REPORT TO
MAYOR AND COUNCIL

PRESENTED: JULY 20, 2015 - REGULAR AFTERNOON MEETING
FROM: COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIVISION
SUBJECT: MANUFACTURED HOME PARK REDEVELOPMENT POLICY - UPDATE
REPORT: 15-87
FILE: 6700-03

RECOMMENDATION:
That Council approve the updated Manufactured Home Park Redevelopment Policy No. 07-121, presented as Attachment D.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:
At the request of the Senior Advisory Committee, Policy No. 07-121, Manufactured Home Park Redevelopment Policy, has been updated for Council’s consideration for approval. The updated policy provides guidelines for communication, relocation plan and assistance between residents and development proponents. The guidelines are in addition to the current requirements under the Provincial Manufactured Home Tenancy Act.

Proposed amendments are intended to strengthen the existing Policy, to the degree possible, without fettering a future Council’s ability to impose additional requirements as they see fit. The updated policy emphasizes the need for tenants’ concerns to be considered as part of redevelopment plans, and provides a wider range of options that Council may consider to assist with compensation to, and relocation of, tenants.

The revisions proposed are based on:

- legal advice;
- best practices in the other municipalities;
- feedback from a public information meeting held on June 22, 2015; and
- feedback from manufactured home park residents.

As directed by Council, a public information meeting was held on June 22, 2015. The meeting was advertised on the Township Page of the local newspapers, ToL Facebook and Twitter accounts, as well as manufactured home park notice boards. The public information meeting was attended by approximately 220 people. A total of 19 written submissions were received.

There was general support for the proposed revisions and the Policy which offer additional considerations beyond Provincial legislation.

PURPOSE:
To present results of a public information meeting for manufactured home park residents and recommend Council adoption of the updated Policy No. 07-121, Manufactured Home Park Redevelopment Policy.
BACKGROUND/HISTORY:

In 2013, the Seniors Advisory Committee requested Council review Policy No. 07-121. Council requested staff to review the policy and practices in other communities.

At the April 13, 2015 Regular Afternoon Meeting, Council received Report #15-39 (Attachment A) which recommended approval of an updated Policy No. 07-121, Manufactured Home Park Redevelopment Policy. The recommendation was based on legal advice and best practices in the Cities of Abbotsford, Coquitlam, Maple Ridge and Surrey.

The proposed policy update provides guidelines to allow manufactured home park tenants, who will need to relocate due to redevelopment of the site, the opportunity for greater notification and assistance from development proponents. The proposed guidelines are in addition to the current requirements under the Provincial Manufactured Home Park Tenancy Act.

At the April 13 meeting, Council passed the following resolution:

“That the Manufactured Home Park Redevelopment Policy be deferred for a public information meeting for manufactured home residents.”

Subsequently, at its Regular Afternoon meeting of July 6, 2015, Council directed staff to report on the venue and participation rate, as well as the need for further public input opportunities relative to this proposed Policy.

DISCUSSION/ANALYSIS:

A public information meeting was held on June 22, 2015, in the Banquet Room, Langley Events Centre. The venue offers convenient access, a room to accommodate up to a minimum of 500 people depending on seating arrangement, and ample parking. The public information meeting was advertised on the Township Page in local newspapers on June 11 and June 18, and via Township’s Facebook and Twitter accounts. In addition, notices of the event were posted on the bulletin boards of all 13 manufactured home parks in the Township. (There are 13 manufactured home parks in the Township, plus one in Katzie First Nation that is not affected by Township policies.)

Information on the proposed policy update and the public information meeting was available on the Township website at www.tol.ca/mhp. The website address was noted in all advertising efforts discussed above.
Approximately 220 people attended the public information meeting. Staff provided a presentation (Attachment B) to outline background information and highlight the following key policy features:

- Community and Neighbourhood Plans should consider the retention of existing manufactured home parks and designation of new sites for manufactured home parks, where appropriate.
- Council expectation: tenants of the manufactured home park will be treated in a fair and equitable manner.
- Council will review redevelopment applications in light of all relevant circumstances.
- Owners of manufactured home parks are required to consider three aspects as part of a redevelopment application:
  - communication,
  - relocation plan, and
  - relocation assistance.

Following the presentation, participants were encouraged to ask questions by using a wireless microphone and a microphone that was set up at the center of the room. However, due to mobility and access challenges, some participants opted to speak or pose their questions without the benefit of the available microphones. The main concerns and comments can be summarized in the following themes:

- concerns about appraised value, assessed value and market value for manufactured homes (see discussion below)
- fear of Township working with developers of manufactured home parks (The update was requested by the Seniors Advisory Committee, not by developers.)
- the lack of relocation options as most, if not all, manufactured home parks are full in the Greater Vancouver area (This concern highlights the nature of the housing market and emphasizes the need for relocation plan and relocation assistance from development proponents, as proposed in the policy.)
- appreciation of the Township to update the policy in addition to the provincial legislation
- appreciation of the public information meeting to learn about the policy changes

The webpage address for the project (www.tol.ca/mhp) was displayed on the screens after the staff presentation. The public was encouraged to visit the webpage and provide additional written input by June 30. A total of 19 written submissions were received. Email submissions and verbatim responses to the Comment Forms are summarized in Attachment C.

Overall, the written comments were consistent with those expressed at the public information meeting. There is general support for the proposed changes to the policy, which offer additional considerations beyond the provincial legislation.

There are concerns about the difference between appraised value, assessed value and market value. The appraised value pertains to the assessed value of real property in the opinion of a qualified appraiser. The BC Assessment Authority (BCAA) has the mandate for updating the assessed value of properties. Owners of manufactured homes should notify BCAA of new additions and renovations, in order to have a better assessment of the value of their homes. Market value is the price that a purchaser would be willing to pay a seller in the open market. The proposed policy has been changed to obtain an unconditional compensatory payment equivalent to the greatest of appraised, assessed and market value.
Section 4.1 of the policy has been added to clarify the definition of manufactured home park in the Township policy and that in the Provincial Manufactured Home Park Tenancy Act. The Township policy defines a manufactured home park as any parcel of land, upon which two or more manufactured homes, occupied for dwelling purposes, are located. The provincial legislation defines a manufactured home park as any parcel of land on which one or more manufactured home sites are located.

The Township is not obligated to use the definition set out in the Act. The Township policy and the Act were enacted to achieve different purposes. The purpose of the Township policy is to recognize the importance of manufactured home parks as a residential land use and outline considerations for owners of manufactured home parks subject to redevelopment, whereas the provincial legislation regulates tenancy agreements and enforces the rights and obligations of landlords and tenants.

Research into best practice in the Cities of Abbotsford, Coquitlam, Maple Ridge and Surrey indicates that “two or more sites” is the standard definition at the municipal level. Also, using the definition in the Act would include manufactured homes in the rural areas, which is not the intent of the Township policy.

Respectfully submitted,

Teresa Kaszonyi
PLANNER
for
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIVISION

ATTACHMENT B Staff Presentation at the Public Information Meeting on June 22, 2015
ATTACHMENT C Email Submissions and Verbatim Responses to Comment Forms
ATTACHMENT D Updated Manufactured Home Park Redevelopment Policy No. 07-121
REPORT TO
MAYOR AND COUNCIL

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council approve updated Policy No. 07-121, Manufactured Home Park Redevelopment, as shown in Attachment C.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

The Mobile Home Park Redevelopment Policy provides guidelines to allow tenants in a manufactured home park who will need to relocate due to redevelopment of the site the opportunity for greater notification and assistance from development proponents than is currently required under the Provincial Manufactured Park Home Tenancy Act. The Seniors Advisory Committee requested review of section 4.5 of the policy and specifically requested that a landlord pay the tenant’s actual relocation costs up to $25,000 and, where the manufactured home cannot be relocated in some circumstances, pay the tenant the appraised or assessed value of the manufactured home.

The obligations of an owner of a manufactured home park are set out in the Provincial Manufactured Home Park Tenancy Act. Municipalities have no authority to make regulations relating to a manufactured home park owner/tenant relationship. In the case of a rezoning application, Council can consider all relevant circumstances and may negotiate relocation or reimbursement issues as part of the consideration of the rezoning bylaw.

An updated Mobile Home Park Redevelopment Policy has been prepared that:

- is based on legal advice;
- emphasizes the need for tenants’ concerns to be considered as part of redevelopment plans; and
- provides a wider range of options that Council may consider to assist with the relocation of tenants.

PURPOSE:

This report reviews the Mobile Home Park Redevelopment Policy, as well as policies in other communities, as requested by Council.
BACKGROUND/HISTORY:
At its meeting on September 17, 2013, the Seniors Advisory Committee (SAC) requested Council review section 4.5 of Policy No: 07 -121, Mobile Home Parks: Redevelopment. More specifically, the SAC proposed that section 4.5 of the current policy (Attachment A) be repealed and replaced with:

1) "A landlord who gives a tenant notice to end tenancy under Section 42 must in addition pay the tenant's actual relocation costs up to $25,000.

