

# General Law Committee JOINT FAVORABLE REPORT

**Bill No:** HB-5226 / [Bill Status](#) / [Public Hearing Testimony](#)

AN ACT CONCERNING MOBILE MANUFACTURED HOMES AND MOBILE  
**Title:** MANUFACTURED HOME PARKS.

**Vote Date:** 3/16/2026

**Vote Action:** Joint Favorable Substitute

**PH Date:** 2/23/2026

**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

General Law Committee

## REASONS FOR BILL

Rep. Martinez brought this proposal to the committee's attention with the intent of continuing work done in the 2025 legislative session toward establishing stronger consumer protections for mobile home park residents. The bill incorporates much of the version of [2025 HB 5428](#) that passed the House with bipartisan support, and the raised bill included new protections with respect to portfolio sales. The main provisions of the bill include the following:

- Giving mobile home parks the option to join regional fair rent commissions.
- Requiring disclosure of various ancillary and penalty fees.
- Updating the relocation assistance amount from \$10,000 to \$20,000.
- Requiring the Department of Consumer Protection (DCP) to acknowledge receipt of a complaint regarding a mobile manufactured park.
- Increase notice of a rent increase from 30 to 60 days.

## SUBSTITUTE LANGUAGE

The substitute language (LCO 3233) responds to concerns raised in public hearing testimony by removing the provisions regarding portfolio sales. It also changes the notice requirement for a rent increase. The raised bill changes it from 30 to 90 days, but the substitute language changes it from 30 to 60 days.

## RESPONSE FROM ADMINISTRATION/AGENCY

[William Tong, Attorney General, State of Connecticut](#) submitted written testimony in support of the bill, stating that it includes provisions aimed at better protecting mobile

manufactured home residents from unfair practices by some mobile home park owners. He notes that these protections have become increasingly needed as parks are being sold to various out-of-state investors who increase fees but neglect park infrastructure. Attorney Tong strongly supports the "right of first refusal" that allows residents to match an offer when their park is being sold. He refers to the provisions about "portfolio transactions" as a way to close a loophole in existing law.

## **NATURE AND SOURCES OF SUPPORT**

[\*\*Christine Cohen, State Senator, Connecticut General Assembly\*\*](#) testified in support of the bill, noting that many of her constituents live in mobile manufactured home parks. Sen. Cohen explains that because these residents own their homes but rent their lot within a park, they are particularly vulnerable to sudden and/or unfair increases in costs. She testifies that while current Fair Rent Commission (FRC) statutes allow regional commissions to be formed, they do not require them. In addition, smaller municipalities are not required to create their own FRCs. Sen. Cohen argues that requiring Councils of Governments (COGs) to establish regional commissions extends access to residents of smaller towns while also giving larger municipalities the option to use the specialized commission for mobile home park issues. She adds comments in support of the bill's measures aimed at increasing transparency and accountability.

[\*\*Jim Heckman, General Counsel, Connecticut REALTORS\*\*](#) submitted written testimony in support of HB 5226. They write that increasing the notice for rent increases is reasonable and important.

[\*\*Amy Peltier, Coalition and Advocacy Director, Partnership for Strong Communities\*\*](#) submitted written testimony in support of the bill. Her testimony states that Partnership for Strong Communities supports HB 5226 because it ensures access to FRCs for residents of mobile home parks in towns with fewer than 15,000 residents, and it empowers residents who wish to purchase a mobile home park when it is offered for sale. The bulk of the written testimony focuses on describing the history of FRCs in Connecticut and explaining how they currently function.

[\*\*Albert Hricz, Vice President, Connecticut Manufactured Homeowners Alliance\*\*](#) echoes the support for regional fair rent commissions expressed in the previous testimony. He adds that he supports the proposed changes regarding portfolio sales, stating, "Residents should only have to get financing FOR the community they live in."

