


**From:** [Inquiry into the Retirement Housing Sector POV eSubmission Form](#)  
**To:** [LSIC](#)  
**Subject:** New Submission to Inquiry into the Retirement Housing Sector  
**Date:** Wednesday, 29 June 2016 6:23:29 PM

---

Inquiry Name: Inquiry into the Retirement Housing Sector

Margaret Pace  




### **SUBMISSION CONTENT:**

--

I am a resident living in a retirement village and my issue relates to the standard of the unit on entry. We experienced issues with carpet and cracks in the ceiling neither of these items have been fixed or resolved and we are concerned that we will be paying the price for shoddy workmanship when we leave the unit and it will be reflected in the refurbishment cost.

In 2012 it was announced at a meeting of the residents that as units became vacant they would be upgraded, the residents would still pay for the refurbishment, but Stockland would pay the extra for the upgrade.

On all occasions the owner has attempted to get the resident or the estate to, pull out and replace the kitchen and all white goods totally, as well as all the bedroom built in wardrobes, the bathroom and floor tiles to be replaced, new shower screen, removal of the bath and to disconnect the floor heating and pay to have new air-conditioning installed. Under no circumstances could this be considered as refurbishment, as the only legal obligation of the outgoing resident is to return the unit as far as practical to its original condition?

The problem with the retirement industry is there is no one identity that residents, who are normally on limited financial means, can address these blatant and discriminating tactics to without engaging expensive lawyers.

With a projected aging community there is an urgent need to have a Commissioner or preferably an Ombudsman to adjudicate on these and other industry matters.

--

File1:

File2:

File3:

