

# Housing Committee

## JOINT FAVORABLE REPORT

**Bill No:** HB-5092 / [Bill Status](#) / [Public Hearing Testimony](#)

AN ACT PROTECTING RENTERS FROM RENT INCREASES UPON THE  
**Title:** TRANSFER OF RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY.

**Vote Date:** 3/10/2026

**Vote Action:** Joint Favorable Substitute

**PH Date:** 2/24/2026

**File No.:**

***Disclaimer:** The following JOINT FAVORABLE Report is prepared for the benefit of the members of the General Assembly, solely for purposes of information, summarization and explanation and does not represent the intent of the General Assembly or either chamber thereof for any purpose.*

### SPONSORS OF BILL:

The Governor's Office

### REASONS FOR BILL:

This bill aims to protect renters from excessive rent increases upon the transfer of residential property. With rising rent prices, finding affordable rent has become more difficult. The administration hopes that this bill will provide Fair Rent Commissions with an objective framework to determine whether rent increases are excessive, and in doing so, increase affordability and fairness in the housing system.

### SUBSTITUTE LANGUAGE:

The substitute language is a small technical correction, fixing grammar issues in lines 57-62. It aims to increase clarity and understanding of the legislation.

### RESPONSE FROM ADMINISTRATION/AGENCY:

[State of Connecticut, Ned Lamont, Governor](#) submitted testimony in support of the bill. He states that the bill is about balance, transparency, and fairness in the housing market, as housing is the foundation of family stability, educational success, workforce participation, and public health. He explains that finding affordable rent has become increasingly difficult with corporate landlords, and out of state landlords have inflated rental prices. As a result, these prices have harmed some of Connecticut's vulnerable populations. He states that the bill modernizes and clarifies the authority of Fair Rent Commissions to ensure that rent increases are not harsh while simultaneously recognizing the legitimate financial realities that property owners face. He believes this proposal affirms that rent increases must be justified, proportional, and fair.

[State of Connecticut Department of Housing, Seila Mosquera-Bruno, Commissioner](#)

expresses support for the legislation, believing that it can assist in stabilizing the housing market by allowing rent commissions to actionably recognize limits of a greater than 5% rent increase by new owners unless two or more significant improvements have been made to specific building systems is uncontainable and harsh. The Commissioner claims that with this recognition, affordability for housing can be comparable to many other states that have actioned such rent increase limits by new owners, in unison with local Fair Rent Commissions.

## **NATURE AND SOURCES OF SUPPORT:**

[CGA Commission on Women, Children, Seniors, Equity and Opportunity, Werner Oyanadel, Policy Director](#) submitted testimony in support of the legislation. He explains that the proposal allows increases tied to inflation and permits higher adjustments when substantial rehabilitation have occurred, while continuing to operate through the Fair Rent Commission structure. Oyanadel continues, stating that the bill does not prevent a commission from determining that a smaller increase is excessive under current law, making the legislation a targeted stabilization measure rather than a permanent rent control policy. He cites numerous statistics in his written testimony from Connecticut municipalities that demonstrate, in his opinion, that this bill is necessary and a measure that supports health and stability of Connecticut's communities. He concludes by stating that the proposal is a measured, data-driven policy to a clearly documented market dynamic.

[CT Tenants Union, Luke Melonakos, Vice President](#) submitted testimony in support of the legislation. He believes the bill is an important tool in protecting tenants from unaffordable rent hikes and disincentivizing harmful investment practices. He urges the committee to amend the bill to include Just Cause Eviction protections. He states that without those protections, it would risk even more no-fault non-renewals and evictions as a method for property owners to avoid what this bill aims to achieve.

