



Summary of Consultation Responses

The survey ran from 22 January 2024 to 4 March 2024

14 online responses were received.

Survey Responses

Q1. Are you answering this survey as (select all that apply)

- 2 = A Residential Park Home owner
- 1 = A Residential Park Home resident
- 1 = A representative of an organisation/residents association
- 9 = A member of the public
- 1 = A Councillor
- None - Other

Q2. Postcode (for you/your organisation)

This information has been redacted.

Q3. Do you agree that North Devon Council should start charging site owners in order to adequately recover the associated costs of processing applications, issuing licences, and ongoing licence maintenance and administration?

- 8 = Yes
- 6 = No

Q4. Please give us any comments you have on the proposal above.

- 1) Please bare in mind any fees charged will not be absorbed by the site operators but will be passed on as increased charges to the individual mobile home residents.
- 2) This type of housing is usually used by those who can't afford a house. Any charges you place on site owners will be passed on to those who live there
- 3) Residential park homes at typically the home for life income older people who can ill afford additional fees.
- 4) Are the council going to start charging for each and every item of work they have to complete as part of their responsibilities? If so why and how many more can be expected?
- 5) The license fee should cover this cost already.
- 6) We feel that the charging for this service is very unfair, we run XXXX and bought the park in 2018, we have a mortgage on the park and still keep the standard very high, that being said if we had to start paying for licence fees this would then reduce our funds to be able to keep the standards of the park so high.
- 7) Paragraph 8.3 of Appendix A states the Park Owner must not pass the fee on to residents via the pitch fee. It should also make clear that this should not be

passed on in any other way and if the Park Owner does try to do this then they should be fined.

8) Seems fair

9) Taxes are the highest they have ever been.

10) My only concern is that the cost is not passed on to the residents, who already pay site fees, and sometimes loans like a mortgage, council tax, lack of energy choice, waste, water, and site maintenance fees. This used to be a very affordable way to live, for elderly, singles, and the disabled. My husband and I lived on a very well maintained official residential site in Surrey for 10yrs, called XXXX. It was a real pleasure, and helped us stay near to family, and save for our future. We were lucky that the owner had inherited it, had a working background in finance, was a decent, kind gentleman, who followed regulations properly. He did not spike the site rent for maximum profit like so many parks can. We moved there because it was affordable, but stayed so long because it was a real pleasure living there. Internal roads were always the parks responsibility and maintained at his own cost. . Fire was always taken very seriously, we were required to have a connected hose on our right side, to assist with any fire emergency, however, like many modern homes the advice was to evacuated immediately. There were no fires in the 10 yrs we were there, before or since. I appreciate that the council needs fair income, so I am in favour of your proposal, but I do worry that residents will somehow be made to pay for it, and struggle with an additional cost. Is there anything the council can do to prevent this from happening?

Q5. There are a number of different options available in setting a fee structure, such as banding by risk or size or a flat rate charge. A fee based upon numbers of units is deemed to be a fair and proportionate method of charging fees in this instance. Thus, the calculations detailed are broken down into four categories, namely 2-50, 51-100, 101-150 and 151 + units of accommodation. Officers have determined it appropriate to use the same methodology for grant of a licence and the payment of annual fee. Do you agree with the size of the banding categories outlined above?

9 = Yes

5 = No

Q6. Please give us comments you have on the proposal above.

- 1) You do not give any supporting data on the number of existing sites that fall into these categories. Before agreeing to banding we need to see the sizes of the existing parks. If lots of little ones they get the biggest burden which gets passed onto their residents.
- 2) Could be in blocks of 25
- 3) We only have 24 homes on our park

- 4) Reasonable
- 5) I think the wealth of the residents should be taken into consideration. New park homes are very expensive, those with many may be able to afford more than more modest sites with a high number of retired or low income/single residents. The cost of personally maintaining a park home is increasing for older residents who can no longer do the work themselves. Additional fees could push them into debt.

Q7. Do you believe the overall fees policy is clear and concise?

9 = Yes

5 = No

Q8. Please give us any comments you have on the proposal above.

Never seen do not know where to find them.

Q9. Do you believe the Council's Policy on the Licensing and Compliance of Residential Park Home Sites is clear and concise?

9 = Yes

5 = No

Q10. Please give us any comments you have on the proposal above.

Never seen do not know where to find them.

Q11. Do you agree with the principle of the two new policies?

8 = Yes

6 = No

Q12. Please give us any comments you have on the proposal above.

- 1) As stated the fee should already cover all costs.
- 2) It states in the rules that there should only be one fit and proper person but we seem to have 4 or 5. We also believe that they should live in a certain radius of the site but ours do not. Maybe something needs to be put in one of these policies to clarify things and see if the Park Owner is adhering to the rules.

- 3) Park homes can be an affordable, ecologically better option to heavily structured estates, for example XXXX. We considered moving there, but found the lack of walking, cycling and public transport to be a barrier.

Equality Information

Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 applies to public sector organisations, whereby Local Authorities must have due regard to the 8 protected characteristics (age, disability, sex, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion/belief, sexual orientation (and marriage and civil partnership in employment) in its decision making.

Not all questions were answered – percentages based on number who did respond

What is your age?

- 19 and under = 0
- 20 to 24 = 0
- 25 to 34 = 1
- 35 to 49 = 5
- 50 to 64 = 3
- 65 to 74 = 5
- 75 to 84 = 0
- 85 and over = 0
- Prefer not to say 0

Do you consider yourself to have a disability (according to the Equality Act 2010)?

- No = 13
- Yes = 1
- Prefer not to say 0

How would you describe your ethnicity?

- White = 12
- Asian, Asian British, or Asian Welsh = 1
- Mixed or multiple ethnic groups = 1
- Other ethnic group = 0
- Prefer not to say = 0

What is your religion or belief?

- No religion = 7
- Christian = 4
- Other religion = 0
- Muslim = 1
- Buddhist = 0

- Jewish = 1
- Hindu = 0
- Prefer not to say = 1

Sex

- Female = 6
- Male = 7
- Prefer not to say = 1
- Other = 0

Please confirm if this is the same as registered at birth

- Yes = 14
- Prefer not to say = 0
- No = 0

Sexual orientation

- Straight or Heterosexual = 11
- Prefer not to say = 3
- Bisexual = 0
- Gay or Lesbian = 0
- Other = 0
- Pansexual = 0
- Other sexual orientation = 0

The results of the equality information responses will be considered alongside the census information for the North Devon Council area. Equality and diversity monitoring can help identify current and future needs, possible inequalities including problems accessing or using services and information, as well as checking that a cross-section of people have been reached and given their views. Results have been published in an anonymised way.

Please note that percentage figures provided are approximate and shown to up to two decimal places.