

# Housing Committee JOINT FAVORABLE REPORT

**Bill No.:** HB-6949  
AN ACT CONCERNING A LANDLORD'S ABILITY TO ENTER A DWELLING  
**Title:** UNIT.  
**Vote Date:** 3/6/2025  
**Vote Action:** Joint Favorable Substitute  
**PH Date:** 2/18/2025  
**File No.:** 234

***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:**

Housing Committee

## **REASONS FOR BILL:**

The bill would establish a six-day waiting period for a landlord to receive consent from an occupying tenant to enter their unit. To ensure the tenant has an opportunity to schedule a visit with the landlord and for the landlord to have proper access to their unit, six days will be considered as a reasonable response time from the tenant.

The bill was passed out of committee with substitute language that extended this response period from six to fourteen days.

## **RESPONSE FROM ADMINISTRATION/AGENCY:**

None expressed.

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

### [John Souza, Connecticut Coalition of Property Owners, President:](#)

John Souza supported the bill with changes. Souza requested, "a better, quicker solution," because the bill, as written, means "the only remedy would be court action if the tenant won't cooperate" with the landlord's request to enter the unit.

### [Bob De Cosmo, CT Property Owners Alliance, Manager:](#)

Bob De Cosmo supported the bill because it solves a common problem landlords encounter when trying to gain access to units: "[m]any times, a tenant will call code enforcement to get the landlord in trouble, often to retaliate for an eviction being started but then refuse to let the

landlord's maintenance people in to do repairs." De Cosmo requested a change to the bill stating after six days, "a landlord shall be allowed to enter the unit to make the repairs and tenant consent is not required."

[Paul Januszewski, Greater Enfield Landlord Association, Chair:](#)

Paul Januszewski supported the bill as "it puts a time frame on the issue of an uncooperative tenant that complains about maintenance or other issues but then restricts the ability to remedy the complaint." Januszewski insisted changes are necessary since it lacks clarity on what the landlord can do after the six days have passed. The bill also does not address urgent maintenance issues as an extenuating circumstance for the landlord to enter.

[Jim Perras, Homebuilders and Remodelers Association of CT, CEO:](#)

Jim Perras supported the bill for its balance of "[t]enant [r]ights with [l]andlord [r]esponsibilities" by addressing unreasonable delays, emergency access, desirability of becoming a landlord, and costs of maintenance and insurance claims.

[Daniel Saunders:](#)

Daniel Saunders supported this bill as "striking a reasonable balance between protecting tenants and ensuring landlords can maintain their properties effectively."

[Jacob Reilly:](#)

Jacob Reilly supported the bill because of the six-day time frame. Reilly warned that the absence of a quick remedy means a landlord will still have to initiate court proceedings, undermining the intent to provide a landlord with quick entry.

[Joan Karlsen, Landlord, Privately Owned:](#)

Joan Karlsen, a landlord with over 45 years of experience, supported the bill's goal, but believes "[i]t should say after 6 days, a landlord shall be allowed to enter the unit."

Multiple individuals support HB-6949 because of the inclusion of a time frame; however, they urge an amendment allowing the landlord to enter after six days.

- [Omar Khan](#)
- [Banmatie Ramlal](#)
- [Somatie Ramlal](#)
- [Keshwar Ramlal](#)
- [Tara Ramlal](#)

**NATURE AND SOURCES OF OPPOSITION:**

[Raphael Podolsky, Connecticut Legal Services, Attorney-Policy Advocate:](#)

Raphael Podolsky opposed this bill. Podolsky's concern is the creation of a "per se rule" that ignores reasonable factors preventing tenant consent for the landlord's entry, including fears of theft and damage. Tenants may not want unsupervised third parties in their homes, and it may be difficult to find mutually acceptable times when tenants often lose income for missing work. Considering that current law allows landlords entry in emergencies and already proscribes solutions if the tenant is unreasonably refusing entry, Podolsky viewed the bill as unnecessary and potentially confusing.

[Greg Kirschner, Connecticut Fair Housing Center, Attorney and Executive Director:](#)

Greg Kirschner opposed the bill current law already allows landlords emergency access to units. Should a tenant refuse access in a nonemergency situation, the landlord may ask for a court order. Kirschner advocated for this approach because it "permits a disinterested judge to learn the facts and make an informed determination." To Kirschner, the bill is vulnerable to landlord abuses and does not account for circumstances that would prevent landlord access within the six days.

[Joe Smith:](#)

Joe Smith opposed the bill, citing issues with "tenant rights, privacy, and safety." Smith identified five primary concerns: (1) infringement upon tenants' sense of privacy and security; (2) insufficient barriers to landlord abuse of reasons for entry; (3) refusal of legitimate concerns for temporary denial of entry; (4) confusion with existing laws that allow landlord entry for "repairs, emergencies, and legal processes;" and (5) unclear enforcement procedures and consequences if the tenant refuses to comply. Smith recommended "reinforcing existing laws" and emphasized the importance of mediation and the court system.

[Robert Jackson:](#)

Robert Jackson opposed the bill and argued landlords should have access to tenancies "at any time without warning" because tenants harm property and put others in danger.

[Anonymous, Anonymous:](#)

Anonymous opposed the bill as "several provisions within the bill are overly restrictive and could have unintended negative consequences for both tenants and landlords." The six-day time frame is unduly rigid, failing to consider numerous situations barring landlord access. The language is unclear and too subjective, inviting abuses. These, and other problems with the bill, may lead to hostilities, mistrust, and legal disputes between landlords and tenants.

[Anonymous, Anonymous:](#)

Anonymous opposes HB-6949 because "[i]t's fine the way it is now."

[Anonymous, Anonymous:](#)

Anonymous opposes HB-6949 for its potential to hurt their business and the free market.

**Reported by: Arianna Tsikitas, Clerk  
Rebecca Hyland, Assistant Clerk**

**Date: 3/24/2025**