2) In addition to the amount payable, if a landlord has ended a tenancy under notice of section 42 and the tenant is unable to satisfactorily relocate the manufactured home due to but not limited to:

   i. Building restrictions in that jurisdiction,

   ii. The Manufactured home fails to meet transportation safety standards,

   iii. A suitable site within 50 kilometers cannot be found"

   The landlord shall pay the tenant the amount that is the greater of the manufactured home’s professionally appraised value as it stands on the site, or the assessed value of the manufactured home. The independent appraisal costs to be borne by the park owner.

At the September 30, 2013 Regular Afternoon Meeting, Council requested staff to review the policy and practices in other communities.

DISCUSSION/ANALYSIS:
Manufactured Home Parks - Background

Manufactured home living is a chosen lifestyle, offering affordable housing to many residents, who often have a strong affinity for this lifestyle and view it as housing of choice. There are 14 manufactured home parks with approximately 1,300 units in the Township of Langley.

Affordability is an important reason for the popularity of this form of housing. The financial investment is approximately 19% to 30% less for manufactured homes than a condo and /or townhouse. Rental of the pad averages (provincially) less than that of most strata fees of a condo. ¹

One in four residents (in 2007) in manufactured homes is a senior and 95% of this group own their dwelling. Other owners fall within the 15 to 34 age category suggesting entry-level ownership option for these households. A large percentage of single parent families also live in a manufactured home park. ²

Pressures for redevelopment of manufactured home parks arise from increasing land values, decreasing profitability of the parks and expensive infrastructure upgrades and repairs. Relocation of manufactured home park residents often results in economic vulnerability and loss of social network. It is difficult for tenants to relocate to other affordable alternate accommodation. There are very few vacancies in manufactured home parks and new parks are not being built in urban areas, so relocation of homes is usually not an option. Some manufactured homes are too old to move. Moving or disposing of these homes has costs, including disposal of materials that may be toxic and require specific removal processes.

¹ McClanaghan & Associates, Manufactured Home Feasibility Study, December 2009, Project Team;
² The Co-op Housing federation of BC & Darren Kitchen
² Ibid
Current Policies Related to Manufactured Home Park Relocation

Manufactured Home Park Tenancy Act (MHPTA)

The *Manufactured Home Park Tenancy Act* (Sections 42 and 44) provides provincial requirements for relocation compensation. When the landlord plans to convert a manufactured home park to another land use, he is required to give a tenant twelve months’ notice to end the tenancy. The landlord must have all the necessary approvals required by law before the notice is issued and pay the tenants, on or before the effective date of notice, the equivalent of twelve months’ rent. The Act also provides for arbitration where a tenant wishes to dispute a notice to terminate a tenancy agreement.

Township of Langley Policy No: 07-121 Mobile Home Parks: Redevelopment

The last review of the Mobile Home Parks: Redevelopment Policy No: 07-121 in February 2008, addressed concerns from the Central Fraser Valley Manufactured Home Owners Association. Amendments made in 2008 strengthened the existing policy by emphasizing that mobile homes are a legitimate form of housing and requiring proposed plans for relocation of tenants to be included in the Report to Council for initial consideration of a rezoning application.

Housing Action Plan

Since the last review of the Manufactured Home Parks Redevelopment Policy, Council adopted the Housing Action Plan on February 4, 2013. The Housing Action Plan includes an objective in Section 3.2.3.d to “preserve and improve the quality of existing rental housing” with the following recommended actions:

- **Review the existing mobile/manufactured home park policy to minimize impact on tenants from redevelopment.**
- **Develop a policy that requires consideration, such as additional compensation, tenant notification standards, first right of refusal, and a rent-to-own provision in rental buildings, non-market housing projects, and mobile home parks being redeveloped.**
- **When a rezoning is applied for as part of mobile home park redevelopment a minimum percentage of units to be affordable rental.**

Review of Policies of Adjacent Municipalities

Many municipalities have adopted policies aimed at mitigating the relocation process for tenants of manufactured home parks by providing longer notification or better assistance than is required under the provincial legislation. These policies vary, but usually include the following components:

- a communication plan
- information on the tenants and manufactured homes, such as an assessment of housing needs, demographic information, housing availability, review of condition of existing homes, potential for reuse or relocation and relocation costs,
- a relocation plan including relocation and compensation assistance options, and
- in some cases demonstration of compliance with relocation plan

Attachment B summarizes the policies of the Township and adjacent municipalities. All municipalities surveyed have provisions for a communications plan and information on tenants
and housing conditions. Most require an assessment of housing needs, although the details of that assessment vary.

Most municipalities require a relocation plan, with various options suggested for inclusion to assist relocation or compensate tenants. The policies generally provide a variety of options for consideration by manufactured home park owners to assist tenants to relocate. The intention is to allow landlords to provide those options that suit the particular needs and situations of the tenants of the manufactured home park, and even tailor the options to the needs of individual tenants.

None of the adjacent municipalities require the landlord to pay the tenant’s relocation costs or the fair market value or assessed value of the manufactured home, although some policies suggest these optional elements in a relocation plan. The Township policy includes payments equivalent to the assessed value of a manufactured home as one potential element of a relocation plan.

Two municipalities on southern Vancouver Island have provisions requiring payment of a value equal to the assessed value of the manufactured home where a home cannot be relocated or a relocation site cannot be found. In one municipality the owner is expected to pay costs associated with moving a tenant’s personal possessions.

Legal Implications

Staff reviewed the proposed changes suggested by the SAC with legal counsel. As noted above, the obligations of an owner of a manufactured home park are set out in the Manufactured Home Park Tenancy Act. Municipalities have no authority to make regulations relating to a manufactured home park owner/tenant relationship. However, in the case of a rezoning application, Council can consider all relevant circumstances and may negotiate relocation or reimbursement issues as part of the consideration of the rezoning bylaw. Any assistance provided by the owner should be proportionate and connected to the redevelopment.

This means that a Manufactured Home Park Redevelopment Policy should not set requirements, but suggest information that should be provided or considerations that Council may take into account.

Revised Manufactured Home Park Policy

Manufactured home parks play an important role in providing a diversity of housing options to meet the housing needs of all demographic groups. Given the fact that this type of housing is an affordable form of housing, it is important to address financial and social issues when manufactured home parks are redeveloped.

A revised Manufactured Home Park Policy (Attachment C) has been drafted for Council consideration. The revised policy strengthens the existing Policy as follows:

- is based on the suggestions of legal counsel,
- emphasizes more strongly that Council is concerned that the needs of tenants be taken into account as part of redevelopment plans, and
- provides a wider range of options that an owner may consider to assist relocation of tenants.
The revised policy is intended to indicate to owners of manufactured home parks the importance of addressing impacts to displaced residents and to provide some direction on elements that could be considered as part of the redevelopment process. The policy does not require a payment for relocation costs or compensation if a manufactured home cannot be relocated as suggested by SAC, because the Township does not have the authority to do this. Any assistance package in each case would be subject to review and negotiation as part of the rezoning process based on the provisions of the policy.

Respectfully submitted,

Teresa Kaszonyi
PLANNER
for
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIVISION

ATTACHMENT A  Policy No: 07-121 Mobile Home Parks: Redevelopment Policy
ATTACHMENT B  Examples of Manufactured Home Park Redevelopment Policies
ATTACHMENT C  Proposed Revised Policy No: 07-121 Manufactured Home Park Redevelopment Policy
1. **Purpose**

To encourage proponents of redevelopment of mobile home parks to engage in a fair and open process with tenants which includes notification, relocation and options to purchase.

2. **Background**

Mobile home living is a chosen lifestyle and a legitimate form of housing.

Redevelopment of Mobile Home Parks may disrupt the living arrangements of tenants. Experience has shown that the needs of tenants must be taken into account if plans are to succeed.

In new development areas, Neighbourhood Plans should take into account the retention of existing mobile home parks.

3. **Related Policies**

07-120

4. **Policy**

4.1 That pre-notification notices be sent to all occupants or tenants of a manufactured home park subject to a redevelopment or strata conversion application, once the file has been assigned to a staff member to process.

4.2 That the applicant of any manufactured home park site undergoing redevelopment or strata conversion provide all tenants of the park with a letter at least 10 days prior to the matter being presented to Council for consideration. This letter should advise the tenants of the time and date of the Council meeting when such application is to be considered, and that any tenants who deem their interest to be affected by such redevelopment or strata conversion may contact the Township to advise on their views regarding redevelopment or strata conversion.

4.3 That redevelopment or strata conversion applications include proposed plans for relocation of persons occupying the current manufactured home park site and that these plans be included in the Report to Council when redevelopment application is presented for Council consideration.
4.4 That the owner of any manufactured home park site proposing to redevelop to another residential zone or strata title the lots, provide present tenants with a right of first refusal to purchase prior to giving notice to tenants that they must vacate the manufactured home park site.

