

## **Sponsor testimony**

Uploaded by: Delegate Holmes Delegate Holmes

Position: FAV

**MARVIN E. HOLMES, JR.**  
*Legislative District 23*  
Prince George's County

Environment and  
Transportation Committee

*Chair*  
Housing and Real Property  
Subcommittee

*Vice Chair*  
Rules and Executive  
Nominations Committee



*The Maryland House of Delegates*  
ANNAPOLIS, MARYLAND 21401

Annapolis Office  
The Maryland House of Delegates  
6 Bladen Street, Room 364  
Annapolis, Maryland 21401  
410-841-3310 · 301-858-3310  
800-492-7122 Ext. 3310  
Fax 410-841-3850 · 301-858-3850  
Marvin.Holmes@house.state.md.us

District Office  
P.O. Box 1631  
Upper Marlboro, Maryland 20773-1631  
301-249-2602  
Fax 301-249-2215

**Testimony of Delegate Marvin E. Holmes, Jr.**  
In Support of House Bill 1571 (Cross-file of SB 729)  
**Position: Favorable**

Chair, Vice Chair, and Members of the Judiciary Committee:

Thank you for the opportunity to present testimony in support of House Bill 1571, the House companion to SB 729. I am proud to sponsor this important legislation because it addresses a longstanding and often overlooked gap in Maryland housing law—one that directly impacts thousands of residents living in mobile home communities across our state.

This legislation is the result of troubling situations occurring not only in Maryland, but nationwide—situations that threaten the ability of residents in these unique communities to remain in the affordable homes they own or rent.

For years, the General Assembly has taken important steps to strengthen tenant protections regarding notice requirements, fees, and eviction procedures. However, residents of Maryland's nearly 437 mobile home communities—documented in a 2024 Penn State research study—have too often fallen outside the protections afforded to traditional landlord-tenant relationships.

These communities are primarily located in Southern Maryland, the Mid-Shore, Northeastern Maryland, and along the Eastern Shore. They are home to retirees, seniors on fixed incomes, veterans, county and state employees, working families, immigrants, and individuals with disabilities. Many residents fall at or below median income levels and rely on mobile home communities as one of the last remaining sources of naturally occurring affordable housing.

To illustrate, in Southern Anne Arundel County's Lothian area—a largely rural and agricultural region—there is a significant concentration of low-income households:

- **14% of households are classified as “very low income,” meaning a family of four earns less than \$58,050 annually.**
- **17% qualify under the county's rental workforce housing threshold, earning under \$50,000 per year.**

While 82% of the approximately 82,000 residents in that region live in single-family detached homes, nearly 20% of those homes are mobile or manufactured housing units located in four distinct communities: Maryland Manor, Patuxent Mobile Estates, Boones Mobile, and Lyons Creek Mobile. What distinguishes mobile home communities is their ownership structure. In most cases, private investors own the land and rent individual lots to residents. Even when residents own their homes, they must pay monthly lot rent, along with utilities and additional fees. Yet these residents often receive only one-year leases that may not be renewable and may contain unregulated provisions.

MARVIN E. HOLMES, JR.  
*Legislative District 23*  
Prince George's County

Environment and  
Transportation Committee

*Chair*  
Housing and Real Property  
Subcommittee

*Vice Chair*  
Rules and Executive  
Nominations Committee



*The Maryland House of Delegates*  
ANNAPOLIS, MARYLAND 21401

Annapolis Office  
The Maryland House of Delegates  
6 Bladen Street, Room 364  
Annapolis, Maryland 21401  
410-841-3310 · 301-858-3310  
800-492-7122 Ext. 3310  
Fax 410-841-3850 · 301-858-3850  
Marvin.Holmes@house.state.md.us

District Office  
P.O. Box 1631  
Upper Marlboro, Maryland 20773-1631  
301-249-2602  
Fax 301-249-2215

Despite the fact that residents often own the structure they live in, existing landlord-tenant protections under federal and Maryland law largely do not apply. Maryland's Mobile Home Act, enacted in 1980, is now outdated and insufficient to address modern challenges.

Residents have reported infrastructure neglect, unexplained fee increases, utility upcharges, and retaliatory threats of eviction when concerns are raised. Because moving a manufactured home is extraordinarily expensive—and often impossible—residents are uniquely vulnerable. This creates a serious affordability gap and power imbalance that current law does not adequately address.

Maryland is not alone in confronting these issues. States including Delaware, Virginia, North Carolina, Florida, Oregon, Washington, Wisconsin, Massachusetts, and Rhode Island have modernized their laws to better regulate landlord-tenant relationships in mobile home communities and to protect affordability.

