- Remove Line 106, requiring towns to allow transferable development rights (air rights)

- State Appointed working groups must be truly inclusive:
  - stakeholders from small towns and suburban planning boards from different CT regions
  - experts in sanitation, conservation & soils. Not just housing advocates

- Must be tasked to create nuanced solutions to reflect the unique characteristics of the 169 municipalities
HB 6611
FAIR SHARE BILL

SIGNIFICANT CONCERNS

OPEN COMMUNITIES ALLIANCE BILL

• CT169Strong.org – list of mandated “fair share” by town
• Affordable housing “fair shares” excessive - not based on infrastructure constraints – turns suburbs into cities
• 45 of 169 towns mandated to build at MAX CAP of 20% of all current housing stock (8-30g only requires 10%)
• No town can afford to build all their “fair shares”
• If towns use inclusionary zoning – builders develop 2 affordable units for every 8 market rate units - the total existing housing stock would have to double - unrealistic
• Increases municipal legal exposure - allows anyone to have legal standing – students, housing advocates.
SUGGESTED IMPROVEMENTS FOR HB6611 FAIR SHARE PLAN

- Need better bill to replace 8-30g, include stakeholders statewide in developing legislation.
- Regional need must be balanced by an realistic assessment of local capacity: sewers, soils, environmental conditions and infrastructure constraints.
- A MAX CAP on Fair Share allocations is 20% of a town’s entire housing stock - that is not realistic. You have to DOUBLE or TRIPLE a town’s housing stock with inclusionary housing.
- “Aggrieved parties” in zoning cases must have legal standing – this is a bedrock legal principal, remove the language giving legal standing to anyone(housing advocates)
- Towns must pay legal fees of prevailing parties – change this to either prevailing party (builder or town) should be reimbursed for their legal fees.
• Allows higher density development in areas without town sewer by increasing septic gallons/day capacity – from 5,000 to 10,000 in SB961 and from 5,000 to 7,500 in SB1024

• Conservation directors, health directors & sanitation experts were not consulted on bill.

• The CT Dept of Health is not adequately funded and regulations have not been written to ensure proper oversight.

• Local municipal experts must have oversight on capacity for smart, sustainable planning given property conditions.

• 50% failure rates within 5 years in RI & MA, and high maintenance costs have put builders in NYS out of business, creating a public health emergency as the systems fail.
• Sec. 4 delete, HB6107 same concepts, more clearly written. Deletes “protect air, light & prevent overcrowding” in language.

• As Of Right: Accessory Dwelling Units – they are already allowed in many towns: as of right and/or by special permit. If the bill only states that P&Zs can decide where to allow ADUs as of right is it really needed at all?

• Working group to create opt-in form-based zoning codes. Proper representation on the group MUST include:
  • Small town, city & suburban P&Z leaders across the state
  • Soils, sanitation, conservation and environmental specialists, not just housing advocates
SB 1024: SECTION 6 (*DELETED – MUST STAY OUT OF ZONING LEGISLATION!)
“AS OF RIGHT” TRANSIT ORIENTED & MAIN STREETS DEVELOPMENT

• “as of right” market value, multifamily or mixed-use complexes for 50% of the buildable lots within a ½ mile of transit and ¼ mile of main street/commercial

• Density: 15+ units/acre; exponential market value development - not affordable

• No required off-street parking – unworkable in towns with narrow roads

• Eliminates P&Z public hearings on individual projects – no ability for neighbors to address infrastructure and environmental impacts

• Suburban TOD requires affordable public transportation with frequent service and adequate municipal infrastructure capacity that most towns lack
HB 6570
STUDY OF STATE AND MUNICIPAL OWNED PARKING LOTS & LAND NEAR TRANSIT

OUR CONCERNS

5 State-owned transit parking lots & 5 other state properties within ½ mile of transit stations in UNNAMED TOWNS targeted by the State for affordable housing development. What towns?

• Can STATE override local P&Z building regs? (height, density)

• Where will residents of housing development park – will they have adequate off-street parking?

• Who (state or town) receives the property tax on that state-owned development? Towns incur the infrastructure costs.

• Can any Housing Authority build in targeted towns (up to 15 miles away) have jurisdiction over a state-owned property?

Towns also disclose town-owned land within 1/2 mile of transit
OTHER NOTABLE BILLS:

SB 1026
ZONING TRAINING

SB1066 & HB6638
PLACEHOLDER/
DUMMY BILLS

- SB 1026: 5 Hrs Training for local P&Z commissioners.
  - Some versions suggested removing right to vote in zoning meetings if training had not been completed.
  - Training heavily weighted on fair housing and totally excludes impact analysis, - the economics of land use decisions is critically important.

- SB1066 & SB6638 Placeholder or “Dummy” Bills
  - A blank slate to add any language to be voted on by the entire General Assembly.
  - Lack of transparency, without a proper public hearing