4.5 Components may include, in addition to the statutory requirements under the *Manufactured Home Park Tenancy Act*:

i. Arranging and paying for the disposal of mobile homes;

ii. Unconditional compensatory payments for a value that would provide tenants with some amount of equity and greater flexibility in their plans for relocation (e.g. a payment equivalent to assessed value of mobile home). This would be in addition to the mandatory payment under the *Manufactured Home Park Tenancy Act*;

iii. Opportunities for first right of refusal to purchase and purchase discounts on local units developed by the applicant, including new units built on the subject site;

iv. Advice on options for relocating in the local and regional context in regard to market housing, non-market housing and mobile home park opportunities.
Examples of Manufactured Home Park Redevelopment Policies

Provincial Requirements
Required - R

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provincial Requirements (MHPTA)</th>
<th>District of Maple Ridge</th>
<th>City of Abbotsford</th>
<th>City of Coquitlam</th>
<th>City of Surrey</th>
<th>Township of Langley</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide notification to residents 12 months from the time permits have been granted. Final moving date.</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents be given a payment equivalent to 12 months pad rent</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides for arbitration where a tenant wishes to dispute a notice to terminate a tenancy agreement</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples of Municipal Policies

- existing policy + revised policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Notification and Communication</th>
<th>District of Maple Ridge</th>
<th>City of Abbotsford</th>
<th>City of Coquitlam</th>
<th>City of Surrey</th>
<th>Township of Langley</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Notification of redevelopment plans to tenants with submission of application</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notice to tenants of application being presented to Council 10 days prior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proof of tenant notification provided with application</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Plan: specifying how and when tenants would be informed of development and relocation plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timely updates by proponent: notice of council, meetings, public hearing dates and reporting residents’ concerns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minutes of development information meeting with tenants</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular updates, status report on relocation plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information</th>
<th>District of Maple Ridge</th>
<th>City of Abbotsford</th>
<th>City of Coquitlam</th>
<th>City of Surrey</th>
<th>Township of Langley</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional appraisal of housing stock and relocation feasibility</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential demographic profile including general income levels, age and family structure</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of manufactured home potential for moving (certified up to code including smoke alarms )</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>District of Maple Ridge</td>
<td>City of Abbotsford</td>
<td>City of Coquitlam</td>
<td>City of Surrey</td>
<td>Township of Langley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey of housing preferences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of the ability of tenants to secure housing in proposed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of affordable housing options on proposed site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive information on relocation options in the area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relocation Plans:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relocation plan to be included in Report to Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hire qualified professional to assist tenants with housing options and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transitions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Assistance:                                                               |                         |                   |                  |               |                     |
| Note: forms of assistance are suggested as potential components of an    |                         |                   |                  |               |                     |
| assistance program                                                       |                         |                   |                  |               |                     |
| Include various options in response to different tenants needs            |                         | +                 |                  | +             | +                   |
| Two year notice to end tendency: effective from date of application      |                         |                   |                  |               | +                   |
| Registered restrictive covenant of Two year eviction notice: effective    |                         |                   | +                |               |                     |
| from date of final approval                                              |                         |                   | +                |               | +                   |
| Options for relocating locally &amp; regionally in other market types         |                         |                   | +                | +             | +                   |
| Provide tenants with right of first refusal to purchase (compensation     |                         | +                 |                  |               | +                   |
| amount applied as down payment)                                          |                         |                   |                  |               | +                   |
| Right of first refusal to purchase of local units developed by applicant,|                         | +                 |                  |               | +                   |
| on other sites including new units on site                               |                         |                   |                  |               | +                   |
| Affordable housing options on same site where residential development is  |                         |                   |                  |               | +                   |
| proposed                                                                  |                         |                   |                  |               | +                   |
| Where redevelopment plans include a residential component tenants shall   |                         |                   |                  |               |                     |
| be offered an affordable housing option to remain on site secured by a    |                         |                   | +                | +             | +                   |
| Housing Agreement                                                         |                         |                   |                  |               |                     |
| Arranging and paying for the disposal of the manufacture home at the      |                         |                   |                  | +             | +                   |
| end of their useful life                                                  |                         |                   |                  |               | +                   |
| Pay reasonable relocation costs                                           |                         | +                 |                  |               | +                   |
| Compensation payments of an assessed value                                |                         | +                 |                  | +             | +                   |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assistance: Note: forms of assistance are suggested as potential components of an assistance program</th>
<th>District of Maple Ridge</th>
<th>City of Abbotsford</th>
<th>City of Coquitlam</th>
<th>City of Surrey</th>
<th>Township of Langley</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compensation payments 24 months pad rental (includes Provincial MHP Act)</td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation payments based on the greater of appraised or assessed values, or $10,000</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase homes at fair market value (determined by appraiser)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proponent may provide additional relocation options</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compliance</th>
<th>District of Maple Ridge</th>
<th>City of Abbotsford</th>
<th>City of Coquitlam</th>
<th>City of Surrey</th>
<th>Township of Langley</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prior to receiving final approval - Demonstrate compliance of Tenant Assistance Plan with regard to the relocation packages</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signed agreements from residents confirming of offers made and status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant must demonstrate compliance with conditions of the relocation plan</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. **Purpose**
   
   1.1 To recognize the importance of manufactured home parks as a residential land use and provide information to owners of manufactured home parks subject to redevelopment concerning elements that they may wish to consider as part of a redevelopment application.

2. **Background**
   
   2.1 Manufactured home living is a chosen lifestyle and a legitimate form of housing. Community and neighbourhood plans should consider the need for manufactured home parks as a residential land use.

   2.2 Redevelopment of manufactured home parks will displace tenants. The *Manufactured Park Home Tenancy Act* sets out the obligations of an owner of a manufactured home park to their tenants where a tenancy is ended. Council believes that the needs of tenants and the changes to their lifestyles must be taken into account as part of the redevelopment plans for manufactured home parks.

   2.3 The Housing Action Plan (Section 3.2.3 d) includes recommendations that the manufactured home policy be reviewed to minimize the impact on tenants from redevelopment and require consideration of additional compensation.

3. **Related Policy**

   3.1 07-120

4. **Policy**

   4.1 Community and Neighbourhood Plans should consider the retention of existing manufactured home parks and designation of new sites for manufactured home parks where appropriate.

   4.2 Where an existing manufactured home park is redeveloped, Council expects that the tenants of the manufactured home park will be treated in a fair and equitable manner. Redevelopment means any amendment of the Zoning Bylaw to allow development of a site currently used as a manufactured home park for another land use or housing form. Redevelopment also includes an application to convert the manufactured home park to a strata development.
4.3 Council will review redevelopment applications in light of all relevant circumstances and suggests owners of manufactured home parks consider the following measures related to communication, relocation plans and relocation assistance when submitting a redevelopment application. Council may consider this policy and any other material it considers relevant to its decision concerning redevelopment of a manufactured home park.

4.4 Clear communication between the owner of a manufactured home park and all occupants and tenants in the manufactured home park subject to a development application is vital. The owner should consider:

- notification of all occupants and tenants in the manufactured home park by individual written notices that an application has been submitted within one week of the submission of the application to the Township;
- updates to tenants advising them of the status of the development application and important Council meeting dates related to it; and
- preparation of a communication plan specifying how and when tenants would be informed of development and relocation plans.

4.5 It is recommended that the owner of a manufactured home park subject to a redevelopment application provide a Relocation Plan to accompany the Report to Council when the redevelopment application is presented for Council consideration that includes:

- a demographic profile of the manufactured home park tenants and occupants;
- a survey of the potential for moving manufactured homes;
- a survey of the housing needs of the existing residents and tenants;
- a review of potential housing opportunities for them; and
- relocation assistance the owner of the manufactured home park will provide based (see Section 4.6), with flexibility to respond to different circumstances and needs of the tenants.

4.6 The owner of a manufactured home park subject to a redevelopment application may wish to consider assistance in addition to the provisions of the Manufactured Home Park Tenancy Act to dislocated tenant. Components of this assistance may include:

- provision of additional notice to end tenancy;
- provision of affordable housing options on the same site, secured by a Housing Agreement;
- provision of a right of first refusal to purchase units in the proposed new development (if it is residential) or another local residential development prior to giving notice to tenants that they must vacate the manufactured home park site;
- unconditional compensatory payments that would provide tenants with equity to allow greater flexibility in their plans for relocation (e.g. a payment equivalent to the appraised or assessed value of manufactured home);
- arranging and paying for the disposal of manufactured homes;
- payment of reasonable relocation costs;
- opportunities for purchase discounts on local dwelling units developed by the applicant, including new units built on the subject site;
- advice on options for relocating in the local and regional context in regard to market housing, non-market housing and manufactured home park opportunities; or
- other forms of assistance.
Manufactured Home Park Redevelopment Policy
Proposed Update

Public Information Meeting – June 22, 2015

Photo Courtesy of Langley Grove Estates
Presentation Outline

- Introduction
- Background:
  - BC Manufactured Home Park (MHP) Tenancy Act
  - Township MHP Redevelopment Policy
  - Township Housing Action Plan
- In Focus: Township MHP Redevelopment Policy
- Next Steps
- Questions
Background: Provincial Legislation

- BC Manufactured Home Park Tenancy Act provides provincial requirements for compensation.

