hope you can correct these where they change the meaning of my reply; or at least that you can note my corrections. (I'm not sure about the boundaries of allowed edits/corrections.) Please let me know what more I can do today – *if* there's more – to 'authorise' as many of my edits/corrections as possible.

I noted just one transcription error which I have marked in the document emailed to you today called "Corrected Transcription". (See p 6, para 3).

The Hon Nicholas Goiran's name doesn't seem to be on the list of Members present?

I'm concerned that in my evidence I made **five factual errors (i.e. the first 5 points noted overleaf)**. I also unintentionally used the wrong word at times, which rendered some points ambiguous or meaningless (noted in points 6, 7 , 8 below).

1 On p 7, para 3, in reply to the Chair's question re PHOAWA /CIAWA dialogue:
I replied "No." This is incorrect. Our President and Vice President sought and had a consultation with the CEO of CIAWA eighteen months ago. But the rest of the answer is accurate.

2 On bottom p 6, just after 10.20 time notification, re SAT rent discussion:

I said, "In theory, you can go to SAT with anything, but if it is in the legislation that this is an option, it will be taken up more and used more by people."
The first part of this sentence (in red above) is factually incorrect.

The fact is that homeowners contesting anything at SAT *must quote precisely the clause in the Act which allows a SAT application*. If there is nothing in the Act to quote, the Tribunal will not accept the case.

3 On p 8, fourth paragraph, also re SAT discussion:

I said ..."Even under the old arrangements, still the resident would have the right to apply to SAT." This statement was also wrong as per point 2 above.

4 On p 9, fourth paragraph re SAT discussion on compensation:

In line 7, I said, "...homeowners would be fearful to do it." - i.e., go to SAT -
Again, this relates to point 2 above. It's not in line with the fact that they're "fearful *because they might not have a case*".

5 On p 5, fourth paragraph, third line:

I said "If you can *buy* a site you are miraculously lucky". This is a factual error made through a slip-of-the-tongue. *Nobody can buy a site*.
I meant to say, "If you can *find* a site you are miraculously lucky." My mistake makes the answer nonsensical.

6 On p 9, paragraph 6:

I said, "If Nick's suggestion were put in, that would answer that one brilliantly."

By this comment, I was referring to paragraph 13 on p 4 where **Hon NICK GOIRAN** **said:** *"Would your members be satisfied if there was a provision in the bill that confirmed that any renewed periodic lease, that was renewed after the commencement of this bill, captures the provisions of the new bill, of the new act. So by being renewed after the commencement, even if it is a periodic lease, you are still subjected to the new arrangements under the act?"*

7 On p 9, just after 10.30am notification, fourth paragraph, fourth line:

I said: "Here we talk about the cost of moving, even if you can *sell* et cetera." This was a slip of the tongue and makes the reply meaningless. I meant to say "even if you can *relocate* et cetera".

(If you can 'sell', moving is not relevant.)

8 On middle of p 5, after the Chair's one-line comment:- "OK, so they are leasing the site."

I said, "We lease the site. This is why park *homeowners* hold all the cards". This was an unfortunate slip-of-the-tongue which completely reverses what I meant to reply. I meant to say "... park *Operators* hold all the cards".

I appreciate that the Hon. Colin de Grussa picked up and clarified this point in para 6 on page 6.

Yours sincerely,

Nada Bond
Assistant Secretary, Park Home Owners Assn WA Inc