

(optional)

Do you feel it is fair for landlords to require aesthetic improvements to your property before selling? Please explain.

Not at all

No. It infringes on your right to sell, whatever the condition.

No. The mobile home belongs to me, not them. So I believe if the buyer is okay with it, and I'm okay with the price, that should be enough.

In no way should they have the right to dictate terms of sale. If the property was acceptable before sale, meaning no requirement to upgrade during current tenant occupancy, it should be okay going forward. And, they shouldn't be able to dictate aesthetic standards. They allowed the mobile to be placed at inception. Market forces, such as, nobody would buy it under the current conditions, should drive improvements.

An owner will naturally make her home as nice as possible for sale. There is no need for a Big Brother.

Your ability to sell your home in their park has always been an issue. Some parks are maintained very well and some are not and as such the cost to refurbish should be placed on the current owner or the new owner whichever you negotiate, not the park manager.

Residents selling have made repairs per home inspection inside and out. Landlord per rental agreement and rules & regulations enforce seller or new resident to meet standards. Some sales have been negotiate in sale of home.

PARK manager has pressured resident selling their homes to correct unimportant items before pricing their home for sale at the homeowners expense

No. I didn't know about the siding, I hope that's not the case for our park we were no informed of anything like this because we just had siding replaced.

The park owners should have no say on how my home looks as long as it is in good shape, neat and tidy.

No. Homes could be improved by the owner, if they want to, but this should not be a requirement to sell. It's a way to set unattainable standards, giving landlords way too much power. Homes should be sold as is.

No, it isn't their home. Parks should not have the right to require uniformity of the homes. They don't own the home.

I can barely afford to fix the things broken

It is not fair. It is an agreement between buyer and seller only

Not sure but attractive homes enhance the value of all.

NO

No, these improvements cost hundreds or thousands of dollars and are often unnecessary

No fair everything has to be the way they want. We are the ones who pay

Their needs to be a way to require tenants to paint their exterior when needed. Not just at sale time.

The only thing I know that part request is before a mobile home goes up for sale that an expectation is done and basically what they're looking for my understanding is anything that needs to be fixed for example, if the skirting is missing damage or anything like that, they asked to be fixed I've never heard of it being replace or change or anything like that light fixture is broken on your home. They say you have to fix it so basically the curb appeal and the yard is clean presentable not full of trash stuff like that. I haven't heard much more than that.

Fair and landlord are rarely contained within the same sentence. In reality, landlords can do whatever they want, as Oregon does not staff nor fund a working department to manage the interface. BCDS is a lousy joke. Eyewash... no enforcement mechanism... waste of zoom meeting.

no. I believe it is fair for a landlord to only require improvements that are or will become hazardous.

Landlords of manufactured home parks regularly and without oversight put all kinds of personal preferences on residents without need. People in my park have been told white is the only color they can paint their homes. Which is ridiculous. They will not pick any residents' color choice based on their mood. This is an abuse of power.

No cause that should be a choice.

I do not feel that it is fair for landlords to require aesthetic improvements to my property before selling!

It's not that aesthetic improvements add additional value to the home, and in some instances, aesthetics are nothing more than a cosmetic improvement to the home and the property in order to sell, only management expects the homeowner to abide by their wishes since they do nothing to accommodate the homeowners desire to sell. Really, it's not aesthetics as much as it is a demand for sale of home.

I feel we should be able to sell as is. The landlord again only owns the land.

No. If there is significant deterioration that would be acceptable but not aesthetic.

As long as aesthetic issues that need improvement are done whether from current owner or new owner

The property is owned by us as private owners and if we find a buyer, the lot managers should have minimal say, beyond safety, as to whether we can sell it. If the new owners are willing to do additional renovation, that's between us and the buyer. Plus the park is poorly maintained and the focus for "needed repairs and yard clean up" is only on a handful of tenants and the rest are not held to the same standard. Older homes or homes not carrying a mortgage with the lot managers seem to be a target for harsher standards, in an effort to evict, force out.

