

<b>Act Number</b>	<b>Session</b>	<b>Bill Number</b>	<b>Total Number of Committee Pages</b>	<b>Total Number of House Pages</b>	<b>Total Number of Senate Pages</b>
PA 71-211		7639	2	1	2
<u>Committee Pages:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Finance 571</li> <li>• Finance 605</li> </ul>				<u>House Pages:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1666(consent)</li> </ul>	<u>Senate Pages:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1563- 1564</li> </ul>

**H-111**

**CONNECTICUT  
GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE**

**PROCEEDINGS  
1971**

**VOL. 14  
PART 4  
1451-1967**

they can be read in without members waiting around.

djh

THE CLERK:

Business on the Calendar for Monday, April 26, 1971. On page 1 of the Calendar, the Consent Calendar.

MR. SARASIN (95th):

Mr. Speaker, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move acceptance of the Joint Committees' favorable reports and passage of the bills on today's Consent Calendar which are: Calendar No. 451, H.B. No. 6173, An Act Concerning Funds for Contingent Losses for Savings and Loan Associations, File No. 377; Calendar No. 452, H.B. No. 6176, An Act Concerning Veteran Administration Mortgages by Savings and Loan Associations, File No. 376; Calendar No. 455, H.B. No. 6545, An Act Concerning the Importation of Fish, Birds and Quadrupeds, File No. 375; Calendar No. 462, H.B. No. 7639, An Act Permitting Associations of Unit Owners to Appeal From Decisions of Local Boards of Tax Review, File No. 379. I move the adoption of these bills.

THE SPEAKER:

The motion of the gentleman from the 95th. Is there any individual member who objects to passage of these bills on the Consent Calendar? If not, the question is on acceptance of the Joint Committees' Favorable Reports and passage of the bills. All those in favor indicate by saying aye. Those opposed? The bills are PASSED.

MR. SARASIN (95th):

Mr. Speaker, I move the following bills be placed on the Consent Calendar: Calendar No. 248, S.B. No. 1131, An Act Concerning Discretionary Refusal of Permits by Liquor Control Commission; File No. 111; Calendar No. 251, S.B. No. 1134, An Act Concerning Employment of Unsuitable Persons On

**S-79**

**CONNECTICUT  
GENERAL ASSEMBLY**

**SENATE**

**PROCEEDINGS  
1971**

**VOL. 14  
PART 4  
1457-1920**

May 6, 1971

Page 24

THE CHAIR:

Question is on passage of the amendment, will you remark further? If not, all those in favor signify by saying, "aye". Opposed, "nay". The ayes have it, the amendment is adopted. The amendment is ruled technical. You may proceed with the bill, as amended.

SENATOR JACKSON:

Mr. President, I move passage of the bill, as amended. This simply adds the Secretary of State to the present statute which requires filing with the Town Clerk when any attachment is made on property which is not removed from the site of the attachment. The amendment just increases from 24 to 48 hours, the time limit within which time this filing has to be accomplished.

THE CHAIR:

Question is on passage of the bill, as amended. Will you remark further? If not, all those in favor of passage of the bill, signify by saying, "aye". Opposed, "nay". The bill is passed.

THE CLERK:

CAL. NO. 430. File No. 379. Favorable report of the joint committee on Finance. House Bill 7639. An Act Permitting Associations of Unit Owners to Appeal From Decisions of Local Boards of Tax Review.

SENATOR CUTILLO:

Mr. President, I move acceptance of the joint committee's favorable report and passage of the bill. The purpose of this bill is to permit association of unit owners to appeal decisions of the local board of Tax Review, on behalf of all such owners of the facility. Because the undivided ownership of a common area in condominiums, this bill will allow the association to appeal in behalf of all unit owners for decisions of the Board of Tax

May 6, 1971

Page 25

Review.

THE CHAIR:

Question is on passage. Will you remark further? If not, all those in favor signify by saying, "aye". Opposed, "nay". The bill is passed.

THE CLERK:

CAL. NO. 442. File No. 626. Favorable Report of the joint committee on General Law. Substitute House Bill 7239. An Act Validating Certain Tax Liens in the Town of Stafford.

SENATOR STRADA:

Mr. President, I move for acceptance of the joint committee's favorable report and passage of the bill. This bill validates certain tax liens filed by the Tax Collector in the Town of Stafford, which were otherwise valid, except that they were not filed within the prescribed time.

THE CHAIR:

Question is on passage. Will you remark further? If not all those in favor signify by saying, "aye". Opposed, "nay". The bill is passed.

THE CLERK:

CAL. NO. 453. File 616. Favorable report of the joint committee on Education. Senate Bill 286. An Act Concerning the Amelia M. Frost Fund of the Board of Education and Services for the Blind.

