



Discussion Forum

The comments and opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect those of the Retirement Village Residents Association (RVRA) or its Members.

Changes in Terminology

Posted - Sat, 4 Dec 2010 1:35 pm

I wonder if anyone else has noticed the changes in terminology being used in village quotations and invoices from tradespeople.

Suddenly, in my village, the term "replacement" is nowhere to be found.

I wonder if it has anything to do with the use of the term "replacement" in the Retirement Villages Act to show the responsibility of the operator, as against the cost to the residents for a repair.

There has also been a change in the use of the term "refurbishment" - the term now used is "reinstatement".

Of course the new amendments to the Act also used the term "refurbishment" in showing the responsibilities of the operators for units which have been vacated, I believe.

Is this just coincidence?

imp

Re: Changes in Terminology

Posted: Sat 4 Dec 2010 2:59 pm

It is my opinion that the comment above "is this just coincidence" is being too charitable.

This new trend by operators is typical of how they use the system to extract monies out of Residents to meet the costs of capital replacement, a cost that clearly belongs to the operator and should not be met by Residents through recurrent charges.

When will these operators who masquerade as caring, honest and reputable business people wake up to the fact that every time they do the 'wrong thing' they are bringing the retirement village industry into disrepute. On every occasion that these operators do the 'wrong thing' they turn prospective Residents, their future customers away, thus making it more difficult to sell vacant properties.

One day, there may be an operator who comes along with the philosophy of not screwing every penny that they can out of the very people who are the life blood of their industry. Such an operator will have a waiting list of Retirees just waiting to buy into that village.

jrc

Re: Changes in Terminology

Posted: Sun 5 Dec 2010 11:12 am

That is simply dishonest if operators are trying to fool their own customers by using such sneaky methods of calling replacements and refurbishing by different names so they can pretend that the work is not capital expenditure and then merrily go on to hit residents with costs that residents should not be legally required to pay, just by calling them repairs and maintenance or similar.

If practices like this become widespread I'm wondering why in future anyone will want to stay in a retirement village to be screwed like that. Why don't residents fight against this blatant dishonesty where they see it happening? Can't the Office of Fair Trading do something about this?

I'll be asking our own village resident committee President to keep an eye open for this sort of deception and try and find out if our own manager is playing this sneaky game. If that is the case then get evidence to send to the Minister in charge. Maybe even the newspapers will become interested in this sort of unfairness. It has to stop before it spreads. Isn't there a regulatory body controlling and advising operators' to tell them to pull their heads in and get real?

not fair