No, this is a market issue that should be the sellers decision and the buyers decision only.

Especially when they do the work and make the money off of tennent

Especially when they do the work and make the money off of tennent

Should not be a requirement

No. What does it matter how a place looks aesthetically between one owner to another? If there are aesthetic problems then they should've already been approaching the original owner to have them addressed in the first place. Otherwise, requiring improvements for sale is just a way to strong arm the owner into doing improvements the landlords may have had trouble getting them to do in the first place. Also, typically when trying to sell property owners will improve the aesthetics anyways just to increase the price and solubility of their property so it's moot.

Absolutely not.

No

No. We already have several inspections per year. This is just an additional hurdle and while I haven't personally experienced, I do know of a seller that was asked to paint a fence in winter. It was raining at the time they were expected to paint.

No. Not any of their business.

No. If the home is livable I should not have to pay extra.

No, park managers are not the owners. Aesthetic improvements need to be negotiated between buyers and sellers

There are some homes in this park that need fixing because they look terrible, unpainted dangerous decks, turn up siding etc. Those repairs should be required ALL the time

Our landlord requires a resale inspection as part of the selling process. The buyer, or the seller can take care of the findings or both.. Yes within reason...I want them to require that because some aesthetics reflect on the resale value of each home in the neighborhood. and bad aesthetics bring values down. Some aesthetics such as paint aren't just for looks it protects from elements.

No, I think that deal is between the seller and buyer.

We are supposed to have only white picket fencing unless grandfathered in. Only certain colors approved for your home

no unless the home needs repairs or is dangerous. usually that is why the seller moves because they can't afford to do repairs, etc.

No, they aren't the buyer. They just rent the space to the homes so they have no business telling a renter what to do before they can sell.

Residents make a commitment upon purchase to maintain upkeep. It would be unfair to require aesthetic improvements before selling. If one cannot sustain ten percent rent increase plus shared cost of water and sewer for the entire park operations, how could one pay for aesthetic upgrades? This represents loss after loss to well meaning home owners who are caught in an impossible situation.

They want that even while residing here, telling us to paint, their colors, matching sheds with house color, approval also with trim colors, landscaping, etc.

It's my property, so no. I understand the significance of aesthetics. Perhaps a carrot for motivation could be applied.

As long as siding is clean then not a concern.

The property owner should have NO right to tell me how to decorate or improve my home. Why do you ask questions like this and others like it involving the property owner. They have NO right to tell me anything about my home.

it should not be any concern to the park owners.

Who knows

I don't have a problem with reasonable requirements for outside. We want the park to look nice and appealing to others.

NO! It is my home and if a buyer is willing to purchase as is, the tenants should be able to sell as is.

No. I was forced to repaint entire home because an area on the side looked "faded"

As we rent the land, they can have a say-so, in how our yards look.

NO unless the unit might be falling apart.

No

Sometimes. They have high standards on exterior appearances.

No

As long as it's not extreme

No, I own my home, not the park.

It depends on if it's reasonable

No, should be none of their concern

No, it is not fair that my landlord requires replacing siding and wanting all homes on outside slips to be 2-story or be moved to an inside slip!

No

No

No, it should be up to the seller if they want to purchase the property as it is.

no!

No. Not at all.

No. It's up to the buyer and seller to decide these issues.

Yes

No. It's subjective.

No. It's subjective.

No. It's subjective.

NO! If someone wants to buy your house as it is, that is on them. NOT on the landlord. The landlord isn't the one that is going to live in it.

What?

No

No

Outside should meet park requirements

I feel it is not fair to require repairs that are not in the contract.

I think as long as everything is in good shape, other aesthetic changes shouldn't be required. Like siding, as long as it's in good shape, it shouldn't matter which way the siding goes.

No

No. I feel if someone wants to buy it the way it is, it's their business

This is a difficult question because there is a fine line between keeping a marina in top condition versus carrying things too far.