**House Bill 1571** is the product of a five-month workgroup that included legal aid attorneys, mobile home residents, and affordable housing advocates. The resulting legislation reflects careful research and thoughtful compromise. It includes:

- **Clearer Definitions** to clarify key terms, including “rent.”
- **Stronger Tenant Protections**, establishing explicit violation criteria and strengthening anti-retaliation safeguards.
- **Rental Agreement Reforms**, adding new prohibitions and clarifying existing standards.
- **Anti-Discrimination Safeguards** addressing discriminatory enforcement practices.
- **Fee and Utility Protections**, limiting unreasonable charges and unjustified utility markups.
- **Legal Consistency**, aligning security deposit and anti-discrimination provisions with broader Maryland law.
- **Improved Eviction Procedures**, protecting tenant property and clarifying subtenant processes.
- **Access to Counsel Coverage**, ensuring mobile home residents are included under Maryland's Access to Counsel in Evictions law.
- **Clear Jury Trial Rights**, defining procedures for dispute resolution.
- **Stronger Enforcement Mechanisms**, increasing accountability for non-compliance by park owners.

MARVIN E. HOLMES, JR.  
*Legislative District 23*  
Prince George's County

---

Environment and  
Transportation Committee

*Chair*  
Housing and Real Property  
Subcommittee

*Vice Chair*  
Rules and Executive  
Nominations Committee



*The Maryland House of Delegates*  
ANNAPOLIS, MARYLAND 21401

Annapolis Office  
The Maryland House of Delegates  
6 Bladen Street, Room 364  
Annapolis, Maryland 21401  
410-841-3310 · 301-858-3310  
800-492-7122 Ext. 3310  
Fax 410-841-3850 · 301-858-3850  
Marvin.Holmes@house.state.md.us

---

District Office  
P.O. Box 1631  
Upper Marlboro, Maryland 20773-1631  
301-249-2602  
Fax 301-249-2215

This legislation does not seek to penalize responsible community owners. Rather, it creates fairness, transparency, and balance in a housing sector that has long operated with limited oversight. At its core, House Bill 1571 protects stability for Maryland families who have invested in their homes but do not own the land beneath them. It strengthens consumer protections, preserves affordability, and ensures that vulnerable residents are not forced out of their communities through unchecked practices.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge a favorable report on **House Bill 1571**.

**HB1571\_DHCD\_SUPPORT.pdf**

Uploaded by: Jake Day

Position: FAV



WES MOORE  
Governor  
ARUNA MILLER  
Lt. Governor  
JACOB R. DAY  
Secretary  
JULIA GLANZ  
Deputy Secretary

**DATE:** March 4, 2026  
**BILL NO.:** House Bill 1571  
**TITLE:** Real Property - Access to Counsel in Evictions Program and Mobile Home Parks  
**COMMITTEE:** House Judiciary Committee

### Letter of Support

#### **Description of Bill:**

House Bill 1571 would expand access to legal representation under the Access to Counsel in Evictions (ACE) Program to individuals who live in a mobile home park. The ACE program is administered by the Maryland Legal Services Corporation, and it provides free lawyers to renters living in Maryland who have a household income that is at or below 50% of Maryland's median income.

#### **Background and Analysis:**

The ACE program was established in 2021 by the Maryland General Assembly, and services began to be administered in July of 2022. Under the program, the Maryland Legal Services Corporation was to provide access to legal representation individuals who either occupy a residential property under a claim of right other than owner (tenants) or are members of a household with an income that is not greater than 50% of the median income of the State (adjusted for household size). However, as written in the 2021 legislation, the program would not have been able to assist residents of mobile homes. As a result, the program would inherently best serve residents in suburban and urban areas.

Residents of mobile home parks experience many of the same economic disadvantages as traditional renters like the threat of eviction from failure to pay rent, and breach of lease, or even subsidy terminations as many residents of mobile homes make applicable use of a section 8 voucher on a mobile home that meets HUD quality standards. In expanding the program's "covered individuals" to include residents of a mobile home park, HB 1571 is protecting another vulnerable population, thereby strengthening the original legislation, and protecting Maryland residents who rent or live in a mobile home park.

#### **DHCD Position**

The Maryland Department of Housing and Community Development respectfully requests a **favorable** report on House Bill 1571.



# **HB1571\_FAV\_EconAction.pdf**

Uploaded by: Jennifer Bevan-Dangel

Position: FAV



**HB1571: Real Property -  
Access to Counsel in Evictions Program and Mobile Home Parks**

**Position: Favorable**

March 4, 2026

The Honorable Sandy Bartlett, Chair  
Judiciary Committee  
100 Taylor House Office Building  
Annapolis, MD 21401  
Cc: Members of the Committee

Chair Bartlett and members of the Judiciary Committee,

Economic Action Maryland Fund urges a favorable report on HB1571, which would ensure appropriate eviction protections for residents of mobile home parks.

Mobile home parks are an important element of affordable housing and have a smaller environmental footprint than traditional homes. In 2017, there were 36,318 mobile homes in Maryland with the highest percentage in Cecil County (7.4%) followed by Wicomico (4.4%) and Allegheny (4.3%).

These residents own their homes but not the ground they sit on. These households pay monthly rent to the owner of a manufactured housing community, and can be evicted like any tenant. But the difficulties faced by a tenant in an apartment building - packing their belongings, finding a new home, and moving - are compounded drastically for residents of a mobile home park.