- The landowner is required to:
  - give a tenant 12 months’ notice to end the tenancy,
  - have all the necessary approvals required by law before the notice is issued, and
  - pay the tenants, on or before the effective date of notice, the equivalent of 12 months’ rent.

- Tenants can dispute a notice through arbitration.
Background: Township Policy

- Township MHP Redevelopment Policy (1998)
  - Purpose: to encourage proponents of redevelopment of manufactured home parks to engage the tenants in a fair and open process which includes notification, relocation and options to purchase

- The Township policy was revised in 2008 by:
  - emphasizing that manufactured homes are a legitimate form of housing, and
  - requiring proposed plans for relocation of tenants to be included in the Report to Council for initial consideration of a rezoning application.
Background: Township Housing Action Plan

- Housing Action Plan (2013) has an objective to “preserve and improve the quality of existing rental housing” with the following recommended actions:
  - review the MHP policy to minimize impact on tenants,
  - develop a policy that requires consideration such as additional compensation, tenant notification standards, first right of refusal, and a rent-to-own provision in MHPs being redeveloped, and
  - set a minimum percentage of units to be affordable rental, when a MHP is redeveloped.
Background: Senior Advisory Committee’s Request

- The Seniors Advisory Committee recommended Council consider changing the MHP Redevelopment Policy to require the landowner pay the tenant:
  - the actual relocation costs up to $25,000, in addition to the 12 months’ rent, and
  - the appraised value of the manufactured home or its assessed value, whichever is greater.

- Council requested staff to review the policy and practices in other communities. In April 2015, Council received a staff report on a draft updated policy and requested staff to hold a public information meeting for manufactured home residents.
Proposed MHP Redevelopment Policy

- For the tenants: it recognizes the importance of manufactured home parks as a residential land use and emphasizes the needs of tenants and the changes to their lifestyles must be taken into account as part of the redevelopment plans.

- For the landowners: provides a range of options for owners to assist relocation of tenants.

- The policy is in addition to the Provincial Manufactured Park Home Tenancy Act.
Key Policy Features

- Community and Neighbourhood Plans should consider the retention of existing manufactured home parks and designation of new sites for manufactured home parks, where appropriate.

- Council expectation: tenants of the manufactured home park will be treated in a fair and equitable manner.

- Redevelopment means:
  - rezoning of the MHP to another land use or housing form
  - conversion of the MHP to a strata development
Key Policy Features

- Council will review redevelopment applications in light of all relevant circumstances.

- Owners of manufactured home parks required to consider three things as part of a redevelopment application:
  - communication,
  - relocation plan, and
  - relocation assistance.
Key Policy Features - Communication

- Clear communication between the owners and tenants is vital.
- Notify all tenants by individual written notices within one week of application for redevelopment.
- Provide all tenants regular updates on the status of the application and important Council meeting dates related to it.
- Prepare a communication plan specifying how and when tenants would be informed of development and relocation plans.
Key Policy Features – Relocation Plan

- A Relocation Plan is recommended for a redevelopment application to include:
  
  - a demographic profile of tenants and occupants
  - a survey of potential for moving manufactured homes
  - a survey of housing needs of tenants and occupants
  - a review of potential housing options for them
  - relocation assistance with the flexibility to meet different needs and circumstances
Key Policy Features – Relocation Assistance

- HMP owner to consider relocation assistance in addition to the provisions of the Manufactured Home Park Tenancy Act.

- Examples of relocation assistance:
  - provision of affordable housing options on the same site
  - provision of a right of first refusal to purchase units in the proposed new development
  - opportunities for purchase discounts on local dwelling units developed by applicant
  - unconditional compensatory payments that would provide tenants with equity to allow greater flexibility in their plans for relocation (e.g. a payment equivalent to the appraised market value of manufactured home)
  - arranging and paying for the disposal of manufactured homes, or
  - other forms of assistance.
Next Steps

- Submit revised Policy to Council for consideration of adoption (July 2015)
Questions?

- For further information, please contact Teresa Kaszonyi, Planner at 604-533-6091.
1. What do you *like* about the policy?

- It is a very positive move.
- The policy provides us with some security should we be forced out of our homes. Manufactured home park owners should be encouraged to attend meetings.
- I like that it seems to address the needs of the residents and the specifications the owner has to do prior to applying for redevelopment and that the residents are to be informed.
- We appreciate the fact that the 2008 policy is being reviewed and updated and we trust it will provide even more protection for residents living in manufactured home parks in Langley.

2. What do you *not like* about the policy?

- The last part about assessment and market value. Both will mean nothing when the news is out about rezoning.
- The sum of $25,000 is inadequate and needs to be increased e.g. $50,000. Fair market value cannot be ascertained as true value of our homes because most sales are under duress situations in a senior’s park – estate sales etc. due to death and health problems. Who is going to purchase a home with a threat of new development? Value would be zero.
- Not sure, at first glance it seems really good.
- We feel manufactured home park owners would benefit from attending these meetings, particularly any re-development meetings! This would give them a clear picture of how many seniors’ lives would be disrupted by re-development at a time when we need to feel safe and secure and ‘age in place’ as long as possible.

Other Comments:

- Some means to determine the value of the M.H.’s. We have renovated and invested $40,000 and paid $50,000. So assessment would not be appropriate for us, or a number of neighbours in the same situation as us.
- The assessed value been decreased drastically e.g. $140,000 to $74,000. The Mayor informed us that the assessments were going to be increased. Nothing was done and they further decreased.

We, as senior citizens take pride in our homes, we take care of each other & assist each other in many ways, doctors appts, shopping, gardening. This is the ultimate lifestyle for seniors for their independency & keeping out of nursing homes. We are at an age where moving & changing our lifestyle is impossible.
• We have just moved to Fernridge Park and we love it. We really hope this policy isn’t a first step to redevelop it. Also, we bought our unit and have totally renovated it. We hope to receive FMV.

• Working with seniors for years as a seniors’ outreach co-ordinator I know that independent living is of primary importance for seniors! Active, happier, healthier seniors live longer, need less time in nursing homes or care facilities, and are less of a burden on our health care system! Our senior population is growing in leaps + bounds, especially as our baby boomers are now becoming seniors! Seniors living in a Manufactured Home Park are an outstanding example of independence!
  - We own our own homes, and take pride in that ownership.
  - Many of us have renovated or upgraded our homes at great expense.
  - We keep physically active, gardening, walking, keeping up our yards.
  - Socialization is great. Neighbours and friends all around us.
  - We have our own front + back doors, and decks to relax or entertain on.
  - It is a caring community to live in, and we are comfortable in the knowledge that help is only a few steps away if needed. Often residents will check on one another if they haven’t seen them for a short period of time. Drives to clinics or hospital or Doctor’s appts. Are often done if someone doesn’t drive or can’t.
  - Dog walkers often gather as they get their exercise + fresh air several times a day, comparing and admiring each other’s pets.
  - Often people socialize as they pick up their mail each day, you see different people at various times of day, waving at you or saying Hi!!
  - We feel safe in our park, and lots of us walk around every day, so if you fell, or didn’t feel well, someone would come right away, or call 911 if needed. That is extremely comforting.
  - Our park has a regular newsletter put out by the manager and his wife. It’s full of valuable hints for upkeep of yards + gardens, jokes, recipes and useful information and upcoming events.
  - We have a ‘young’ senior in our park who mows people’s grass and prunes shrubs and trees for a nominal amount.
  - There is also a handy man resident in our park who is in great demand and is very reasonable too.
  - Our clubhouse is a great place for pot-luck dinners, seasonal meals, crafts, and there is a library, bingo, a treadmill, shuffle board and dart board. Some pot-lucks are held outdoors under canopies, weather permitting. Puzzles + games are in the library too.
  - All these amenities keep us in better physical, mental and emotional health, and independent for years longer than if we were in a small apartment, condo, or other forms of senior housing. I repeat, it is a well-known fact that seniors live longer when they are able to stay in their own homes as long as they are able to, so there is far less drain on the health care system. It just makes sense!!

• I want to thank you, the engineer and others who hosted the meeting on June 22. It is wonderful that you are trying to preserve a preferred, and still affordable place for living for some of us.
   Although I live in the City of Langley, one of two home owners in a ‘park’ of seven owned by a developer, I felt encouraged by what the Township is trying to do. Maybe I could feel without risk moving to The Township when my time comes? I think most of the meeting was wasted about home value, not your thing? I thought you already had it covered (incl the room for negotiation). They totally missed your point?
   Not sure how this works? I am totally politically naive. It seemed like your team
was trying to make things better for MHP residents, and asked for input from the residents, before putting a proposal to the elected council to vote on. If I'm only part right, where was council to hear views of residents on an issue they may be asked to vote on?
From: Jason Chu
To: Teresa Kaszonyi
Subject: FW: Yours
Date: Monday, May 25, 2015 8:01:20 AM
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From: Stephen Richardson
Sent: Sunday, May 24, 2015 6:10 PM
To: Jason Chu
Cc: Mark Bakken
Subject: FW: Yours

Good afternoon Jason:

Please see below and can you please ensure this input is included as part of the public input on the proposed policy.