These individuals from the Connecticut Fair Housing Center submitted joint testimony in support of the bill with an amendment. They ask that the bill be amended to clarify that the Fair Rent Commission could still disallow a smaller rent increase if it found it was harsh and unconscionable. Additionally, they urge the legislature to pass the bill along with Just Cause, as they believe it would ensure that new owners are not able to bypass protections on rent increases by using no-fault evictions to clear out buildings. They agree with the bill's intent, as they have witnessed corporate landlords purchase properties and quickly spike rents. They note that Fair Rent Commissions are crucial against large rent increases, but the proposed legislation would be more efficient if passed:

[Connecticut Fair Housing Center, Sarah White, Attorney](#)

[Connecticut Fair Housing Center, Chelsea Connery, Attorney](#)

[Connecticut Legal Services, Raphael Podolsky, Attorney and Policy Advocate](#) submitted testimony in support of this legislation with a clarifying amendment. He stated that for consistency, line 60 should be changed to read: "it shall not order an increase greater than". He noted that this would enable a fair rent commission to reject a small increase or reduce rents if the owner fails to comply with code enforcement orders or maintain the property, or if

the increase is otherwise unfair. He adds that the word “greater” could be changed in lines 41 and 61 to “lesser”. He advises that the bill could be written as an overall rule, rather than as a standard for fair rent commissions. He expressed that only a very small percentage of tenants who are faced with an unconscionable rent increase ever file a complaint with a fair rent commission.

[Brooke Ramlakhan](#) submitted testimony in support of this legislation noting tenants deserve protections from undesirable circumstances in rental purchases.

[Town of Guilford Planning and Zoning and Affordable Housing Commission, Larry Rizzolo, Member](#) submitted testimony in support of this legislation sharing that it does not create an undue burden, as landlords are allowed to increase rents commensurate with increases in the cost of living and renovations made to the property. Larry expressed that this legislation would help in minimizing homelessness while ensuring safe housing. Larry submitted a [second testimony](#).

[Friendship Service Center, Inc., Caitlin Rose, CEO](#) submitted testimony in support of this legislation noting her personal experience of a high increase in her rent but being unable to go to her Fair Rent Commission, as it would be considered a new lease negotiation. She stated that while not all landlords are bad actors, in a free market economy, those with resources always win and that power imbalance is why the state has more people experiencing homelessness than ever before. She emphasized that legislation is necessary to ensure that price gouging for the sake of price gouging with no repercussions stops.

[The Housing Collective, Beth Sabilia, Director for Housing Opportunity Eastern Connecticut](#) submitted testimony in support of this legislation noting that many residents she works with are older adults living on fixed incomes, and some faced the possibility of homelessness for the first time because they could not absorb sudden rent increases or find comparable housing. She noted that while it is encouraging to see residents come together to fight unfair rent increases, they should not have to organize and fight to simply stay housed. She stated that this legislation can help preserve affordability without any new spending. She expressed this bill would also provide peace of mind and security that we all deserve by establishing modest baseline protections for the one-third of Connecticut residents who rent their home.

[Connecticut Tenants Union, Hannah Srajer, President](#) submitted testimony in support of this legislation but emphasized the importance of it being paired with Just Cause, otherwise there is a risk of it worsening the incentivization of more mass no-fault evictions as a way for landlords to evade the 5% rent cap.

[Anonymous, Anonymous](#) supports this legislation claiming that it would provide research proposed in the article, "The Affordable Rental Housing Crisis and Population Health Equity: a Multidimensional and Multilevel Framework" (2023). The respondent believes, given the paper's conclusions that this bill can create solutions to housing shortages felt in Connecticut.

[Anonymous, Anonymous](#) supports this legislation claiming that many young people between the ages of 18-30 who, according to this respondent, need more affordable housing options to become independent members of society without massive financial barriers.

[Open Communities Alliance, Victoria Asfalq, Policy and Data Analyst](#) supports this legislation claiming that it can act as an expansion of tenant protections amidst a housing crisis.

[Connecticut Tenants Association, Jared Cavagnuolo](#) submitted testimony in support of this bill.

[Connecticut Voices for Children, Carmen Clarkin et al., Special Assistant for Strategic Initiatives](#) submitted testimony supporting this bill, citing the low vacancy rates, rising rents, and prevalence of cost burdening for households in Connecticut. They support this bill as a protection for renters.

[Hillary Desideraggio, Resident](#) submitted testimony in support of this bill, emphasizing their strong support for tenants' rights and safeguards.

[Parkridge Tenants Union, Gerene Freeman, Chapter Vice President](#) submitted testimony in support of this bill.

[Partnership for Strong Communities, Sean Ghio, Policy Director](#) supports this bill and urged the committee to amend it to include all municipalities, not just those with fair rent commissions.