If it becomes necessary for a mobile home park resident to move, it costs thousands of dollars to relocate the home. The cost and logistics of relocating can be prohibitive, often forcing these owners to either sell their mobile home for pennies on the dollar or abandon their home altogether.<sup>1</sup> This makes mobile home residents uniquely vulnerable when faced with the threat of eviction.

Because of the legal status of mobile park residents, many of the protections afforded to tenants have historically not been available to them. HB1571 would address this oversight in state law by extending basic guardrails that protect individuals facing eviction to mobile home owners, and allowing mobile home owners to access legal assistance traditionally reserved for traditional renters.

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://evictionlab.org/mobile-home-parks-eviction/>

*Economic Action (formerly the Maryland Consumer Rights Coalition) champions economic rights and housing justice through advocacy, research, consumer education, and direct service. Our 12,500 supporters include consumer advocates, practitioners, and low-income and working families throughout Maryland.*



For these reasons, we urge a favorable report on HB1571.

Sincerely,  
Jennifer Bevan-Dangel, Deputy Director

*Economic Action (formerly the Maryland Consumer Rights Coalition) champions economic rights and housing justice through advocacy, research, consumer education, and direct service. Our 12,500 supporters include consumer advocates, practitioners, and low-income and working families throughout Maryland.*

2209 Maryland Ave · Baltimore, MD 21218 | [www.econaction.org](http://www.econaction.org)  
Marceline White · [Marceline@EconAction.org](mailto:Marceline@EconAction.org) | Jennifer Bevan-Dangel · [Jennifer@EconAction.org](mailto:Jennifer@EconAction.org)

# **HB 1571 - CLS Support - Mobile Home Parks.pdf**

Uploaded by: John Kowalko

Position: FAV

Jessica A. Quincosa, Esq.  
Executive Director

Kayla Williams-Campbell, Esq.  
Deputy Director

Lisa Sarro, Esq.  
Director of Litigation &  
Advocacy



## **HB1571 - Real Property - Access to Counsel in Evictions Program and Mobile Home Parks**

**Hearing before the House Judiciary Committee  
March 4, 2026**

**Position: FAVORABLE**

---

To the Honorable Members of the Judiciary Committee:

**[Community Legal Services](#) (CLS) supports House Bill 1571.**

CLS provides free, high-quality legal services to protect the fundamental rights, ensure equal access to justice, and uplift the individuals, families, and communities we serve. The CLS Eviction Prevention Program assists low-income individuals and families facing eviction through the Access to Counsel in Evictions program. We provide representation for thousands of Maryland households annually.

CLS strongly supports House Bill 1571 to ensure critical protections are in place to protect the rights of mobile home park residents. Without these protections, mobile home park residents are extremely vulnerable to exploitation and abuse.

### **Mobile Home Park Residents Are the Most Vulnerable Tenants Under Maryland Law**

“Mobile homes” is an older term for what is now more commonly referred to as manufactured housing. Almost all “mobile homes” are in fact permanent residences that cannot be moved without extremely costly expenses and the risk of critical damage to the home.

Whether these homes are rented or owned, they are on property owned by the mobile home park, and the residents must pay a fee to rent their lot area. Therefore, park residents who own their mobile homes are taking an extreme risk under current Maryland law. One late rental payment gives a park owner enough legal justification

to evict the residents from a mobile home.<sup>1</sup> In most cases, the residents are unable to move their home due to cost or risk of damage, and so the park gets to reclaim that home as abandoned property.

**One missed payment, and a mobile home resident can lose not just their home but all the money and investments they have put into that home.** And for the unscrupulous park owner, they can flip that home and do it all again to the next tenant.

The exploitation of mobile home residents in Maryland has only worsened as mobile home parks are increasingly bought up by hedge funds and other large institutional investors.<sup>2</sup> The affordable housing crisis in Maryland has worked to squeeze these residents through both increased demands for affordable homes as well as rapidly increasing lot rents, causing more and more residents to fall behind on the lot rent and eventually lose their homes as a result. These evictions fall most heavily on those who depend on the affordability of mobile home communities, such as veterans and retirees.

## **HB 1571 Provides Urgently Needed Protections for Mobile Home Residents**

House Bill 1571 would significantly **enhance protections for “qualified residents” by requiring a “substantial violation” to deny lease renewals.** Thousands of mobile home residents would no longer have to fear the threat of eviction and the loss of their home for a single late rental payment.

In addition, in the cases where a resident is evicted, HB 1571 would **require park owners to make a written offer to purchase the home based on the appraised value** by a qualified and disinterested appraiser. Residents would no longer have to fear losing all their housing investments upon eviction, and park owners would no longer be able to merely flip houses as abandoned property.

HB 1571 also **aligns Maryland law for mobile home tenants with the protections afforded to all other tenants** in the state for notice periods before landlords can file eviction lawsuits or impose rent increases. Mobile home tenants would no longer be the forgotten class of tenancies that lack these protections.