Certainly not. If this were a requirement, I know that most elderly people here would not be able to afford it and, therefore, would lose their home before they could make the repairs to sell it, especially for aesthetic improvements that really don't improve the value of the home much.

In some cases perhaps, otherwise undecided. For a hard yes or no I'd go with no.

Na

no

No

No, it shouldn't be their concern

No, it would not be fair.

Heck, no...though he gets a commission from the sale.

Not at all. First of all, we will all have to take a substantial LOSS in the selling price to even be able to find a buyer. To be required to make repairs, which would mean MORE loss of money , won't be possible for a lot of people.

the parking lot is in poor state - as well as the pump station for sewer and the docks... I updated my electrical system including the tap in portion from the main electrical lines - that was a 3k extra expense that should have been provided by the property owner.

Helll No! It's my house. The landlords aesthetics and my buyers preference may be completely opposite of each other. This could ruin my sale. That's too much overreach.

No, if the aesthetics were good enough for me when I bought the house why do I need to spend money because the park owners want you to make changes. If they want to make changes and pay for it the ok.

no

The park owner/managers have NO AUTHORITY over the exterior of my home and therefore should not be able to require inspections of any kind, regardless of who pays. This is completely inappropriate and unwarranted. Also, it was not part of my original lot rent lease and I don't see how it can be required now.

maybe

No

As long as the exterior is neat and in good repair, it is the park owners business.

no

not fair

not at all

Not at all.

No

Each person should keep up their own ppty aesthetics in general.

Yes. On a fixed income, this can be impossible creating a no-win situation.

No, I think that is not appropriate

To a degree

No

If the home is faded or deteriorated then yes. You need to keep the appearance of the neighborhood up in order to keep home values up.

Sellers have to follow real estate safety laws

I have mixed feelings , they should be allowed to require landscape improvements and clean up but the structural imperfections should be left for the new owner to deal with in a reasonable amount of time

No I don't think it is fair If they require us to make repairs then they should also be required to maintain the amenities as well; no only the clubhouse and pool, but also the trees that are hanging over many of the units. We rent the spaces and shouldn't have to maintain the overgrown trees on the property.

No

no

Not MY property. Not at all fair. I have paid my rent for 20 years never once late. Cal am has not made one improvement on this piece of property in that time. Not even to piping that attaches to my home don't they have to provide good safe water to my home? It was not new by any means when I moved in here.

no

no

No

No. You want the best curb appeal anyway but it's not my landlord's business. I pay rent for the land not from my home.

No if it's already in good shape and had been maintained.

Yes should be their costs

No

no

Not an issue that I am aware of.

No it none of their business

If aesthetic improvements are an issue with a particular home, they should be addressed by management and the community whether the home is being sold or not

no

N/A

No.

Nice for uniformity. I have no problem with this.

no, regular upkeep should be enough

No While it is necessary for the home to look good to a buyer, the first impression to the outside of the home also depends on the look of the neighbors as to whether I would buy a home.

no. people should be able to sell as is.

No. The owner will deal with the outcome of not having the property in top sellable condition. Again, not the landlords business.

This would be a big hardship to us if that were to happen. Currently, we have only needed to paint the outside.

If just aesthetic I don't see why they should say anything

No

No. Again, not their business.

Previous park managers have tried to control the color of paint residents want to use. Landscaping improvements would be beneficial for the park as a whole. Grounds are in ill repair, competent landscapers need to be hired. We have seen the common areas in this park deteriorate. Owners only invest in the minimum. We have invested a considerable amount of time and money in improving our lot and the upkeep of shared areas, including maintenance, landscaping, new fencing, retaining walls, and a carport extension.

Depends on how bad it is.

Within reason, to keep the standard up in the park. This company that purchased our park is not a good company.

no

No, unless it was in the bylaws of an HOA that I was aware of when I moved into the moorage. Otherwise it should be none of their business.

The contract we have with the park already requires the home to be kept up to certain standards, that should be enough

No

Most people cannot afford to pay the expenses of home improvements, that's why they are selling or trying to sell, because it's too expensive to live here!!!