[Scott Guertin](#) offered testimony in support of this bill, citing concerns about rising homelessness.

[Kristian Hart](#) offered their support for this bill and housing as a human right, detailing their personal experience with homelessness.

[RJ Hinds, Tenant](#) submitted testimony supporting this bill and tenants' rights, citing their own experiences with increasing rent.

[Connecticut Tenants Union, Calder Hudson](#) testified in support of this bill, though they suggested that S.B. 257 is needed to accompany it and prevent landlords from using no fault evictions to circumvent this bill's provisions.

[Connecticut Tenants Union, Benjamin Hurley, Stonegate Chapter Vice President](#) supports this bill, but caution that without S.B. 257 it may unintentionally worsen Connecticut's housing crisis.

[Greater Hartford Gives Foundation](#) submitted testimony supporting this bill's efforts to protect renters from unfair cost burdening. They suggested that guidance be provided to Fair Rent Commissions in determining appropriate rent increases in instances where major renovations have not been completed.

The following submitted general support for the bill:

[Teamsters Local 191, Jason Ruiz, Member](#)  
[Braedyn Inmon](#)

## **NATURE AND SOURCES OF OPPOSITION:**

[Roberta Lauria](#) submitted testimony in opposition of the bill. She believes the bill will cause issues for both renters and landlords. As prices rise, Lauria believes that it is unreasonable not to expect property owners to raise rents to cover rising costs.

[Garen Mirzoian](#) submitted testimony in opposition to the bill. They believe the bill to be reactionary and that it can adversely impact the state's real estate values. Additionally, they state that the legislation can be an obstacle for those who wish to purchase or sell their real estate in Connecticut.

[Michele Onofrio](#) submitted testimony in opposition to HB 5092. She believes the bill is too broad and would allow Fair Rent Commissions to overstep their authority. She states that the language can harm small property owners, and disincentivize new investors from buying and renovating older properties.

[Gabrielle Peters](#) submitted testimony in opposition to the bill. Peters states that the bill is a rent control on new buyers, which could discourage property sales, reduce housing supply, and risk a broader market collapse. She urges the committee to pursue balanced approaches to encourage property investment while safeguarding tenants and notes her opposition to the bill.

[Jason Voorhees, Small Landlord](#) submitted testimony in opposition to the bill. He states his belief that the legislation is a form of rent control on new buyers, the per unit upgrade requirement is too high, and there will be a negative impact on property valuation and comparable sales.

[Z Wang](#) submitted testimony in opposition to the proposed legislation. He is concerned that the bill's language will destabilize the state's residential real estate market and freeze the capital needed to maintain aging housing stock.

[Shulem Perl](#) submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation noting that it would create additional restrictions on housing providers that will reduce housing availability and hurt tenants. Shulem noted that when landlords face increased regulation, financial uncertainty, or limitations on how they manage risk, many small property owners reconsider staying in the rental market, which can result in fewer rental units available, and when supply decreases, it can force prices to rise. Shulem posited that this legislation could increase operating costs, increase risk, and discourage responsible investment in housing. He emphasized that if legislation unintentionally pushes small and mid-sized landlords out of the market, tenants will face tighter supply, reduced choice, and higher overall costs.

[HBRA of CT, Jim Perras, CEO](#) submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation noting that it makes underwriting acquisitions far more difficult and increases financial risk. Jim notes that fewer properties will trade hands, fewer improvements will be made, and more housing will remain undercapitalized and deteriorating. He noted that this legislation fails to consider real-world operating costs that routinely rise following a transfer of ownership. He expressed that this legislation creates a perverse incentive to avoid reinvestment or delay necessary upgrades, which directly harms the long-term condition of the housing stock. He emphasized that protecting tenants and stabilizing housing markets requires policies that encourage

reinvestment, rehabilitation, and responsible ownership, not measures that penalize ownership transitions.

[Rick Poulin](#) submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation sharing he is concern about the increased regulatory burden without corresponding support. He noted that this legislation would reduce predictability in rental operations, shifts financial risk to housing providers, and negatively impacts housing supply. He stated that there is a need for balanced policy to ensure tenant protections and landlord rights both remain intact. He emphasized that the state benefits from policies that protect vulnerable tenants while also maintaining a healthy and functional rental housing environment.