Finally, HB 1571 makes several minor changes to address common areas of exploitation for mobile home residents, including **prohibiting common excessive and unjustified fees and requiring certain policies and rules be provided to residents in writing.**

---

<sup>1</sup> See [Maryland Real Property § 8A-202\(c\)\(1\)\(i\)](#). One missed rental payment is sufficient to disqualify a resident from being a “qualified resident” who is entitled to a one-year lease renewal each year. For non-qualified residents, their lease can be changed to month-to-month at the expiration of the prior term. Once a resident is on a month-to-month lease, a park owner can end their lease upon 30-days’ notice. The residents would have no recourse to challenge the subsequent eviction as tenants holding over after the expiration of a lease term.

<sup>2</sup> See, e.g., [Cassie Powell, “Private equity firms are snapping up mobile home parks – and driving out the residents who can least afford to lose them.” \*The Conversation\* \(November 3, 2025\).](#)

**Mobile homes have long been a vital affordable housing choice for low-income individuals and families, but Maryland law needs to keep up with the protections needed to ensure this choice is not in actuality a trap designed to exploit and defraud the low-income families and individuals who rely on it.**

The Maryland General Assembly has the opportunity this year to protect these vulnerable tenants and their families by fixing the law for mobile home residents. Every year that this is not fixed, people are hurt. People are put out of their homes for no good reason, and since they are mobile home residents, they may lose their house and all the money they put into it as well.

For questions, please contact John Kowalko at [johnkowalko@clspgc.org](mailto:johnkowalko@clspgc.org).

**Community Legal Services urges a favorable report on HB 1571.**

**HB1571\_ShoreLegalAccess\_FAVORABLE.pdf**

Uploaded by: Meredith Girard

Position: FAV

## HB1571 - Real Property - Access to Counsel in Evictions Program and Mobile Home Parks

HEARING BEFORE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE 3/4/26 1 pm  
POSITION: FAVORABLE

Chair Bartlett, Vice Chair Davis and Members of the Judiciary Committee:

Shore Legal Access respectfully requests your favorable report for HB1571. This bill makes necessary and long overdue updates to Maryland's law governing mobile home parks. This legislation clarifies that mobile home tenants have access to legal representation under the Access to Counsel in Evictions program and provides meaningful protection for tenants, including notice requirements, required lease terms, guardrails on park fees and utility charges, and procedural safeguards in the event of repossession.

Shore Legal Access (SLA) connects people on the Eastern Shore with limited financial means to legal representation and essential community resources. Each year, SLA helps over 3,0000 people in our community access the legal system when they would otherwise be shut out. Our small legal team and network of volunteer lawyers provide free legal services for eviction prevention, criminal record expungement, life and estate planning, family law, foreclosure, and consumer debt. These services help families gain financial and housing stability and give people hope and agency over their future.

**Mobile home residents are among Maryland's most vulnerable tenants.** Mobile home park residents occupy a uniquely precarious position in Maryland's housing landscape. They own their homes but rent the land beneath them. Eviction does not merely displace a family, it can force them to abandon or move a significant financial asset. Moving a mobile home is expensive, logistically complex, and often impossible. Older adults and low-income families are especially vulnerable to housing loss in a mobile home eviction. Despite this vulnerability, mobile home park residents have historically operated with fewer legal protections than traditional renters.

**Mobile home tenants should have legal representation under the Access to Counsel in Evictions program.** As a provider for Maryland's Access to Counsel in Evictions program, we see firsthand the unique challenges mobile home tenants face and the benefits of having legal representation. Having legal representation helps to level the playing field, facilitates equitable resolutions, and leads to better outcomes for both parties.



### BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Tim Abeska  
Tanisha Armstrong  
Arlette Bright, Esq.  
Holland Brownley, Esq.  
Rebecca Burner  
Thomas Deliberto, Esq.  
Jennifer Goolie, Esq.  
Candace Henry  
Anthony Rodriguez, Esq.  
Kathleen Smith, Esq.  
Michael Starling  
Ruth Thomas  
Doncella Wilson

### EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Meredith L. Girard, Esq.

### MAIN OFFICE | EASTON

499 Idlewild Avenue  
Suite 102  
Easton, MD 21601

### SALISBURY OFFICE

4601-B E. Naylor Mill Road  
Salisbury, MD 21804

p 410.690.8128

f 443.385.0210

[shorelegal.org](http://shorelegal.org)

## **Tenant protections for mobile home park tenants are necessary reforms.**

Clear notice and opportunity to cure: HB 1571 establishes meaningful notice requirements before a park owner may file a complaint for repossession. A park owner must provide written notice of intent to file, including the type and basis of the complaint. In cases of nonpayment of rent, the resident has 10 days to cure before a complaint may be filed. These provisions promote fairness and transparency. They help prevent unnecessary displacement by giving residents a clear opportunity to resolve issues before court involvement. Allowing a reasonable grace period can prevent families from losing their homes over a temporary hardship.

Fair rental agreements: HB1571 strengthens rental agreement requirements including mandatory 1-year initial terms, clear standards for renewal, and prevents clauses that are unenforceable.

Limits on fees and utility charges: This bill would end unpredictable and unreasonable fees that have been used to burden residents. The bill sets a clear standard protecting residents from arbitrary charges.