Yes

No. Every person has different tastes. A seller shouldn't be responsible for someone else's likes or dislikes.

No its none of their business should they decide to do that

Yes, within reason, to keep up values within the park.

If a landlord wants something changed they can pay for it.

No... a lot of people who sell can't afford to live here anymore. So how can they afford to do cosmetic upgrades in order to sell!

Absolutely not. For one thing when I purchased my home it needed cosmetic improvements painting, broken screens deck repair. I negotiated with the seller got an estimate and had that price deducted from the sale price.

The landlord has no right to tell me how my house should look

No , I may not reap the profits.

No. Will sell as is.

Landlords do not own these homes. They have no right of inspection.

No. Beauty is in the eyes of the beholder. Their beloved aesthetic may be the buyers unloved aesthetic. There is no apparent bottom-line justification for this unless the landlord wishes to pay for it. I prefer it when people own responsibility for their own wishes and needs.

not with out compensation

No, since we are basically just renting the land.

Yes

Yes

No not on siding

No I do not. Some people aren't capable of making improvements so home is sold as is.

No. I think the exterior must be maintained close to the original.

No opinion

No I do not

no

No, its your house

No

No

No we should be able sell as seen.

No. I have the right to sell as seen

yes they want landscaping to be our responsibility even that is the parks responsibility

N/A

Landlord dictates paint colors homeowners can select for exterior painting.

NO! We are not an HMO. We rent the space that our home sits on. PERIOD

Management only does this to intimidate

I don't think it is there concern if seller wants better price they will do what is needed

Not fair at all! I do understand keep a certain aesthetic of beauty throughout the park for every homeowner's benefit, but I don't think it's right for landlords to pressure tenants to invest their own money on things like fencing or expensive landscaping when that investment will only profit the land owner when the tenant moves. Fences and carports should be the responsibility of the land owners.

Manager must encourage homeowners to maintain homes yearround according to rules and regs ONLY

No.

Should depend on the seller's desire to present well and make money. Many people are summarily forced to sell, and some buyers want a 'fixer' at the right price.

Circumstances dictate..

Not at the extra expense of seniors on fixed incomes. Currently, park residents are required to pay to have park owned driveways repaired (at a cost of approximately \$2400), and park owned storage sheds repaired, although the park pays for some materials for the sheds. We are also required to paint the carport and storage sheds which often means paying for labor and frequently for a special brown paint from Rodda paints. The park even put out a notice to residents to water the street trees near their homes and to use a special fertilizer for the trees from Grange Co op. This is the general attitude of the park owner and indicates his willingness to have residents pay to keep his park looking maintained. Enough already.

No, the house is ours, only the property is theirs.

Not an issue in our park.

To maintain the standards of our community, I could see exterior paint or yard clean up, etc

No. I do not think it is any of their business.

The owners should be sued if there is no requirement under the original lease

My seller had to put in ? amount of lawn before it could sell. Although there was other green in the yard.

I own the home. As long as the home meets park standards that is all that should matter

No.

Unless the structure is a hazard in some way, no.

No

No, but it should matter to the homeowner.

Not as long as the home looks presentable

This, too, should be between the seller and potential buyer.

No I do not. My park rules/reg talk about maintaining my home and some of that could be considered "aesthetic" such as exterior painting per their color guidelines. If I want to sell my home "as is" and find a willing buyer, then that's my and the willing buyer's business, not my landlords.

No! If the landlord wants aesthetic improvements made to my property before selling then they can do it at their expense. I already pay above and beyond for improvements and maintenance of my home and leased space.

no

It should only be required in absolutely needed to sell as there are structural issues.

no

Clean and in good repair yes. Doing expensive repairs on a 50 year old mobile home would not be made up in the sale of the home.

NO.

I don't think that management should require anything be done. I would make sure everything was in good shape though.

No, spaces are mandated to be kept clean and cared for. So as a disabled person I have to be able to pay for upkeep....very expensive.

