



Connecticut Manufactured Housing Association

---

Statement of Connecticut Manufactured Housing Association on:

SB 594, An Act Concerning Personal Property of Evicted Tenants  
and

SB 823, An Act Concerning The Recovery Of Municipal Expenses Incurred In The Removal,  
Storage And Sale Of Unclaimed Possessions And Personal Effects Of Evicted Tenants.

The Connecticut Manufactured Housing Association (CMHA) is a statewide association representing owners and operators of manufactured housing parks in Connecticut as well as manufacturers of homes and suppliers of goods and services for such homes. We are writing to express our opposition to SB 594, An Act Concerning Personal Property of Evicted Tenants and SB 823, An Act Concerning The Recovery Of Municipal Expenses Incurred In The Removal, Storage And Sale Of Unclaimed Possessions And Personal Effects Of Evicted Tenants.

While these bills appear to have been written with the contents of rental or storage units in mind, they apply nonetheless to manufactured homes as well. Whenever the owner of a manufactured home, who leases space from one of our member parks, is the subject of an eviction or abandonment proceeding, the subject of what to do with the home becomes an issue. Typically, homes in this position have little value. Nonetheless, they often have liens placed on them (sometimes for many years) by local tax collectors. Do you really contemplate turning ownership of such a home over to the park owner after 15 days? If we were to take ownership, would the tax lien be removed? Or, would the park owner inherit the back due tax liability?

Regarding SB 823, the same issue remains. If the home has delinquent taxes (it is rare to see a home evicted from a park or abandoned for which the home owner does not owe back taxes) it should fall to the municipality to hold on to the home which it considers collateral for the tax debt, not mandate that the park owner keep the home, empty and deteriorating, in his/her community. This proposed remedy is unfair to the park owner and the residents around the home in question.

The replacement of an abandoned or evicted home is of interest to all parties. A new home creates a much more pleasant community for the park residents, brings a responsible and desirable tenant to the park and generates greater property tax revenue to the town. To place such burdens on the back of the park owner, especially when the principal barrier to disposal of the home is often the town itself, seems most unfair.

We urge the committee to reject these bills at least until they can more reasonably address the hopefully unintended consequences that they pose for manufactured home parks throughout the state.

Joseph Mike  
Executive Director