SENATOR MONDANI:

Mr. President, I move acceptance of the joint committee's favorable report and passage of the bill. This bill re-creates a fund as an independent fund. And gives the Board of Ed Services for the Blind is able to spend the interest as well as the principle. The fund was independent from its creation in 1931 and then was placed into the general fund. The total amount of

**JOINT  
STANDING  
COMMITTEE  
HEARINGS**

**FINANCE**

**PART 2  
330-726**

**1971**

method of arriving at value of the commonly owned property. As you know in unit housing a great deal of the area is owned by each of the people who own a separate unit. Presently the law provides that the declarations which are filed when the property is first developed set the value. The value on the common property is very important because the cost of the individual unit owners is arrived at by sharing expenses based upon what percentage they own, of the common value. Now, presently when the declarations are filed, there is a value established. However, as prices increase as they have in the last 7-10 years, the value changes. Under the a law now, the declaration of value can only be changed by unanimous consent. All of the owners of the units involved. The bill which I have filed 7642, would change this. In section II of that bill, on line 32 it would change obviously when the municipalities reassesses. On line 32 that and should be an or. Or with the consent of 75% of all the unit owners. The idea behind this is, it would allow a fairer sharing in costs if the owners could by 75% agreeing at the time change the value of the commonly owned property. Also, in Section I of that bill we will see that the fair value, of the commonly owned property would be changed to the assessed value which appears on the Grand List of the municipalities. This also would allow a fairer share in cost in the common property. Now, the second bill 7639 also relates to unit ownership. This would allow associations of unit owners to appeal from decisions of local boards of tax revue. If you take a situation now where you have an association as all these unit ownerships do, and there are say 250 pieces of property, and the municipality reevaluates the property as they must every 10 years, in Connecticut now, you cannot have an action by the association on behalf of all of the members. Yet, it is prohibitive today for an individual member to take an appeal from the board of tax revue. It is prohibitive because part of the evaluation is based upon the interest in the common property. In Milford last year we had reevaluation, 10 members wanted to take an appeal, the cost of determining their interest in the commonly owned property was far in excess of the cost of getting appraisals on their ten individual units. You just cannot do it today, dollars and cents wise. This would merely allow the association to bring in action from the Board of Tax Revues decision on the avaluation of the units in the association and the commonly owned property. I realize that these are very technical bills, and would be happy to meet with the sub-committee if the Chairman decides it is necessary to go over this, also, there are people who are today who will be speaking later, who are members of the association in Milford which has this problem.

Rep. Camp, 163rd Dist.: Gentlemen, I am the representative from the 163rd Assembly District. I come today to speak in favor of HB 5649, and 7475. The former was introduced by Representative Comstock, the latter was introduced by myself. Both of these bills deal in the same field, and, that is the question of trying to pick up taxation on new construction, at an earlier time than is done at present laws. Those bills are 5649, and 7475. HB 5649, is I

years the Town of Westport has experienced a substantial loss in personal property taxes from restaurants and food establishments that have not paid their taxes for a year or two and have subsequently gone out of business for various reasons. If this bill was enacted we feel that there would not be any difficulties in administering it with the tax department and the department responsible for issuing the health permit. A procedure similar to this is presently in effect in the Motor Vehicle Department where the registration is withheld because of non-payment of Motor Vehicle Taxes. Since all towns and cities, as well as the state, are having difficulty providing means of income other than taxes, a bill of this kind will enable municipalities to collect all the taxes levied upon the taxpayer and making each one pay their share of the towns operations. It will help to bring the tax collections closer to the 100% level as compared to the 95-98% level as most towns are presently experiencing. Based on this explanation and the facts presented, we support H.B. 6713.

Mr. William Kaminski: Director of the Long Meadow Association, a condominium of 215 family units, in Milford, Connecticut. I am here to speak in favor of Bill 642, and 7639. I would like to point out and repeat what Senator Stevens mentioned previously, it is very important that the wording be changed on line 32 and/or. The reason for that is that this bill addresses itself to a reassessment on 10 year basis with a municipality. At the present value, it was allowed to be made by the builder himself. And, you could appreciate that the builder could in some cases favor himself by keeping the value of his original homes at a minimum in order to attract sales for the first group of homes. The bill intends to change the method of assessment .....common interest and service.....What happens this is just an example, using our association as an example, we have what we call the common charge, used for the payment of services. The high of common charge is \$32.45 per month and the lowest common charge is \$17.85 per month. The average cost of services is \$20 to \$27.50. The difference between the highest and the lowest is 45%. Far below the average service cost which is equally distributed to all unit owners. What the new wording will do, by allowing the common charge or the common interest be assessed by the assessed valuation that is the valuation placed on the units by the municipalities, would be the disparity of 45% and to a 21% difference. In other words using an example that does now exist. If the assessed valuation was used as a basis for the determining of the common interest, which in turn determines the cost of services, the 32.45 - 17.85 example would change to 32.45 - 25.64. The 25.64 would be still under the present or lower than the average cost. However, it would be 21% difference as opposed to 45. That all this bill intends to do. We feel very strongly that the allowing of the wording of the unit ownership act, which merely, directs itself toward the wording of fair value, without qualifying it is not a good way of determining the fate of 215 families and multiplied by many, many condominiums.....we feel that perhaps the municipality would give us a fair base, in determining