[Hongying Qian](#) submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation sharing that it would discourage investment, distorts property valuations, and introduces systemic financial risk. They note that this would likely reduce supply and limit capital availability.

[Lawrence Rabago](#) submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation stating a new investor may purchase a property with the intention of investing significant capital to modernize units. He says that investment is typically based on the expectation that, after improvements, rents can gradually reflect the upgraded condition of the building. He stated that under this legislation, the financial incentive to purchase and rehabilitate the property disappears. He added that the fifty-thousand-dollar threshold is not realistic, especially when units are occupied. He pointed out when valuations decline, lenders reassess risk, which can restrict capital availability for future housing investment.

[CTAA, Dondre Roberts, Member](#) submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation sharing that limiting rent increases makes it harder for new owners to stabilize operating costs. He points out that many housing providers keep rents below market for long-term tenants, prioritizing stability, and good relationships. He noted that when properties change ownership, adjustments sometimes reflect operating costs that have been deferred for years. He stated this legislation would reduce investment, slow rehabilitation and turnover of rental housing and limit availability for tenants.

[Jacob Rocco](#) submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation noting that as a landlord he has always charged fair rent but has been able to do so because he had reasonable options to mitigate his risk. He stated that removing tools to manage that risk will make small landlords less willing to be flexible and be more cautious when selecting tenants. He added that this would incentivize small landlords to sell to larger companies while they can.

[Jorge Rodriguez](#) submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation stating that increased compliance costs for housing providers are passed to tenants through higher rents. He noted that small landlords may sell or convert their properties. He added that market conditions should determine rent. He pointed out that further rent regulations will price out small landlords from acquiring rental properties and shift wealth into the hands of large corporations, preventing ordinary people with ordinary incomes from entering the real estate market.

[Tzvee Rotberg](#) submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation noting that it discourages reinvestment. They note that without the ability to reasonably adjust rents, necessary improvements will be delayed or abandoned thereby harming housing quality.

[Richard Sadlon](#) submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation noting that housing providers want to provide affordable housing but also need to remain competitive in the market and pay their bills and mortgages. He noted that expenses go up every year, and if landlords cannot keep up, they need to raise rents or sell. Richard added that if a prospective buyer does not see a valid investment opportunity, the property will remain vacant or unsellable. He pointed out that banks will have limited supply of capital to lend. He emphasized that private housing providers need to treat their properties as businesses, while providing a service to the community.

[Eric Amodio, Local Landlord](#) opposes this legislation claiming that requiring \$50,000 in repairs to justify an over 5% increase in rent by new owners is not sound policy. They claim that, with a family occupying the dwelling, such labor could carry on without unduly disturbing the tenant, causing property values to go down as such repairs are not completed due to. According to this respondent, the foreseen lack of lending potential caused by such a requirement.

[Via Real Estate, Peter Anderson, Real Estate Broker](#) opposes this legislation claiming that it would, in their view, put a barrier to them providing good service to their customers.

[Anonymous, Anonymous](#) opposes this legislation claiming that a requirement for renovations over \$50,000 would need to be done in vacant units and is fiscally unrealistic to small landlords, negatively affecting the housing market and property value.

[Richard Bouvier](#) opposes this legislation claiming that it could reduce available housing in the state and would overburden small landlords of multi-family homes and apartments.

[Simon Brecher](#) opposes this legislation claiming that it would lower landlords' ability to manage their property and, " If landlords cannot protect their investment, we will screen more strictly, approve fewer tenants, and avoid improvements. The result? Fewer options and higher barriers for tenants."

[MCR Property Management Company, Inc., Gabrielle Armstrong, General Manager](#) opposes this legislation claiming that it risks disincentivizing reinvestment into properties, creating market uncertainty, and increased regulatory inconsistencies dictated by rent commissions across municipalities.

[Anonymous, Anonymous](#) opposes this legislation claiming that it would, "[Add] time, cost, and uncertainty to operating rental property." Which are unrealistic to expect small to medium sized landlord to comply with financially.

