

HB 6107 WORKING GROUP BILL CONCERNS

- 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 HB66 I I 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.**

SB1024, SEC 9-11
AND
SB 961:
INCREASING
ALTERNATIVE
COMMUNITY
SEPTIC CAPACITY

SIGNIFICANT
CONCERNS

- **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.**

SB 1024
REMAINING
DESEGREGATECT
PLAN
(SEE ALTERNATIVE
COMMUNITY
SEWER CAPACITY
AS WELL)

OUR CONCERNS

- 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 1/2 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**