[\*\*Raphael Podolsky, Attorney and Policy Advocate, Connecticut Legal Services, Inc.\*\*](#) wrote and spoke in support of HB 5226. His written testimony focuses on two provisions: regional FRCs and modifications to portfolio sales. Podolsky testifies that existing law will leave residents in 21 towns with mobile home parks without access to an FRC, and the bill seeks to remedy that situation. His written testimony offers what he refers to as "simpler approach" to structuring regional FRCs. With respect to portfolio sales, Podolsky notes that requiring a separate price to be disclosed for each park would bring Connecticut in line with Maine, New Jersey, Massachusetts, and other states. He writes, "Residents neither can nor want to buy any park other than their own." According to Podolsky, the two "most serious" efforts to purchase Connecticut parks in the last two years were made impossible by sellers

who included the parks in portfolios. Podolsky adds a statement in support of the bill's other provisions, which passed the House 132-16 in 2025 but died in the Senate.

[Dave Delohery, Mobile Manufactured Home Advisory Council](#) testified that he supports the expansion of Fair Rent Commissions and elimination of what he refers to as the "portfolio exemption." Delohery argues that access to regional FRCs is critical for mobile home park residents, citing hundreds of active complaints in towns with functioning FRCs. He notes that many residents live in towns that are too small to require FRCs, and he testifies that municipal leaders in two small towns have resisted forming an FRC. With regard to the "portfolio exemption," Delohery relays a story regarding residents' unsuccessful attempts to purchase six parks in eastern Connecticut. His written testimony contains supplemental details regarding eventual real estate transactions with a corporate buyer. Overall, Delohery urges the committee to vote favorably on the bill.

[Nora Gosselin, Director of Acquisitions, Cooperative Development Institute \(CDI\)](#) testified in support of the bill, with her comments focusing on portfolio transactions. Gosselin states that in portfolio sales, owners are not required to give a price allocation for each property being sold. She testifies that she worked with residents of Little Valley MHC in Norwich who were trying to purchase their community. Their park was being sold along with five others, but Little Valley was the only group interested in making a purchase. Gosselin states that the residents' offer for their own park was rejected, as they were not offering to buy the others. Gosselin argues that the portfolio sales provisions of HB 5226 would have protected those residents, and she notes that such changes would bring Connecticut law in line with that of several neighboring states.

[Darrell K. Fennell](#) is a member of the Middletown Fair Rent Commission and a member of the state Network of Fair Rent Commissioners. He testified solely in his individual capacity in support of HB 5226. Fennell writes that moving expenses for mobile home parks are "astronomical," which ensures that mobile home park owners are not subject to market pressures to keep prices fair. He argues that the expansion of FRCs is critical to addressing the state's housing shortage.

**Thirty-one residents of mobile home parks** testified in support of the HB 5226, sharing stories about how they have been personally impacted by rent increases. The residents express concern about the size of rent increases, and many comment on lack of maintenance of park infrastructure.

## **GENERAL COMMENTS**

[Elyssa Romero, Connecticut Statewide Fair Rent Commissions Network](#) testified to comment on the bill. She writes that her testimony is not in opposition to the bill but is instead requesting clarification on several matters:

- Must regional FRCs be formed through COGs, or can municipalities form other regional agreements?
- Are municipalities permitted to join a regional FRC for mobile home matters but retain their own FRC for other cases? The Network argues that municipalities should be allowed to maintain their own FRCs if they choose to.

- May complainants who receive a ruling from a regional FRC seek one from a municipal one? The Network encourages the committee to clarify procedure and jurisdictional questions.

**Francis Pickering, Executive Director, Western Council of Governments (WestCOG)**

testified to request clarification regarding the legal status of any potential regional FRCs. They note that municipal FRCs and their members are given certain immunity from tort liability. If regional FRCs are going to operate, WestCOG argues that it should be made clear that regional commissions, commissioners, staff, and participating municipalities have the same protections as if they were running their own commission.

**NATURE AND SOURCES OF OPPOSITION**

**Mark Asnes, President, Connecticut Manufactured Housing Association (CMHA)**

testified in opposition to parts of HB 5226, with certain modifications suggested.