Or make the new owners of the space do them.

Our management is not very good with inspections and have missed things that should have been addressed.

Only if it does not meet the requirements of the park.

I do not agree with the landlord requiring aesthetic improvements to the base home while renting or during sale.

No

No!

Yes its part of the home.

See preceding comment

No, I feel you can sell a home "as is" at a reduced price and let prospective buyers put in upgrades to suit their own taste in flooring, countertops, paint, etc.

No

No

No. I own the house and the buyer should have options.

Yes to the degree that it effects the appearance of the home.

NO! A realtor may suggest improvements that would help selling your property

All homes should never become an eye sore, but, limits should be placed on what on site managers demand

I do to some degree. But I also believe it's up to the owner to maintain their house exterior and keep up with any repairs and yard maintenance that are needed

No

No. Unnecessary selling expense benefitting no one.

Neighbors have tall dry weeds and the park does not require them to remove the fire hazard.

It's just another reason to intimidate owners.

No

We have a clause within our lease that allows for yearly external inspection for dry rot and damage. We also have a painting standard that limits the color options to a chosen color palette. Personally I don't have a problem with this, especially considering that we have had neighbors in the past not choose colors that fit the neighborhood ambience. I have lived in communities with HOA's that have the same requirements and don't see an issue as long as enforcement is not draconian. As far as requiring improvements prior to sell I would think that if there are known violations of Lease or Rules that require correction they should be addressed as far as aesthetic improvements I think that should be included as a buyers requirement, most Realtors discourage painting and flooring changes unless it is to repair damage as most buyers have their own desires and opinions.

No the new owner of unit should decide how they want it to look

No, the landlords should not control our home.

No I do not. I can agree to aesthetic improvements to my home site in order to sell.

no

NO, and they have no say so about your home just their dirt.

no. buyers are supposed to be aware of what is being sold and what condition the home is in. If the park has an issue with it's annual "review", then the property owner will have to comply. It's not up to a sale in the middle of the year for the park to interfere.

Not if the property is otherwise well maintained and new owners will fix what may be required

No. Putting more money in if I have to sell, isn't right.

N/A in this park. They have allowed hoarders to pile there stuff on the exterior and do nothing about it

yes as needed to remain compliant with others in park. However I remain compliant on my own with improvements.

No

If outside of house looks deteriorated, then I understand necessary improvements. Otherwise, no. Besides, it won't sell if it looks poorly.

No! It's my home. I certainly would take responsibility for the condition of my home and some buyers might decide to purchase a home that requires some updating. Perhaps at a better price. I don't think the landlord needs anymore 'power/authority'.

Had our house painted and the carport painted the same color. Landlord made us repaint the carport to a color that they dictated. Not in my contract it had to be painted that color. They did furnish paint but we had to have it painted.

Yes

No. If I purchased a home the existing siding should be approved. They should not be allowed to change the type of siding. Not fair. Burden on the home buyer. Seller should not have been allowed to sell it with the wrong preferred siding.

Tenant was told her planter had to match the color of her home

Upgrades or improvements not pertaining to the structure of the home often are unreasonable. ie, changing color of home

No

Some cannot afford it.

Yes. Keeping the outside looking nice makes it better for everyone to be able to sell.

Our "landlord" is unclear about house paint colors and there have been issues and arguments.

Again, MY HOME. If the land lord wishes to pay for it and the owner keeps the profits then let the land lord pay for improvements

No it is not fair

No

No. However on the same hand, I do not want the park to become a slum in its appearance.

Yes

Not fair. Those who have terrible curb appeal pay the price of selling their place at a lower cost.

No

Absolutely not.

no, but the exterior should be as presentable as circumstances provide.

No

NO

When being forced to sell my home because of higher rent I will not have the money for repairs

I don't know if many of us in the park are on disability or some government help program and I think it's our choice to sell our homes however we want as most of us own the home.

Absolutely Not

If it was something needed. We like our park to look nice.