[Joshua Schechter](#) submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation noting he cares about his tenants and wants to provide stable housing, but this legislation limits landlords' ability to manage risk and maintain properties. He stated if landlords cannot protect their investment, they will screen more strictly, approve fewer tenants, and avoid improvements.

[Isaac Schwartz](#) submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation noting that when properties are sold, new owners deal with many costs and limiting rent increases discourages

investment in properties. He stated that if buyers avoid purchasing or improving homes, tenants will have older, poorly maintained housing.

[Nikoll Selca](#) submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation sharing that operating costs reflect contemporary valuation including financing, insurance, and taxes. Nikoll noted that if this legislation is passed, transactions become financially unworkable, investment slows, property improvements decline, and supply tightens. Nikoll added that the state needs more housing investment, not policy that discourages capital.

[CT Coalition of Property Owners John Souza, President](#) submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation noting that there are already fair rent commissions to dispute proposed rent increases. John stated that rent caps would deter potential buyers from properties that need the repairs and advises the committee not to encourage investor buyers to go to other states.

[Middlesex County Chamber of Commerce, Haley Stafford, PR Coordinator](#) submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation sharing that limiting rent adjustments creates uncertainty for potential buyers and can complicate financing, since lenders rely on predictable rental income when underwriting mortgages. She stated that this could also reduce the number of investors willing to purchase properties that require rehabilitation or reinvestment. Haley shared that this restriction could discourage the purchase and improvement of older housing stock that is essential to maintaining safe and habitable rental units.

[Ralph Harris](#) oppose this bill, stating that most landlords are families. They warn that increasing the risk assumed by landlords will decrease the number of people willing to rent to tenants.

[Tara Hawley](#) submitted testimony opposed to this bill. They state that the \$50,000 threshold for significant renovations is unrealistic, and that the bill places undue risk on landlords. They warn that this will limit the number of people willing to buy rental properties, lead to lower-quality housing, and limit housing supply, harming landlords and tenants alike.

[Connecticut Realtors, Jim Heckman, General Counsel](#) opposes this bill, warning that the \$50,000 benchmark for significant renovations is impossible to meet with an existing tenant in the unit. They state that new owners may be forced to maintain below-market rent offered to tenants out of personal generosity by the previous owner, and caution that this bill would lead to greater disrepair in Connecticut's housing supply.

[Himmelstein Financial, Paul Himmelstein, Owner](#) submitted testimony in opposition to this bill. They state that rent increase restrictions will cause buyers to avoid purchasing properties most in need of repair, citing the cost of renovations.

[JMJ Connecticut Property Management, Jan Maria Jagush, Owner](#) offered testimony in opposition to this bill. They state that rising costs necessitate rent increases and oppose this bill's restrictions.

[Paul Januszewski](#) oppose this bill, stating that rent increase limits will cause buyers to avoid properties in need of repair and result in the loss of rental housing units. They state that fair rent commissions already exist to settle rent increase disputes.

[Levi Judquin, Landlord](#) submitted testimony opposing this bill. They state that new owners face higher costs and that limits to rent increase will discourage investment, leading to worse conditions for tenants.

[Paredim Communities, Morgan Oleksiak, Leasing Consultant](#) offered testimony in opposition, cautioning that this bill will discourage investment in existing housing and hurt the quality of Connecticut's rental housing supply. They cite the high cost of insurance, utilities, maintenance, and taxes, stating that this bill's restrictions on rent increases may prevent improvements to rental housing.

The following submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation sharing that it would act as de facto rent control by tying new owners to existing rents, which would prevent market-based adjustments without approval from Fair Rent Commissions. They stated that the fifty-thousand-dollar threshold for unit upgrades is unworkable and makes compliance nearly impossible. They noted that this combined with Just Cause would deliver a double blow to the rental market. They expressed that small housing providers would exit the market, reduce overall inventory, and push rents higher for remaining options, which would exacerbate the affordability crisis. They pointed out that banks holding mortgages on devalued properties would find loan balances exceeding current market values, forcing them to allocate capital into loan loss reserves during audits:

[Gabrielle Peters](#)

[Eric M. Polinsky](#)

[Tara Ramlal](#)

