

SUBMISSION

Submission to the Review of the Retirement Villages Act 1986

In general the Recommendations of the Parliamentary Inquiry into the Act seem to me to be sensible, reasonable and practical. They strike a balance between over expansiveness and brevity, and cover the deficiencies in the Act which are most pressing.

That said, there are two issues which I would like to express my opinion on, namely Recommendation 5 and Recommendation 11.

Recommendation 5: Residents' voting rights

The situation with regard to voting rights for residents is very mixed and extremely unsatisfactory in very many cases. There are instances where there is not a residents' committee and thus no channel of communication with management. There needs to be legislation to require the operation of a committee with enough powers to be an effective force and one with meaningful terms of reference.

Recommendation 11: Accreditation

It would seem obvious that effective accreditation is necessary for all retirement housing providers, both for reasons of maintenance of standards and giving a means of comparison between providers. There are not so many Villages that a large bureaucracy would be required, and the benefits would far outweigh the costs.

One other issue, not mentioned in the Recommendations, is the wording of the entrance contract – it appears to me that in an attempt to render the wording in 'plain English' in many cases meaning has disappeared and inconsistencies and conflicts in meaning have crept in. The contract should be rewritten by a competent lawyer.

Neil Galbraith

Resident, [REDACTED] Retirement Village

Dr M Neil Galbraith
[REDACTED]