Best regards- Stephen

Stephen Richardson | Director - Development Services | Township of Langley
T 604.533.6042 | F 604.533.6110 | 20338 - 65 Avenue Langley, BC V2Y 3J1 | www.tol.ca

From: Mark Bakken
Sent: Friday, May 22, 2015 4:50 PM
To: Stephen Richardson
Subject: FW: Yours

Please pass on to appropriate party.

Thanks.

From: Kim Richter
Sent: Friday, May 22, 2015 4:49 PM
To: FOIPAA s. 22(1)
Cc: Mark Bakken; Stephen Richardson
Subject: Re: Yours

Thank you very much, for your input on this! I sincerely appreciated receiving your comments and I am forwarding them to Township staff for inclusion as part of the public response to this proposed policy. I will also raise your points when Council formally considers the matter next. I hope you will be able to attend the public feedback session/open house scheduled for June 22/15. Kim

On May 22, 2015, at 4:18 PM, FOIPAA s. 22(1) wrote:

Hi Kim,

Sorry I have not replied sooner but we have been out of town.
Thank you so much for your email and info.

It made very interesting reading but there are a few points I would like to bring to your attention.

1...Throughout the documents the words "Mobile" and "Manufactured" are interchangeable it seems. The Provincial Government, In 2002 said they were Manufactured homes. It would be much appreciated if T of L Council and all those involved would also use this terminology. We are very proud of our homes (no one in today's world calls an apt/condo "a tenement" or similar).

2...The Provincial Laws give us one years notice and one years rent in the case of redevelopment. This is absolutely ridiculous and amounts to approx. $52,000 to $82,000, depending on which Manufactured Home Park. Where can you get a home in T of L for that price. Even Manufactured Home Parks in the O.K. are now charging the same as they are here. There are several M.H. owners in T of L living on the very, very basic monthly income of approx. $1000 a month, any savings they had was spent on purchasing a M.H. What would they do?...............I can see the number of homeless in T of L grow tremendously.

3...There are several references in the documents to "fair market value" or "assessed value" This should be defined. Where the assessors get their dollar figures from we have never been able to fathom. They never come around to see the homes/gardens, or ask what updates have been done inside etc.. For example, we have at least one home here in Pineridge that is assessed at $27,000 yet its selling price would be at least $50,000 or more.

Hope this helps you
Have a great weekend
May 22, 2015

Teresa Kaszonyi, Planner

Township of Langley

Let me again thank you for forwarding to me the proposed Manufactured Home Park Redevelopment Policy allowing me an opportunity to respond with what I consider are necessary and needed changes, clarifications or additions. In my estimation the current policy is a C- and the proposed is a C+ to a B. and all concerned should be striving for an A and not be afraid of being the leader. As a Realtor I listed and sold my first MHP in 1976, the second in 1977 and on and on selling my last park in Langley in 2011 before I retired. My web presence is .

Most park owners when the “pull” of profit becomes too attractive use as the basic reason for redevelopment something along the lines as you have stated, “decreasing profitability, expensive infrastructure and repairs but never “increasing values.” Very few owners in my experience of viewing their financials maintain a reserve for unexpected expenses as they are aware of the potential of passing along the expenses as additional rent increases. Under the Residential Tenancy Act owners have no such recourse and they, like Strata owners keep a contingency fund and usually plan ahead. As an aside to this some Bank lenders build in a contingency fund in their lending criteria and then base their lending amount on the new net profit. As to decreasing profitability, this is a myth as for the last three to four years there are more owners by far attempting to purchase additional parks than owners attempting to sell. As long as interest rates stay in the same range this will continue, as Pension Funds understand parks are a top notch investment and invest heavily in them along with other individual investors.

Park owners have been enjoying the protection of the MHPTA at least since 2002 when Minister Coleman changed the act from 12 months notice and moving expenses up to $10,000 to each tenant if they intended to redevelop to only 12 months rent compensation requirement. Another benefit change is rent increases. Minister Coleman decreed the base for an increase to be 2% plus an inflation increase plus increase on municipal levy and utility increases plus the unexpected expenses increase. From 2010 up to and including 2015 the cumulative rent increase in one park in Langley is about $100 per month per tenancy site. The Manufactured Home Park Landlords’ risk study 2010 stated Landlords have “little” risk, Tenants have “many” risks and Landlords have absolute control. Owners also enjoy the protection of the MHPTA under section 42 (1) to close a park down for a few years not getting income but not having to pay assessed or appraised values on the manufactured homes plus other redevelopment costs. Or under 44 (2) an additional six months’ rent if steps have not been taken to accomplish the stated purpose for ending the tenancy. The District of Sooke states “If the landowner does not require any permits or approvals, a future rezoning application to change the zone of said Manufactured Home Park shall not be considered for 24 months from the date of issuance of the Notice to End.” Langley policy does not speak to this and the policy should be 48 months instead of 24 months. This is really only 36 months after all tenants have vacated the park and perhaps will discourage owners from evading paying their due share of redevelopment costs.
One of the largest discussions regards whether assessment or appraisal value should be the norm in park redevelopment. Of the 17 policies I am familiar with 11 are assessment (including Langley) and 6 are appraised or market value. The BC Assessment Authority asks “Why are assessments based on market value?”, and then answers “market value assessment is widely considered to be the fairest system for distributing the property tax burden.” The fact sheet further states assessments reflects the value as of July 1 of the previous year, while a private appraisal can be done at any time. The assessment authority also stated to me in 2015 that they know they assess below market value. In one Langley park two assessments were taken to appeal in February 2015. One with an assessed value of $29,700 was raised to $41,900 and the other from $37,700 to $65,000. In both cases market value is higher than the revised assessments. The assessed value in all manufactured home parks in Langley and probably elsewhere are not anywhere near market and very few seniors having the knowledge necessary to get their assessment increased to near market value. It has been many years since assessments reflected market or close to market values. If the Township was acquiring private land for whatever reason private market appraisal value would be used to help arrive at the sale price not the BC assessment figure. It would be incomprehensible to most people that they could lose their investment in their manufactured home because assessed value is used rather than market value while park owners make windfall profits – this goes against any ideals of fundamental fairness and certainly does not make it a level playing field. Independently appraised value of the home as it stands on its lot using comparables from non affected parks with the park owner paying should be the norm. I will at public hearings be asking councillors and planners if they are prepared to sell their homes, businesses, farms at their assessed value leaving hundreds of thousand dollars on the table. If the answer is no then it should be no for park tenants also. Manufactured home prices based on market value (current comparable sales) or assessed value whichever is the highest at least affords park tenants the maximum “fair” return on their investment along with both the Act and other TOL policy requirements.

To quote the 2008 letter from the C.F.V.M.H.O.A. “No one seems to understand that we are in a totally different situation to those who rent houses or suites.

We are in a sort of partnership with the Manufactured Park Owners. They supply the land, water, sewer/septic system and garbage disposal and we provide the dwellings, which in turn, are their source of revenue. Unlike other renters we have to pay taxes on our living quarters and are responsible for all home repairs, yard maintenance and landscaping. As well, we always have to bear the full cost of heat, light, cable and building insurance.

Obviously we have a considerable investment in our homes and sites where they are situated and should not be expected to give them up, through no fault of our own, for a pittance, while all other interested parties stand to reap large profits from our ouster.”

The proposed policy mentions “manufactured home Park” nineteen times but makes no mention of what is a manufactured home park other than in 2. 2.2. Unfortunately the planning department has a definition which goes against the MHPTA and needs to be corrected. In September 2008 a Aldergrove
tenant in a manufactured home park was given one year's notice to vacate. In filing for arbitration he was referred to the hall by the property owner. He was surprised that both the head planner and his assistant greeted him to discuss his problem. He was informed that only MH-1 zoned land was policy even though the policy document made no mention of this and since the land in question was RU-2 it did not qualify for the protection of the policy. The landlord did pay the tenant 12 months' rent acknowledging it was a one-site manufactured home park. All properties that are by the MHPTA definition manufactured homes parks must be included in TOL policy as those properties suffer the same consequences on redevelopment. Only the MHPTA should be the gospel as policy as to the definition of what is a manufactured home park.

Why should the policy be fair to both sides? In the 2007 the Manufactured Home Study-Housing and Construction presented to B.C. Housing Branch estimated parks increase in value ranged from 101% to 235% in 13 major areas on redevelopment. Langley's increase was 220%.

**Redevelopment Example – Port Coquitlam.**

“This scenario assumes a typical Manufactured Home Park of 10 acres in Port Coquitlam with an appraised value of $3,565,040 (as an operating MHP) versus a rezoned value of $9,500,000.

The potential gross margin to the owner or developer is $5,934,960 or an increase in value of 166%. “As a Langley example Cedar Creek Estates of 14.25 acres would have a rezoned value in 2007 of $14,250,000. The gross margin to the owner or developer is $5,753,000 using the assessed value for 2015 of $8,497,000. It is safe to say 2007 assessed value was much lower than 2015 and the rezoned value would now be higher with land price much higher in 2015. Datweiler’s MHP and RV park at 22301 Fraser Hwy sold for redevelopment March 2006 for $5,400,000, total 2006 assessments $1,554,000 or an increase in value of $3,846,000 with only 19 manufactured home sites. Since Datweiler’s was sold under the 1998 redevelopment policy only your records are available to know if they were required to pay the assessed value or other tenant costs. Garden Village in Abbotsford (101 sites) offered tenants two years rent totalling $11,000 which is one year more than the MHPTA requirement but is the Abbotsford policy. This represents an outlay of $1,111,000 while the redevelopment value of the 13 acres is well over $15,000,000. Currently there are over 50 manufactured home parks that have been closed for redevelopment. In Ladysmith on Vancouver Island tenants in a 38 site park were moved to a new park that the Town of Ladysmith created. It is not known what other compensation they received other than what is in the Act. To my knowledge this is the only example of a local government stepping in to make sure the tenants had a location to move to. And what of the other 47 parks? Were they protected or did tenants go away penniless?

You recommend that the redevelopment policy should not set requirements, but suggest information that should be provided for consideration that Council may take into account. Under policy 4.2 “Council expects that the tenants of the manufactured home park will be treated in a fair and equitable manner.”
Fortunately in the Township the largest park is owned by the BC Government pension board that has a public reputation to uphold. Two are local owners who we would expect the same from and four others are absentee owners and who knows what they would do if push came to shove with the new suggested policy of wishy washy words like consider (5 times), may or may wish (5 times) and recommended (1 time) while the word must is only used one time.

The recent rail disaster south of New York in which seven lost their lives and two hundred were injured could have been avoided had the word must, install a failsafe safety devise been in legislation rather than the words should consider installing a failsafe safety devise. The lawsuits start.

Conclusion

Manufactured Home Park owners are handsomely rewarded on redevelopment. Tenants live in fear of redevelopment and financial loss. Council has the power to ensure TOL policy upgrades to an A from the current C+ to a B and be the leader.
I bought about a year ago, and I love where I live and I am not moving this trailer so some smart ass can put townhomes or condos. Where I live there are a lot of elderly people who have no family close by, and to rip or take away what they have and feel safe is so stupid it stinks. All it is, is making the developer richer. Do you think he gives a rat's ass about anyone in these places? Think again. Also there are no affordability here at all. It is with us to try to find a place in Langley is not easy. I will be at this meeting and have more to say.
Good morning
Just a short note to say that, when reading the info sheets for Mondays meeting, it was upsetting to see that the Tof L is still using both words.................Manufactured and Mobile to describe our homes. They are NOT interchangeable, a MOBILE is what you tow behind a vehicle, a MANUFACTURED is what we live in. It is hooked up to water, sewer and hydro, and is NOT easily moved as is a mobile. The Provincial Government made this distinction in 2002.

Could T of L please get this correct.

FOIPAA s. 22(1)
MANUFACTURED Home Park
Hi Teresa:

The meeting today, to me, was very well presented. Most of the audience, I think, wandered from the proposals that is going to protect them better then before.

I feel the tenants need the proposals explained to them more simply, if that makes sense?

I like the fact that the Township of Langley is, at all costs, going to keep the established Mobile Park Sites and develop New Sites where possible.

The biggest concern to me, if relocation is required, what is the value to be paid to the owners for their homes? Some can be moved and some cannot.

The Assessed Value and or Market Value may not be a fair payment---- The Value of the homes will not increase, as we do not own the land, but maybe fair payment should be based on how much money has been totally spent to keep the homes liveable?

I am not living here to make money but would like my investment back if I have to relocate, is that not fair?

Thanks.
Dear Teresa.
Thank you for the notice regarding the Manufactured Home Park development policy (proposed update) meeting.
I will keep this short and to the point.

Firstly – myself - I am the manager (and also tenant) of the Aldergrove Mobile Home Park and attended as a representative of the Park, at my own choice to obtain information that would enable myself to speak to tenants with the much more knowledgeable background.

Secondly - your presentation (speaker and Associates) were very informative and provided a good perspective as to the direction that our Langley Township is acting on behalf of the Mobile Home owners.

Thirdly - there are good questions, and with appropriate answers, although, I feel that the majority of the questions were for individual situations, and not for the overall benefit of the group. I took those as a "grain of salt". I personally hope that I am one of the majority with that opinion and will be following your progress online.

Thank you.
Doug Deschene, manager

ps: as for owner participation-I don't think it would work; "business is business" and they invest for their own livelihood and it is their right to profit (or lose) by doing so.
Good morning Teresa

I am sorry that I was not able to make the meeting at the events center yesterday. My job precluded me from taking that time away.

I am very interested in being more active in regards to the Manufactured Homes in the Langley area. My husband and I live in a new doublewide at [FOIPAA s. 22(1)](cell). We do have concerns that the owners one day they will pull the plug and sell the property out from under us. With redeveloping happening all around us the threat is real.

Is there a chance there are minutes available for me to read and contribute some information?

I do have a question in regards to any new development or lack of for new manufactured home parks in Langley?

Please feel free to call me at [FOIPAA s. 22(1)](cell) if that would be easier.

Thank you
Teresa:

This message concerns a Township housing issue and was sent to us in error.

FYI

RMB

Roy M. Beddow, MCIP, RPP
Deputy Director of Development Services & Economic Development
City Hall, 20399 Douglas Crescent, Langley, BC V3A 4B3
P 604.514.2817 | F 604.514-2322 | rbeddow@langleycity.ca

-----Original Message-----
From: Gail Wadd
Sent: June-23-15 8:30 AM
To: Roy Beddow; Gerald Minchuk
Subject: FW: Website Contact Form

-----Original Message-----
From: FOIPAA s. 22(1) via City of Langley [mailto:info@langleycity.ca]
Sent: June-22-15 5:33 PM
To: Gail Wadd
Subject: Website Contact Form

Submitted on Monday, June 22, 2015 - 5:32pm Submitted by anonymous user: 75.157.42.185
Submitted values are:

Inquiry Type: Development / Planning / Zoning
Name: FOIPAA s. 22(1)
Street Address: FOIPAA s. 22(1)
Email: FOIPAA s. 22(1)
Comments: I wanted to thank Langley Council for trying to strengthen the Provincial Manufactured Home Act for Langley. Attended a meeting today at the Events Centre, there seemed to be a lot of concussion for Mobile Home owners.
I don't think much was accomplished but is a wonderful idea and much appreciated. Just wanted you to know, wonderful work.

The results of this submission may be viewed at:
http://city.langley.bc.ca/node/21/submission/220
FYI and records and potential inclusion as part of our staff report to bring the policy forward for council's consideration of adoption.

Thanks.

Begin forwarded message:

From: FOIPAA s. 22(1)
Date: June 23, 2015 at 8:10:50 AM PDT
To: <rseifi@tol.ca>
Subject: June 22 meeting

Ramin Seifi
Community Development. General Manager,

Good morning,
Just a quick note to say thank you for yesterday’s meeting. We appreciate all that you are doing in giving manufactured home owners more protection and compensation. Your care and concern for Township of Langley residents and for seniors is greatly appreciated.

One or two points we would like to bring to your attention.

The meetings was very informative, but it was hard to hear most of the people asking questions as they did not have a mike. There should have been a place for them to speak from or more hand held mikes available.

We found out after the meeting that there were sign in sheets, a lot of people did not see them and so did not sign in.

We also found out after the meeting that there were comment sheets which again we did not know about. One of our members asked for more copies to give out and was told there were only a few or limited amount available.

Also, for your information, many of the manufactured homes cannot be moved due to their age and Provincial regulation. At present in the lower mainland there are no (or extremely few) empty pad spaces available for the newer homes to be moved to.

Again, thank you for trying to let people understand what was in the process.

Regards

FOIPAA s. 22(1)
Thank you to you and Ramei for Informing us of the latest changes to the policy and we hope to continue the ongoing communication between us the Retired community of Langley.

Thanks again

FOIPAA s. 22(1)

FOIPAA s. 22(1)

FOIPAA s. 22(1)
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FOIPAA s. 22(1)
The Honorable Mayor of the Township of Langley and members of the City Council:

Ladies and gentlemen thank you for allowing me the time to address you regarding the Mobile Home Park Redevelopment Policy:

Your written notice concerning the above has emphasized three main areas of interest and I would like to address these proposals.