[Connecticut Project Action Fund, Sana Shah, Director of Policy and Advocacy](#)

[Greater Hartford Legal Aid, Giovanna Shay, Litigation & Advocacy Director](#)

[Peter Sosnow](#)

The following submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation noting when properties change hands, the new owners can inherit deferred maintenance and rising costs. They noted that restricting rent flexibility discourages reinvestment in aging housing stock. They expressed that capital flows where it is treated fairly, and the state cannot afford to deter that:

[David Patel, Landlord](#)

[David Patel, Small Landlord](#)

[David Patel](#)

These members of CTAA submitted similar testimony in opposition to the bill. They state that while they appreciate the intent of the bill, they are concerned that the bill will negatively impact long-term quality of rental stock in Connecticut. They believe it creates a cap on rent, therefore limiting a new owner's ability to bring rents in line with market conditions or cover operating costs. They believe the bill will create uncertainty and discourage investment:

[CTAA, Brian Lemire, Senior Director of Operations](#)

[CTAA, Morgan Miller](#)

[CUE Residential, Dassy Kaufman, CFO](#)

[CTAA, Judy Kechejian, Compliance Manager](#)  
[Cue Residential, John Murillo, Maintenance Supervisor](#)  
[Paredim Communities, Stephanie Neill, Property Manager](#)  
[CTAA, Nakita Norton](#)  
[Morgan Olesiak](#)  
[Paredim Properties, David Parisier, Managing Director](#)  
[CTAA, Kaila Parsons, Assistant Property Manager](#)  
[Eric Pentore, Senior Managing Director](#)  
[Building and Land Technology, Ryan Stone, Asset Manager](#)  
[Lauren Tagliatela, Volunteer](#)  
[Carrie Rowley](#)  
[MCR – Groton Estates, Christina Baxter, Property Manager](#)  
[Eagle Rock Apartments at West Hartford, Diana Bisson, Community Manager](#)  
[Matis Dier](#)  
[Landlord Law Firm, Robert Chesson, Managing Partner](#)  
[360 State, Shannon Colon, Assistant Community Manager](#)  
[Greenbriar Hills Apartments, Maria Dacunha, Property Manager](#)  
[The Connecticut Apartment Association, Jessica Doll, Executive Director](#)  
[Cue Residential, Scott Ferguson, Property Manager](#)  
[Trio Properties, Jeff Feron, President](#)  
[Eagle Rock Properties, Cenobia Garvey, Property Manager](#)  
[MCR Property Management, Shelly Gosselin, Regional Manager](#)  
[360 State, Kyle Huckle, Community Manager](#)

These individuals submitted similar testimony opposing the legislation. They believe that the bill would make it more difficult to invest and improve existing housing:

[Marcus-Millichap, Westly Klockner, Managing Director](#)  
[IPA Northeast, Victor Nolletti](#)

These individuals submitted testimony in general opposition of the bill:

[Shuly Lieber](#)  
[White Oak Holdings, Rachel Meyer, Owner](#)  
[Cue Residential, David Klein](#)  
[Evon Muschinsky](#)  
[Paul Ostrowski](#)  
[Abraham Steinmetz](#)  
[Hilary Stoudt](#)  
[Justin Sudol](#)  
[Spencer Weinkle](#)  
[Jen Wells](#)  
[Yong Yan, Owner](#)  
[Bo Yang](#)  
[Tracy Yang](#)  
[Selina Rifkin](#)  
[Daniel S](#)  
[Manny Santos](#)

**GENERAL COMMENTS:**

[LeadingAge CT, Mag Morelli, President](#) submitted testimony with general comments on the bill. They ask the committee that the Managed Residential Community (MRC) be exempt from this proposal. MRCs are residential properties registered with the Department of Health that provide residents with assisted living services. Morelli explains that the legislature passed legislation in 2024 (Public Act 24-39) regarding MRC ownership transfers and rate increases. Therefore, they do not believe there is a demonstrated need for additional legislation and request exemption.

These individuals provided general comments regarding the bill:  
[CT Tenants Union, Serge Lindor](#)

**Reported by: Michael Flynn  
Tyler Fisher  
Tom Atwood  
Kyle Lowry**

**Date: 03/25/2026**