Safeguards during repossession: One of the most important aspects of this bill are the provisions addressing repossession. After a warrant of restitution is executed, residents would have at least 30 days to recover personal property, sell their mobile home, and seek a purchase offer from the park owner at fair appraised value. Safeguards during repossession are particularly important because the cost of moving a mobile home is typically more than the value of the property itself. Often, the mobile homeowner is never able to move their home of the park and must abandon their home without any compensation. In these situations the landlord ultimately gets ownership of the mobile home. HB1571 acknowledge the unique financial stakes of mobile home park evictions and provide a meaningful opportunity for residents to protect their assets.

We ask for your favorable report for HB1571. By expanding access to counsel, strengthening notice requirements, limiting unreasonable fees, and creating meaningful protections in repossession proceedings, this bill promotes housing stability and economic security for some of Maryland's most vulnerable. For more information about our position, please feel free to reach out to Meredith Girard, Esq., Executive Director, at: [mgirard@shorelegal.org](mailto:mgirard@shorelegal.org), 410-690-8128.

**Maryland Catholic Conference\_FAVHB1571\_.pdf**

Uploaded by: Michelle Zelaya

Position: FAV



MARYLAND  
CATHOLIC  
CONFERENCE

March 4<sup>th</sup> 2026

**HB1571**

**Real Property - Access to Counsel in Evictions Program and Mobile Home Parks**  
**Judiciary Committee**  
**Position: Favorable**

The Maryland Catholic Conference offers this testimony in support of **House Bill 1571**. The Maryland Catholic Conference is the public policy representative of the three (arch)dioceses serving Maryland, which together encompass over one million Marylanders. Statewide, their parishes, schools, hospitals and numerous charities combine to form our state's second largest social service provider network, behind only our state government.

**House Bill 1571** strengthens the Access to Counsel in Evictions Program by extending legal representation and supportive services to individuals living in mobile home parks. Mobile home residents often face unique vulnerabilities, including complex tenancy laws and power imbalances between residents and park owners. By authorizing prospective residents to take legal action when essential documents or disclosures are withheld, the bill ensures transparency, fairness in housing agreements, and accountability for park owners. Its purpose is to prevent exploitation and ensure residents understand their rights before entering long-term commitments.

Expanding access to legal counsel helps stabilize households, prevent unjust evictions, and reduce the long-term social and economic costs associated with housing insecurity. Families who receive legal support are more likely to remain housed, avoid homelessness, and protect their financial well-being. When communities experience fewer evictions, neighborhoods remain stable, local schools and businesses benefit, and social safety nets experience less strain. These protections are especially critical in mobile home communities, where residents often own their homes but rent the land—creating unique risks when legal protections are weak or unclear.

By defending the dignity of the human person and promoting the common good through stable housing we prioritize the most vulnerable populations. Ensuring that families have fair access to legal support is an expression of solidarity, especially toward those who face structural disadvantages in the housing market. Housing is more than a commodity—it is a basic human need essential to safety, stability, and family life. By expanding legal protections and preventing unjust displacement, this bill honors the Gospel call to protect the vulnerable and uphold justice in social structures. Supporting this bill is a moral commitment to fairness, compassion, and the well-being of Maryland families.

For these reasons, the Maryland Catholic Conference urges a favorable report on **House Bill 1571**.

# **Testimony in support of HB1571 - Real Property - A**

Uploaded by: Richard KAP Kaplowitz

Position: FAV

HB1571\_RichardKaplowitz\_FAV

03/04/2026

Richard Keith Kaplowitz  
Frederick, MD 21703

**TESTIMONY ON HB#1571- POSITION: FAVORABLE**

**Real Property - Access to Counsel in Evictions Program and Mobile Home Parks**

**TO:** Chair Bartlett, Vice Chair Davis, and members of the Judiciary Committee

**FROM:** Richard Keith Kaplowitz

My name is Richard Keith Kaplowitz. I am a resident of District 3, Frederick County. I am submitting this testimony in support of HB#1571, **Real Property - Access to Counsel in Evictions Program and Mobile Home Parks**

This bill states that the Maryland Legal Services Corporation (MLSC) shall provide for access to legal representation by a covered individual for a judicial or administrative proceeding to EVICT or terminate the tenancy or housing subsidy of a covered individual. This includes attempts to repossess the premises of a covered individual. The access to legal representation ... includes the first appeal of a decision in the proceeding if the designated organization determines that there are sufficient legal grounds for the appeal.

The bill specifies when, where, how and under what conditions an eviction can occur and when legal representation must intervene in the proceedings.

This bill will meet those goals by altering the Access to Counsel in Evictions Program to expand access to legal representation and other services under the Program to individuals who occupy premises of a mobile home park; authorizing a prospective resident of a mobile home park to bring an action against a park owner for failing to provide certain documents and terms related to the tenancy; etc.

Persons in this situation often have limited or no resources to oppose the action being taken against them by landlords with substantial legal assets. This bill will help level the field and place these individuals on an equal footing in legal matters affecting their housing.