1. Recognizing the importance of manufactured home parks as a residential land use.

This “Recognizing The Importance” is of paramount significance for many reasons and one of these reasons, that I consider the MOST important, is the ability of people of ALL age groups, but primarily the Senior age groups, to live in an environment that most definitely addresses their own personal needs from a physical point of view but even more so from an emotional point of view and necessity... by that I mean to live OUTSIDE of the “CONDO COMPLEX” environment. There are so very few of us that can readily or easily afford a single detached dwelling which, by the way, is the absolute normal desire of most folks. Unfortunately due to the high cost of this lifestyle it is almost beyond reach of most folks whether they are young, elderly, retired or working.

As an example.....I personally wanted a single detached dwelling some years ago but it was financially out of reach for me. I settled for a condominium in Langley and lived in, what I call a nightmare environment. I certainly recognized the absolute need for rules concerning condo living but I found these rules, the rule makers and the rule enforcers much akin to what I would consider a custodial environment. Such limitations as: 1."Don’t put that item on your balcony.” 2. Don’t hang those curtains they are the wrong color.” 3. No, no, no, Terry we never do our laundry at 11:30 at night...and it goes on and on...then one day...”Eureka,” I came across a mobile home park while visiting some friends.....I could not believe what I found....A. A single detached dwelling....B. 2 bathrooms...C. 2 Bedrooms....1,100 square feet of living space and, get this, almost 5,000 square feet of outdoor lawn and garden ....and to top it off...2 parking spaces and one was undercover. All this for a very affordable price with a monthly pad rent very much lower than I would have paid to rent this same space in an apartment.

2. Emphasize the NEEDS of the tenants (and consider the changes to their lifestyles as part of the redevelopment plans)... IF A PARK WAS TO BE REDEVELOPED.

I have hopefully addressed the NEEDS of the tenants in the above. Your emphasis “IF A PARK WAS TO BE REDEVELOPED” speaks ominously, threatening, disturbing and uncompromising. There was, not so many years ago, a man who had lofty ideas for his “Grand Plan” for his country and the rest of the world....but he needed to redevelop certain segments of society in order to fulfill HIS lofty personal and financial goals. To do this he had to convince a whole country that what he was doing was solely for their own good....his first obstacle was the elderly and senior citizens (Speaking here of HOMES AND LIVING SPACE) if this person was to accomplish his own agenda.
He needed, first of all, to move the seniors...he did this by making the people believe that the elderly were just a drag on the population financially and emotionally....he then referred to these beautiful senior folks as "Useless Eaters." And the population bought it and the seniors were moved. Now please do not misunderstand me...I am using this only as a reference as to what could happen in the future if we are not careful in the present. I am in NO WAY WHATSOEVER implying that this council, the mayor or staff or our citizens hold this view...I am speaking of what can happen in the future if we, as a society, lose our ability to put compassion before money. Some say that money is the root of all evil....not so, says I....and the book I read says it also... It is the LOVE of money that is the root of all evil. Let us NOT take from those with less and give it to those that already have millions. We can live with a mobile home park in our very midst.

3. Provide owners of manufactured home parks a range of options to assist relocating tenants.

Mobile home parks are and always have been a true necessity in any and all communities. Mobile home parks can and DO exist in the midst of commercial areas, residential areas, high traffic areas and low traffic areas. A mobile home park is NOT a detriment to ANY enterprise or any City redevelopment plan. We do NOT need to MOVE the folks out so a GRANDER scheme can be realized.

Where would you re-locate upwards of 1000 beautiful and wonderful human beings, most of whom are seniors?

May I suggest you consider the following:

You and your family or possibly your aged mother and or father live at (and I will pick an address at random) FOI.PAA’s, 22(1), street Langley Township...but the Township wants to allow an industrial park at that location.

So the city sells the whole of four city blocks and here is what you receive for your valued $300,000 - $600,000 dollar home....you receive $12,000 dollars and you don’t have to pay for water for a year....This is almost the exact scenario that presently is being considered for the mobile home park folk in Langley Township. You would NOT want the citizens of Langley to vote for that industrial park that would impact your life in so many negative ways....nor would you want the city to proceed to tell you to move after you and your family have lived in that house for 20 plus years. And what about the 65, 78 or 86 year old senior who lives with an aged partner and takes care of that partner or the senior of 87 years of age who lives alone...do you want to be the one to knock on her or his door and say “You have to move.” Remember what I mentioned above

"Compassion" and the “Love of money” They just do not go hand in hand...this day you must choose one or the other. I would hope that you or I would never have to look back and say “I wish I had done it differently” or I regret my decision that displaced all those folks.”
Mobile home parks are a necessity and a very important part of our community and way of life...no I do not want to move into subsidized housing and that is exactly what this REDEVELOPMENT plan is forecasting for many hundreds and hundreds of folks....forcing them out of their homes after having lived in that home for sometimes 10, 15, 20, 25, 30 and even 40 years.

Please do not sell my home but if you do please know that I feel I am entitled to the full assessed value plus any and all moving expenses and also entitled to a minimum of one year free pad rent as I incur numerous expenses (storage, moving, car use in looking for another home, etc.) over the coming year. I am seventy seven years old and have lived in MY mobile home for 12 years.

There is no shame, but only honor in designating space “Permanently,” as a “Mobile Home Park.”

I am submitting a poem for you to read...with the emphasis on “Regret.” Remembering, “I should have,” I wish I had,” as you make your decision. Here is hoping you never have to place a single rose on the grave of a Mobile Home Park.

God Bless you all.

Respectfully submitted;

Langley BC
Phone
THEN THERE WERE NON

First they came for the Communists
And I did not speak out
Because I was not a Communist;
Then they came for the Socialists
And I did not speak out
Because I was not a Socialist;
Then they came for the trade unionists
And I did not speak out
Because I was not a trade unionist;
Then they came for the Jews
And I did not speak out
Because I was not a Jew;
Then they came for me...
And there was no one left
To speak out for me.

Pastor, Martin Niemoller wrote the above from a concentration camp:
From: Mark Bakken  
Sent: Thursday, June 25, 2015 8:38 AM  
To: Ramin Seifi  
Subject: FW: Public information meeting- Manufactured Home Park Redevelopment Policy

Feedback and a heads up for Monday

I will see that the attachment goes on the Distribution List.

Thanks.

From: Kim Richter  
Sent: Wednesday, June 24, 2015 7:42 PM  
To: FOIPAA s. 22(1)  
Cc: Mark Bakken  
Subject: Re: Public information meeting- Manufactured Home Park Redevelopment Policy

Hi

Thank you very much for this feedback on the recent public meeting relative to the MHO policy in the Township - I really appreciated receiving it!

I will ask at Monday's Council Meeting if more meetings are planned, when and where? Also I will ask if sufficiently large facilities have been booked for them.

Sincerely, Kim Richter

Mobile: 604-340-9517  
Home: 604-856-9788  
Email: krichter@tol.ca  
Facebook: kim.richter2  
Twitter: @KimRichterTOL  
Website: krichter.com

On Jun 24, 2015, at 12:47 PM, FOIPAA s. 22(1) > wrote:

Kim the attachment is my talking points for the meeting but I am writing now about the meeting itself. Mr. Seifi opened the meeting. He was reading from a script and had difficulty coordinating the script with the script on the two
screens which did not make him a fan favourite at that point.

He opened the floor to questions and his answers indicated he was not really the person who should be doing this part of the program. His replies in a lot of instances were incorrect and he appeared a little agitated.

The majority of questions was to do with assessment and folks losing their investment. He turned a few questions over to planner Jason who I later spoke with.

Jason thinks MHP assessments are done the same way as residential housing and his answer was confusing to a lot of people. Jason also told my they were not expecting the size of the audience which was 150 - 250 folks. I asked when a future meeting would be held since Mr. Seifi ended the meeting off at exactly 2 PM turning questions over to Jason and Teresa Kaszonyi with many more folks wanting to be heard.

Most left in a hurry as both Jason and Teresa could only answer one question from one person at a time. We were informed there were no other meetings. Teresa in a conversation with me in May suggested and I quote from what I wrote down “June 22 Public meeting then meet with a rep from each park if possible or hold a meeting in each park?”

Of my four pages of talking points the only items I spoke to were #2 and #4. I got the impression they felt they provided what council asked for (the meeting) therefore the accomplished this.

I have no idea if the meeting was taped for reference or who else beside me submitted a written reply except one fellow who went on the stage to read a four minute letter he said he sent to Mayor and Council. He wanted all parks to remain in eternity and there be zero redevelopment.

Enthusiastically

<public hearing- relocation policy.docx>
In my getting an understanding of manufactured home policies I looked at the policies of seventeen jurisdictions. It seems the planners only looked at other jurisdictions relocation policies for input as none mention tenant or owner input. Do planners really know anything about the real life facing tenants in parks. In my humble opinion the answer is no and one of the reasons amongst many is most planners have not gone past a short meeting with tenants in the parks rec building to understand the facts. Another reason is that most are too young and are geared to other issues.