No

Park rules require us to upkeep the appearance of our home and yard at all times at our own expense.

No

If necessary for maintaining park desirability and other home values.

It is none of their business.

Only the requirements to maintain the yard. I believe this is necessary to maintain the value on all our homes.

No. The home is mine, not the landlord.

no, not their right

No. This should be between the buyer and the seller.

Yes and no. Aesthetic improvements are needed for any property to maintain the value of the neighborhood as a whole.

Yes, because of certain upkeep requirements in the contract, those should be addressed.

Too costly for just aesthetics

No. In our park people take pride in their homes. I believe usually it would be suggestions from your realtor that improvements would aid in the sale

yes

No, if someone hasn't taken care of there property, the final sale price will indicates that. The yards should be kept up or management should have someone come in and bill the tenant

No I would sell because of illness or death, daughter can't rent out, upfront \$ to sell

No. They own the land and require a certain level of maintenance to meet park requirements. If those are already being met they shouldn't be able to require more of any individual.

To the extent that a neglected property may influence the overall appearance of the park, landlords should have some role in the property repair.

No, because my home doesn't need it. They should do the necessary work to their land before scrutinizing the interior. They aren't keeping up on their end. We keep up on our homes in our park overall because of having pride in our community.

It is not fair, there are already rules in place to keep our home and yards looking nice.

no

No

No. Other than maintaining the appearance of the house to the standards of the park (weed removal, trees trimmed, no peeling paint, etc.), it shouldn't be a condition to list the house for sale.

Should be decided between buyer and seller.

Keeping things looking nice and tidy is a help for the whole park. (There is a fine line on the eye of the beholder.)

no some are selling because they cant afford improvements. some buyers require repairs or reduced sale price.

No. If I own it, it is up to me to make it saleable. In over 55 parks, elderly and disabled people may not be physically able to do this and if on a fixed income, may not be able to afford to do this.

No - they don't have to pay for that. We don't have the income to make those improvements.

No. I can understand the desire to ask for it, though; my exterior affects not only my ability to sell, the value of the homes around me, and the general desirability of the park. I do feel that they have been illogically punitive to others, as I have heard through the grapevine.

No, it's my home

No

no

no

No. I am legally required to pay rent on the lot until I sell it. The landlord would be potentially increasing the cost burden on me while still requiring me to pay them rent. If I lacked the financial resources to make such improvements, the landlord could potentially require unrealistic improvements under the guise of "aesthetic" thereby forcing me to abandon the home to their possession, sale, and profit. Forced forfeiture.

The management at our park has an inspection of the exterior twice a year. I'm not sure whether this inspection is for code and safety or simply aesthetics but it seems intrusive. If they were willing to pay for the upkeep of the grounds around the houses then I suppose it would be fine. But as it is, the homeowner is required to meet their set of rules and do it at the homeowners expense and there's no obvious negotiable path.

No, the market will determine what improvements are needed

yes

No, if I am moving because I can not afford the site rental how would I change something just for aesthetic??

If the improvements they suggest falls under the rules of the park it should be done otherwise, not just to sell the property.

No/ the property is ours the ground is theres

Again, I feel landlords have NO say regarding the inside of the home because it's personal between seller and buyer!!

No I do not think it is fair. They only own the land.

In extreme cases, yes. The problem lies with who inspects the property. In our park, it is done by the manager, who does not have the experience or expertise to make some of the calls that are being made.

Example here: Several residents have painted their homes as they wish despite needing approval of management and adherence to a paint code. Management doesn't make exterior paint requirements clear or available. One person, I know was "required" to repaint. Home owner thumbed her nose.

Again, people on a fixed income may not be able to afford to make too many improvements.

Not Sure

in this particular situation the park has not maintained their own land so I don't believe they have any business telling an individual owner that they need to fix up their home. Also, in this case this part has 200+ homes and most of them are very well-maintained. People take pride in what they own. I just want the park to take care of what they need to take care of and maintain the land that they own.