**I respectfully urge this committee to return a favorable report on HB#1571.**

**Rob's edited statedmedntSB729-1571.docx.pdf**

Uploaded by: Robin (Rob) Ross

Position: FAV

Chai, Vice Chair and Judiciary Committee Members

For the record my name is Robin Ross, I reside in Lothian, Md in one of the four mobile home parks – Patuxent Mobile Home Community sometime referred to as Patuxent Shores in Anne Arundel County

I am here representing myself – and other residents within the mobile home parks to urge you to vote for and in favor of HB1571 and SB0729 – Real Property – Access to Counsel in Evictions Programs – Mobile Home Parks

I am going to share with you the situations that residents are subjected to by park owners and what we experience also occurs within other similar communities. What is important to realize is that while we live in “mobile homes” – they are not as “mobile” as you might or would believe. These large manufactured homes – are placed on pad and footers in privately owned communities that have gone for years as regulated as “mobile home parks.” To move one of these homes is often as expensive as it is to purchase a used one costing upward of and in many cases in excess of 20k.

Tenants in these parks – or communities either purchase outright a unit from a previous owner, or sign a lease to rent. At the same time, while they may own the unit they live in – they must rent the ground space (the dirt) from the park owners that the unit is placed on. Park owners not only charge for the pad space, but residents are required to pay fees for unrelated repairs and subjected to retaliatory evictions if payments were late -- ultimately impacting residents' economic ability to live in an affordable community. As land renters, we pay as much as \$812-\$1,500 or more in ground rent for their units in addition to high monthly costs for water/sewer service which for water is more times than not poor to undrinkable , and maintenance of community property – which does not materialize

Mobile home parks in Anne Arundel county and throughout the state are primarily privately-owned. Our research and all the research shows that the vast majority of these communities are owned by out of state investors whose goal is to increase their profitability. They commonly and routinely neglect the infrastructure in the community and residents needs as a general and common practice to move existing tenants out – and get in new ones to raise the rents. Residents are typically only allowed a one-year unrennewable lease, which includes discriminatory illegal practices. Then they intentionally seek to push you to a month to month lease which they can terminate at any point for any reason. They speak and claim of park rules and standards that are not part of the written rules and more times than, not refuse to or do not provide the information to residents, and are not equally applied or enforced. When we raise questions or voice concerns about rates or situations occurring in the park, we are

further threatened with these false rule violations and eviction if we persist. Getting these unexpected and false notices of supposed rule violation comes with additional charges and without identifying the reasons or rule.

You will not hear from the vast number of mobile home residents, for fear of retaliation – losing their homes – even if they own the unit. This is what happens. I myself was subjected to a 2 almost 3-year litigation with park owners over a false claim of holding over that cost me 10k.

The court issued a verdict in my favor – I do not and will never fear speaking out against what is wrong and unjust! However, make no mistake, I am sure that I will face nefarious and retaliatory actions again due to my being here. However, most of the residents in these parks cannot afford to spend the money for legal fees and are afraid of becoming homeless.

Maryland laws protecting landlord-tenant relationships do not address the issues or give rights to those residing in mobile home communities. We are grateful for Senator Henson, the Maryland legal lab and other tenant advocates to get this legislation drafted.

Please approve this legislation – HB1571 – to help us remain in our affordable homes and have rights to object to conditions affecting us financially.

Robin R. Ross

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Robin R. Ross". The signature is written in a cursive style and is positioned above a thin horizontal line.

56 Patuxent Mobile Ests.  
Lothian, MD, 20711  
443-261-7017

# **MMHA - 2026 - HB 1571 - Mobile Homes Parks - Acces**

Uploaded by: Aaron Greenfield

Position: UNF



**Bill Title:** House Bill 1571, Real Property - Access to Counsel in Evictions Program and Mobile Home Parks

**Committee:** Judiciary Committee

**Date:** March 4, 2026

**Position:** Unfavorable

This testimony is offered on behalf of the Maryland Multi-Housing Association (MMHA). MMHA is a professional trade association established in 1996, whose members consist of owners and managers of more than 214,000 rental housing homes in over 1015 apartment communities. Our members house over 571,000 residents of the State of Maryland. MMHA also represents over 270 associate member companies who supply goods and services to the multi-housing industry.

While we share the goal of housing stability and fair treatment for residents, HB 1571 goes far beyond reasonable tenant protections and would fundamentally alter the legal and economic framework governing mobile home communities in Maryland.

First, the bill dramatically restricts property owners' ability to manage their communities. By narrowing eviction grounds to just three categories, creating broad cure rights, capping appeal bonds, and imposing an automatic 30-day delay after a warrant of restitution, the legislation makes it extraordinarily difficult to address serious lease violations in a timely manner. These provisions risk undermining community safety and place responsible residents at a disadvantage when bad actors cannot be promptly removed.

Second, the bill imposes sweeping rent and fee regulations. Ninety-day notice requirements, caps on utility charges, strict limitations on fees, and security deposit caps—combined with presumptions that certain fees are unreasonable—interfere with the basic economics of operating a community. These restrictions do not account for rising infrastructure costs, insurance premiums, property taxes, and utility expenses. Over time, this level of regulation will discourage investment in existing communities and make new development financially infeasible.