Don’t take the easy way out

I am a retired Realtor in real estate. I listed & sold my first park in 1976 and my last one, a Langley park in 2011 with lots of listing and sales in between all over BC. I was one of a very few Realtors who specialized in manufactured home parks and I communicated with over 400 park owners via newsletters and association meetings. I was also a member of the owners association for many years.

In April 2015 the planning dept was kind enough to email me all the info regarding the proposed new policy. I replied to planning with a 4 page submission covering 5 -7 issues that I felt were of greatest importance after downloading the relocation policies of 17 BC jurisdictions.

1. In my opinion Tol current policy is a C- compared to a lot of other redevelopment policies. The proposed policy is a C+ but affected parties in Langley Township deserve an A policy.

2. There are lots of reasons a park owner considers in coming to the redevelopment option but the one seldom mentioned is the “Pull” of profit in redeveloping a park. In Langley a 19 pad park gross redevelopment profit in 2007 was estimated at $3,800,000. In Abbotsford a 101 pad park on 13 acre was almost $8,400,000. There are other examples.
3. Minister Coleman has looked after park owners very well since 2002. From lowered protection for tenants, guaranteed rent increase amounts to potential wiggling out of TOL policy on redevelopment. Be assured no Langley park owner is on the dole.

4. Assessment value vs market value is a contentious issue. Of the 17 policies I studied 11 use assessment value in policy and 6 use market value. TOL uses assessed value. I gave several valid reasons why it is necessary to use market value or assessed value whichever is higher. I don’t think anyone in this room who owns a house, acreage, farm or commercial or industrial land & buildings would sell at their current assessed value and leave several thousands on the table. Why should park tenants by policy be forced to leave money on the table. If TOL was purchasing land, appraised value not assessment value would be used in negotiations and if TOL was selling, appraised value would be the norm to make sure taxpayers received market value. Quoting the Vancouver Sun of June 6 “Premier Christy Clark has thrown cold water on Vancouver Mayor Gregor Robinson’s call for extraordinary tax measures to cool speculation in the housing market, saying they could wipe out billions of dollars in peoples home equity.” Proposed TOL policy will do the same to manufactured home owners and wipe out their equity.

5. What is considered a manufactured home park? The MHPTA has a very clear definition, one or more. Planning notes state Municipalities have no authority to make regulations relating to manufactured home park owner/tenant relationship then make policy with a different definition and interpretation. I gave reasons why the MHPTA should be gospel and not the whims of planning
who are setting up some park tenants to be road kill by the proposed policy.

6. In the planning notes, reference for council is made to a 2009 study which states pad rents (provincially) are lower than condo fees. This was not true for TOL then and is not true now, TOL Pad rents are much higher than condo fees and that should have been made clear as additional planning notes to give a balanced view to council. That important information is easily found.

7. Over 50 parks have been redeveloped in recent years with more to come. Only Ladysmith built a new park so the 38 pad renters in a local park had a place to go other than on the street. More local governments should be doing this or assisting park owners in doing so.

The recent rail disaster south of NY in which 7 lost their lives and 200 were injured could have been avoided had the word must install a failsafe safety devise been in legislation rather than the words should consider installing a failsafe safety devise. The lawsuits have started.

Montana tailing pond law ‘It’s not a guidance document, we made it hard and fast law.” TOL is a guidance document and avoids all thoughts of law.

In conclusion

Manufactured home park owners are handsomely rewarded on redevelopment. Tenants live in fear of redevelopment and financial loss. Planning and Council have the power to ensure TOL policy upgrades to an A from the current C+ to a B by eliminating such wishy washy words like consider, may or may wish and make use of the word must more often.
Quoting a park owner. “Tenants in Manufactured Home Parks are unique, because unlike other tenants THEY OWN THEIR OWN HOME, therefore they have made a financial investment in our Parks and have a much more vested interest in what happens in the Park they reside in. As opposed to other residential tenancies most of our tenants are financially and physically responsible for the maintenance of both their site as well as their home, and they pay taxes on their homes just like we do. Therefore they are Homeowners in every sense of the word. They own homes, they do not own Trailers.

4 pages sent to planning, will they also be sent to Mayor & council?

When are you holding public hearings? 17 policies no mention of public input, only planners input.
Dear Teresa Kaszonyi,

I want to thank you, the engineer and others who hosted the meeting on June 22. It is wonderful that you are trying to preserve a preferred, and still affordable place for living for some of us.

Although I live in the City of Langley, one of two home owners in a 'park' of seven owned by a developer, I felt encouraged by what the Township is trying to do. Maybe I could feel without risk moving to The Township when my time comes?

I think most of the meeting was wasted about home value, not your thing? I thought you already had it covered (incl the room for negotiation). They totally missed your point?

Not sure how this works? I am totally politically naive. It seemed like your team was trying to make things better for MHP residents, and asked for input from the residents, before putting a proposal to the elected council to vote on. If I'm only part right, where was council to hear views of residents on an issue they may be asked to vote on?

Sincerely,

FOIPAA s. 22(1)

FOIPAA s. 22(1)
1. Purpose

1.1 To recognize the importance of manufactured home parks as a residential land use and provide information to owners of manufactured home parks subject to redevelopment concerning elements that they may wish to consider as part of a redevelopment application.

2. Background

2.1 Manufactured home living is a chosen lifestyle and a legitimate form of housing. Community and neighbourhood plans should consider the need for manufactured home parks as a residential land use.

2.2 Redevelopment of manufactured home parks will displace tenants. The Manufactured Park Home Tenancy Act sets out the obligations of an owner of a manufactured home park to their tenants where a tenancy is ended. Council believes that the needs of tenants and the changes to their lifestyles must be taken into account as part of the redevelopment plans for manufactured home parks.

2.3 The Housing Action Plan (Section 3.2.3 d) includes recommendations that the manufactured home policy be reviewed to minimize the impact on tenants from redevelopment and require consideration of additional compensation.

3. Related Policy

3.1 07-120

4. Policy

4.1 Notwithstanding the definition of “manufactured home park” in the Manufactured Home Park Tenancy Act, in this policy, “manufactured home park” means any parcel of land, upon which two or more manufactured homes, occupied for dwelling purposes, are located, including all buildings, structures or accessories used or intended to be used as equipment for such manufactured home park, but shall not include vehicle sales or other lands on which manufactured homes are manufactured or placed solely for the purposes of storage or inspection and sale.

4.2 Community and Neighbourhood Plans should consider the retention of existing manufactured home parks and designation of new sites for manufactured home parks where appropriate.
4.3 Where an existing manufactured home park is redeveloped, Council expects that the tenants of the manufactured home park will be treated in a fair and equitable manner. Redevelopment means any amendment of the Zoning Bylaw to allow development of a site currently used as a manufactured home park for another land use or housing form. Redevelopment also includes an application to convert the manufactured home park to a strata development.

4.4 Council will review redevelopment applications in light of all relevant circumstances and suggests owners of manufactured home parks consider the following measures related to communication, relocation plans and relocation assistance when submitting a redevelopment application. Council may consider this policy and any other material it considers relevant to its decision concerning redevelopment of a manufactured home park.

4.5 Clear communication between the owner of a manufactured home park and all occupants and tenants in the manufactured home park subject to a development application is vital. The owner should consider:

- notification of all occupants and tenants in the manufactured home park by individual written notices that an application has been submitted within one week of the submission of the application to the Township;
- updates to tenants advising them of the status of the development application and important Council meeting dates related to it; and
- preparation of a communication plan specifying how and when tenants would be informed of development and relocation plans.

4.6 It is recommended that the owner of a manufactured home park subject to a redevelopment application provide a Relocation Plan to accompany the Report to Council when the redevelopment application is presented for council consideration that includes:

- a demographic profile of the manufactured home park tenants and occupants;
- a survey of the potential for moving manufactured homes;
- a survey of the housing needs of the existing residents and tenants;
- a review of potential housing opportunities for them; and
- relocation assistance the owner of the manufactured home park will provide based on components of assistance (see Section 4.7), with flexibility to respond to different circumstances and needs of the tenants.

4.7 The owner of a manufactured home park, subject to a redevelopment application, should consider assistance in addition to the provisions of the Manufactured Home Park Tenancy Act to dislocate tenant. Components of this assistance may include:

- provision of additional notice to end tenancy;
- provision of affordable housing options on the same site, secured by a Housing Agreement;
- provision of a right of first refusal to purchase units in the proposed new development (if it is residential) or another local residential development prior to giving notice to tenants that they must vacate the manufactured home park site;
unconditional compensatory payments that would provide tenants with equity to allow greater flexibility in their plans for relocation (e.g. a payment equivalent to the greatest of appraised, assessed and market value of manufactured home);
arranging and paying for the disposal of manufactured home;
payment of reasonable relocation costs;
opportunities for purchase discounts on local dwelling developed by the applicant, including new units built on the subject site;
advice on options for relocating in the local and regional context in regard to market housing, non-market housing and manufactured home park opportunities; or
other forms of assistance.