No

We all have pride in our homes and our landscaping here in the park, so, no need to micro manage then homeowners.

I think that is unfair as it requires the seller to do something that the buyer may not want. For instance, painting and the buyer would like a different color.

Not relating to siding.

No

no

No, this is very subjective unless specific, written standing requirements have been established and agreed-to when purchased.

yes

We already have many aesthetic improvement requirements which are reviewed constantly by management. Some are not fair to the home owner.

No. I should be able to sell my house as is

I don't think its fair. People here cannot afford rent, never mind repairs

They require this type of thing all year round not just prior to selling.

I think that issue would be between the seller and the buyer

We'll know soon as we were just notified of an "immediate" inspection. It's none of their business. Aesthetics is the realm of the building owner. As long as there is not rot or damage (holes in siding, broken windows etc) it's the owners wallet that takes the beating. Never give the landlord the right to force whimsical changes on the building owner. NEVER!

The Owner is threatening to disallow anything she chooses; ie: Catios, patio furniture if she doesn't like it, fences previously approved - if she decides she doesn't like it.

no a buyer will tell you what they require. They have certain colors you can paint or do to your home which we own

Yes, it depends. Such as asking tenants to paint if they're willing to help with the cost

No

no

No

NO

No

No, that should be up to the seller and buyer.

no its my property and I can choose what to do before selling

NO other than ensuring that it's in decent condition. Once you've allowed a structure to be placed on the property no one else should have to be responsible to make those kind of changes unless the owner decides to do it themselves and at their cost.

Landlords should have no say on aesthetics of homes, if they don't like their lot they can fix that if they choose to.

I understand the landlords want to maintain the parks, and a buyer should review the rules about these. But the buyer and seller should agree on needed improvements within the park rules during the sale negotiations.

It is none of their business and would cost money we don't have to fix anything aesthetic to a home they have no say over. That is between buyer and seller

I do not feel landlords should require aesthetic improvements to my personal property. The grounds belong to the landlord but the home is mine.

No.

Because it seems to give the landlord the opportunity to be discriminatory.

Yes it is u fair, what if you cannot afford what they request. It should be between the seller & buyer? Our owner gets paid regardless, so it doesn't affect her. We have to pay monthly until the house is sold. She is not out any money so that should not be a stipulation. [1]

Depends on the type and expense for said improvements

No.

This is not fair, it should be up to the purchaser if they want to make improvements.

Depends on the rest of the park and what it's aesthetics look like. I do want sites looking nicer. My son lives in a park one mile away, and there are many places with junky cars or trash, etc. They hate it and management struggles to get it cleaned up.

I do not as long as the look is reasonable

No. If they're asking seniors to do this it creates a burden

No, it is inappropriate as we have maintenance requirements to stay here already. I have heard of residents that have had to deal with this. It's unfair!

Having had some estimates on window either sealing or replacing, siding replaced and metal roof *really want to get solar panels* it is expensive. One quote was as much as we paid for the whole of the home. One suggestion was to demo and get a new one. I would imagine folks needing to sell for being priced out would not be able to afford the aesthetic improvements. Relatives may not be financially either if the property was inherited. In our case the property changed hands for 10k to a lawyer I believe, we paid 115k. The woman, Nickerson, family was not involved in the transaction.

No, they do not own the home, only the land it sits on.

No

improvements to structure to make it sellable within reason.....most people make their opinions the law not looking at what actually needs to be done

I like others believe that if they are going to require us to pay these high lot fees that they need to care for the land ie. driveways and drainage

Not fair at all and creates a huge burden for seniors who need to sell their home

They want me to sign an addendum to a lease I never signed, which could require me to make aesthetic improvements to my home since it's over 20 years old. My home looks great, but they want homes with vinyl or fiber cement siding, shingled roofs etc. They also sent me a 2 year lease that still allows for rent increases. I don't understand it. If I don't deliver written objection along with 51% of residents, the changes will happen Feb. 1st

[1] Responder updated this value.