

To Whom it May Concern,

From: Arthur D. Mazeau
President, Connecticut Manufactured Home Owners Alliance
229 Killingworth Turnpike Lot #17
Clinton, Ct. 06413

Consider this as testimony to support HB-7031, but with the following inclusions:

1. Wording that would include the same type of situation between the owners of Mobile Manufactured Homes, and the owners or management teams that manage where they reside.
2. The fact is that while different, Mobile Manufactured Housing is more similar than different from condominium living.
3. The fact is, that when disputes arise between the owners of a Manufactured Mobile Home that resides in a manufactured mobile home park, the end result can be the same as a foreclosure.
4. The fact is, that eviction from a mobile manufactured home park is the equivalent of eviction, as it is nearly impossible to relocate the property of the home owner into another park.
5. The fact is, that both in Condominium living, and Manufactured Mobile home park living situations, the resident can be removed from their home during a dispute, and that neither one is able to take the home with them.
6. The fact is that both home owners are subject to potentially a great deal of monetary loss.
7. The fact is that in many cases, in a Mobile manufactured Home Park, the owner or management team of that park, will often use the threat of eviction to force their will upon the home owner.

As the President of The Connecticut Manufactured Home Owners Alliance (the only advocacy group recognized by the State of Connecticut) and as an appointed member of the Mobile Manufactured Homes Advisory Council, I deal with similar situations very often, except that instead of condominium; with mobile manufactured homes. In many cases, the home owner catches the displeasure of the management or owner of the park where they reside. In my case personally, I caught the displeasure by refusing to sign a lease renewal when I found out that it contained illegal language in it, that violated the statutes. I was promptly served with a notice to quit.

The notice to quit, also failed to satisfy the statutes, and I was forced to file a complaint with the Department of Consumer Protection. The complaint process is long, confusing, and leaves the home owner with no say in the matter once it has begun, as it then becomes a case between the State and the Park owner. By virtue of attending meetings of the manufactured Mobile Homes Advisory Council, I was able to get information and support from the council and the Department of Consumer Protection, which was an advantage that the average home owner might not be able to do.

After reading the purpose of this bill, I decided that this may be a format that could also be used to assist Manufactured Mobile Home Owners and their park owners and management teams in solving disputes. Since the two entities are so similar in nature and consequence, I wanted to bring this up before the legislature by adding this information to the submitted testimony.

So in closing,

Please take the information and thoughts I have provided and try to find a way that either may be able to include them, or submit them to another committee to see if there is anything that can be done to help the Mobile Manufactured Home Owners in the State of Connecticut in the same manner.

Respectfully,

Arthur D. Mazeau

President
CMHOA
Cmhoa.org

President@cmhoa.org