Third, the mandatory lease renewal requirements and expanded anti-retaliation and discrimination provisions, coupled with triple damages and attorneys' fees, significantly increase litigation exposure. At the same time, the expansion of the Access-to-Counsel program ensures that virtually every dispute will become more complex and prolonged, increasing costs for all parties and burdening the court system.

Additionally, the bill's "soft landing" provisions—requiring appraisal and purchase offers for homes and extended access rights—create operational and financial uncertainty that is unprecedented in landlord-tenant law.



Mobile home communities already operate under a distinct and highly regulated framework under Title 8A. HB 1571 would make Maryland one of the most restrictive states in the country for this housing type, with the unintended consequence of reducing affordability and long-term housing supply.

For these reasons, we respectfully request an unfavorable report on House Bill 1571.

**Aaron J. Greenfield, MMHA Director of Government Affairs, 410.446.1992**

# House Bill 1571 Testimony

Uploaded by: Lisa Bradley

Position: UNF



## House Bill 1571 – Real Property – Access to Counsel in Evictions Program and Mobile Home Parks

### Position: Oppose

Horizon Land Management owns Manufactured Housing (MH) communities throughout Maryland. MH communities are one of the most affordable market rate housing left in Maryland. Horizon understands the legislation is intended to align current MH law more closely with changes in landlord tenant law. However, the nature of these communities is very different. Tenants in these communities own the dwelling but lease the land underneath their home.

Given the differences between normal landlord and tenant law and MH communities and the broad reach of this bill, Horizon is concerned over the following provisions.

- **8-904 (and throughout):** The Bill references repossession of the premises throughout its text but fails to distinguish the tenant owned home from the land on which it is situated. In the context of MH a clear distinction of the premises is critical, as MH laws pertain to the parties' respective responsibilities in relation to the land – NOT the home itself, as matters relating to the possession of the home (in the instance that the park owner owns the home) fall within the purview of Maryland's general landlord tenant laws. Given that a park owner typically is not the owner or holder of purchase-money secured interest in the home, the park owner landlords usually aren't in a position to "repossess" a home in the traditional sense that the landlord of a multifamily or other residential landlord would repossess the premises. While the park owner may seek to repossess the land on which a home sits, taking possession of the home itself (chattel) is a separate matter and legal process.
- **8A-101:** As it relates to the definition of a "Substantial Violation," Horizon believes that the legislation should include additional parameters around repeated violations. While Horizon appreciates "willfully and repeatedly disregarding the rules of the rental agreement" is a substantial violation, we would like also clarify that multiple violations within a lease term would be considered a "Substantial Violation." A tenant who is not in compliance with lease terms is may be committing violations of community standards that impact other tenants.
- **8A-201 & 8A-202:** The term "Qualified Resident" for purposes of MH should be limited to those occupants who are parties to an active, fully executed lease agreement. The mere ownership of a home and residence within a community isn't sufficient, because the vast majority of homeowners within MH communities fail to execute their lease renewals, which effectively results in the conversion of a lease to a month-to-month tenancy. In the event that a tenant fails to execute a renewal document by the expiration of their then active executed lease term, then the renewal offer should be deemed rejected, and the landlord should, thereafter, not be required to extend an annual lease to that tenant or treat them as a "Qualified Resident." Further, to the extent that a resident has lost the benefit of being a "Qualified Tenant," a Landlord should not be required to highlight violations that the resident "may" cure to maintain the status of a "Qualified Resident". If the tenant does not meet the criteria of a "Qualified Resident" at the time that renewal offers are extended (or would be required), they



simply shouldn't qualify to receive those benefits. A Landlord should only be required to inform the tenant that they are no longer a "Qualified Resident" and state the specific reason for that termination; and that notice should only be required to be issued when the tenant loses status of a "Qualified Tenant". Landlord should not be required to meet with the resident to review or reconsider the determination.