- Regional FRCs—Asnes states that CMHA does not oppose expanding access to FRCs to mobile home park residents. However, he requests that park owners receive representation on these commissions. Asnes also requests that commission members be required to undergo training that is specific to manufactured home communities.
- Fee disclosures—Asnes testifies that CMHA does not oppose this section, as fees should already be disclosed within a lease.
- Relocation expenses—Asnes writes that CMHA does not oppose the updates to these amounts. According to Asnes, only two parks have closed over the past several decades.
- DCP complaint acknowledgement—CMHA does not oppose the acknowledgement of complaints, but they insist that they remain confidential while being adjudicated.
- Notice of rent increase—CMHA characterizes the current notice requirement of 45 days as more reasonable and would prefer to keep the existing standard over moving to 90 days. However, they testify that they would support moving to 60 days.
- Portfolio sales—CMHA expresses strong opposition to these provisions, arguing that they negotiated "right of first refusal" provisions about two years ago and approached those negotiations in good faith.

**Adrian Furlotte, Managing Partner, Parkwood Communities** and **Scott Gladstone, Freehold Real Estate** echo the sentiments expressed in CMHA's testimony.

**Lesli Gooch, CEO, Manufactured Housing Institute (MHI)** testified to raise concerns similar to those in CMHA's testimony regarding regional FRCs, notice of rent increases, and portfolio sales. However, MHI's testimony declines to comment on fee disclosures, relocation expenses, and DCP complaint acknowledgement.

**Sean Dizenzo, Owner-Operator, Colchester West LLC** testified in opposition to all of the bill's provisions, as he believes that current statutory protections for manufactured home residents are sufficient. He argues that HB 5226 may unintentionally increase costs for homeowners. Dizenzo argues that FRCs increase compliance costs and make the system more adversarial rather than cooperative. He objects to provisions regarding disclosures, rent increases, and complaints, as he believes that added statutory requirements would impair owners' ability to respond to changing conditions. Dizenzo argues that the provisions

regarding relocation assistance and portfolio sales will make park ownership too risky and reduce availability of this housing option.

**Ken Hoddinott, Park Owner** testified in opposition to HB 5226, stating that his own rent increases have been reasonable, but that increases are necessary to maintain a park's infrastructure. He objects to any changes to the "right of first refusal," characterizing them as unfair. He writes, "I feel that we resolved this issue in the past and there are more important issues that lawmakers should be addressing other than this."

**Betsy Gara, Executive Director, Connecticut Council of Small Towns (COST)** testified in opposition to Section 1 of HB 5226. COST's primary concern is with the expense associated with requiring all towns to create FRCs. Gara notes that towns are already dedicating resources to complying with Public Act 25-1 from the November Special Session.

**Samuel Gold, Executive Director, Lower Connecticut River Valley Council of Governments** testified in opposition to HB 5226 but with comments focusing on regional FRCs. They argue that the language would eliminate an existing exemption for small towns and would impose significant costs on small towns.

**Matthew Hart, Executive Director, Capitol Region Council of Governments** testified in opposition to HB 5226. He notes that although the recently passed housing bill, SS PA 25-1, An Act Concerning Housing Growth, gives municipalities the option to join an FRC hosted by a COG, he is unsure how many towns would choose to join a regional commission. He expresses skepticism regarding claims that local FRCs are not equipped to handle mobile home park complaints. Hart raises concerns regarding the cost to small towns who would have to support regional FRCs. Alternatively, he suggests directing educational resources to municipal FRCs so that they are ready to handle mobile home park complaints.

**Zachary McKeown, Advocacy Manager, Connecticut Conference of Municipalities** testified in opposition to Section 1 of the bill, which pertains to regional FRCs and mobile home parks. McKeown argues that municipalities need to focus on implementing new requirements associated with Public Act 25-1, and he requests that the committee remove this section of the bill.

**Michael Weiss** testified in opposition to HB 5226, arguing that mobile home park owners and residents/advocates should be equally represented on regional FRCs.

**Peter Black, Chair, Branford Fair Rent Commission** testified in opposition to HB 5226, stating that his reading of the bill is that it eliminates local FRCs.

**Reported by: Betsy Francolino**

**Date: March 24, 2026**