- **8A-202:** As it relates to subleasing approval, park owners should not be deemed to have approved a sublease simply by virtue of accepting a rental payment directly from an unauthorized occupant who has moved into the community without following appropriate occupant approval processes. Often tenants will engage in a private sale of their home, unbeknownst to the park owner, who unknowingly accepts a rent payment from an occupant who has not applied to be a resident of the community or passed credit and background checks. At times, Horizon may learn that the home is occupied by someone who has not completed our application process and it will only come to our attention if the rent for a lot has fallen significantly delinquent. In that instance, a park owner should have the right to demand that the unauthorized occupant submit any required occupancy application and related background checks and landlord should be afforded a reasonable amount of time after receipt of that information to make a determination as to whether the applicant is approved for occupancy.
- **8A-401:** Given the fact that rental rates within a MH community are typically low, a presumption that a fee is unreasonable if it exceeds 3% of 1 month's rent is unreasonable. As such the 3% cap should be stricken.
- **8A-402:** Horizon believes it is unreasonable to prohibit landlords from assessing fees for parking or pets. Parking fees are usually used to limit the number of cars brought into a community, in the interest of maintaining sufficient parking for each home, to prevent the accumulation of non-working vehicles and to otherwise regulate parking within the community. Pet fees are used to offset the costs and expenses of maintenance that inevitably falls on the park owner to repair damages/expenses caused by those tenants who have pets (e.g., pet waste clean-up/removal, damaged landscaping, maintenance of dog park amenities, etc.).
- **8A-503:** As it related to utility charges, Horizon has the following concerns:
  - o Administrative Fees are often incurred for employment of 3<sup>rd</sup> party submetering and billing service providers when a landlord bills and collects utility expenses from tenants. That said, a reasonable cap on administrative fees (i.e., an administrative fee not to exceed \$10/month) may make more sense.
  - o Maintenance, Transmission, Treatment and Infrastructure Fees are often 3<sup>rd</sup> party expenses that a landlord needs to pass through to tenants. Landlords do not control those expenses and should be able to recover those expenses as a pass-through to the tenants.
  - o The concept of limiting well water service fees to 5% of the monthly rent is not realistic, particularly if the fee for the well water service must include uncontrollable costs/expenses that the park owner may incur to operate and maintain the well in good working order, for the benefit of the tenants.
  - o The inclusion of the new language that comprises 8A-503(D) is misplaced. Requirements directed at utility vendors may be addressed better under utility regulation.



- **8A-801(C)(2)(II):** Instead of being required to provide a Consumer Water Report to every resident, Horizon thinks that it would be more effective to make the report available and/or to provide it to tenants upon request.
- **8A-1706(C):** A park owner should not be required to make a written offer to purchase a home due to its election to execute a warrant of restitution. Further to the extent that an offer is extended, the park owner should not be required to incur the costs of obtaining an appraisal or held to extend an offer no less than the appraised value.
- **8A-1706(D):** Horizon recommends removing the section extending the time for a warrant of restitution.

Finally, Horizon is also concerned about provisions in the bill that are in multiple sections. Horizon believes the award of treble damages for landlord violations of this act is extreme and should be stricken. Also, as a general matter, when there is a month to month tenancy, landlords and park owners should not be required to provide more than 60 days' notice of termination.

For these reasons, Horizon recommends an unfavorable report.

For more information contact Bill Castelli at [wcastelli@rwillaw.com](mailto:wcastelli@rwillaw.com)

**hb1571.pdf**

Uploaded by: Will Vormelker

Position: UNF

HON. STACY A. MAYER  
CIRCUIT COURT  
JUDGE  
BALTIMORE COUNTY  
CHAIR

HON. RICHARD SANDY  
CIRCUIT COURT  
JUDGE  
FREDERICK COUNTY  
VICE-CHAIR



KELLEY O'CONNOR  
ASSISTANT STATE COURT  
ADMINISTRATOR  
GOVERNMENT RELATIONS  
AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS  
P: (410) 260-1560

SUZANNE PELZ, ESQ.  
SNR. GOVT. RELATIONS AND  
PUBLIC AFFAIRS OFFICER  
P: (410)260-1523

## MARYLAND JUDICIAL COUNCIL LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE

### MEMORANDUM

**TO:** House Judiciary Committee  
**FROM:** Legislative Committee  
Suzanne D. Pelz, Esq.  
410-260-1523  
**RE:** House Bill 1571  
Real Property – Access to Counsel in Evictions Program and  
Mobile Home Parks  
**DATE:** February 25, 2026  
(3/4)  
**POSITION:** Oppose, only as to the specific provisions noted below

---

The Judiciary has no opposition to the overarching objectives of the bill and appreciates the bill's expansion of access to counsel. The bill creates a statutory scheme for adjudicating disputes regarding rental agreements between mobile park owners and residents. It provides a number of safeguards to protect the rights of residents and prescribes remedies for a range of enforcement actions. These generally constitute public policy determinations which are the purview of the Maryland General Assembly. The Judiciary only opposes the specific provisions below.

The bill provides that when an appeal is noted from the District Court judgment, the District Court shall immediately enter an order directing the resident to pay all rent that comes due during the pendency of action into an escrow account of the clerk of the circuit court, an administrative agency that is empowered by local law to hold rents in escrow, or the park owner. Real Prop. § 8A-1705. The Judiciary traditionally opposes legislation that includes mandatory provisions and curtails judicial discretion. Additionally, to create an escrow account, especially to hold funds generated during the

pendency of an appeal, a circuit court clerk would normally need an order from a circuit court judge. The bill does not provide for such a process.

In addition, on page 35, lines 3 through 4, the bill requires the court to conduct a hearing within 30 days after certification of the status of the delinquent account. That timeline does not allow for the necessary notice to litigants nor for the Court to give meaningful opportunity for same. Additionally, as a separate branch of government, the Judiciary must retain the authority over docket management, including the scheduling of its cases. The Judiciary would request that the mandatory timeline be removed.

cc. Hon. Marvin Holmes, Jr.  
Judicial Council  
Legislative Committee  
Kelley O'Connor