

HB 5002 AN ACT CONCERNING HOUSING AND THE NEEDS OF HOMELESS PERSONS

UPDATE 5/23: VERSION LCO 8974, posted on [cga.ct.gov](https://www.cga.ct.gov) website Wednesday 5/21 evening. Link here for 92-page bill language:

<https://www.cga.ct.gov/2025/lcoamd/pdf/2025LCO08974-R00-AMD.pdf>

READ BELOW & SIGN CT169Strong's PETITION NOW:

<https://ct169strong.org/petition-2025/>

COMMENTS ON HB5002 AS AMENDED AND VOTED OUT OF HOUSE & SENATE::

HB5002 will forever harm our state and our communities and take Connecticut further away from affordability with concepts that include:

1) Housing quotas for every town and city: latest language requires to rezone for density so developers build 25% of Fair Share Study "Alternative A." Review the Connecticut Conference of Municipalities' (CCM) slideshow that details why the Fair Share Study allocations are wrong for our State.

- Uses original flawed methodology, flawed regional allocations and twice failed to pass in prior sessions.
- Requires all municipalities to zone for 30K units of housing (which is 25% of the ALTERNATIVE A FAIR SHARES) for a vague "realistic opportunity" that developers will build the units.
- How many units? [x What's Your Town's Fair Share?.xlsx](#) TAB A
- The problem is: the ECO NORTHWEST Study states in ALTERNATIVE A that 84% of the units should be build for the lowest of income levels in CT (0-30% of the area median income - those earning under roughly \$0 - 30K). Is it a 40 year commitment to be affordable like 8-30g? Bills is silent on that. What is a "realistic opportunity" as the bill language states that any developer builds a single unit where they make no profit? There is none as far as we can see at a 0-30% income level without significant subsidies from the state to developers and there are non stated in the bill.

WARNING: THESE ALLOCATIONS ARE ONLY THE AFFORDABLE UNITS, NOT THE ACTUAL DEVELOPMENT ANY TOWN WOULD NEED TO REZONE FOR TO GET DEVELOPERS TO BUILD THESE UNITS:

- **THEY WOULD ONLY ACCOUNT FOR 5-20% AT MOST OF THE DENSITY A TOWN WOULD NEED TO REZONE FOR.**
- **PROJECTS STILL MAY NOT PENCIL OUT AS PROFITABLE FOR DEVELOPERS WITH ONLY 10% AFFORDABLE AND 90% MARKET VALUE IN SOME PARTS OF CT**
- **SO THE UNITS WON'T GET BUILT & MUNICIPALITIES WILL GET BLAMED BY ADVOCATES AND THE BIASED PRESS FOR NOT**

HAVING MET THE VAGUELY DEFINED "REALISTIC OPPORTUNITY" OF THE UNITS BEING BUILT, LEADING TO

- UNENDING LITIGATION& SENATE:



WHICH DEMOCRATIC STATE REPS PASSED HB5002 IN THE HOUSE?

Vote for HB-5002 Roll Call Number 196
Taken on 05/27 AS AMENDED

House Tally - FINAL VOTE

The Speaker ordered the vote be taken by roll call at 10:59 p.m.

The following is the result of the vote:

5/27, Tuesday 10:59PM

Total Number Voting	151
Necessary for Passage	76
Those voting Yea	84
Those voting Nay	67
Those absent and not voting.....	0

The following is the roll call vote:

N ALLIE-BRENNAN	Y	HUGHES	Y	WELANDER	N	PISCOPO
N ARZENO	Y	JACOBSON	Y	WILSON	N	PIZZUTO
N BAKER	Y	JOHNSON, D.	Y	WINTER	N	POLLETTA
N BARRY	Y	JOHNSON, S.	N	WOOD	N	REDDINGTON-HUGHES
Y BELTON	Y	KAVROS DEGRAW			N	ROMANO
N BERGER-GIRVALO	N	KEITT			N	RUTIGLIANO
Y BIGGINS	Y	KHAN	N	ACKERT	N	SCOTT
Y BLUMENTHAL	Y	LAMARK MUIR	N	ANDERSON	N	STEWART
N BOYD	N	LEEPER	N	ANISKOVICH	N	VAIL
Y BROWN, K.	Y	LEMAR	N	BOLINSKY	N	VEACH
N BROWN, M.	Y	LUXENBERG	N	BRONKO	N	WEIR
Y BUMGARDNER	Y	MARTINEZ, R.	N	BUCHSBAUM	N	YACCARINO
Y CHAFEE	Y	MCCARTHY VAHEY	N	BUCKBEE	N	ZAWISTOWSKI
Y COLLINS MAIN	Y	MC GEE	N	CALLAHAN	N	ZULLO
Y COMEY	Y	MENAFACE	N	CANDELORA, V.	N	ZUPKUS
Y CONCEPCION	N	MESKERS	N	CANINO		
N CONSTANTINE	Y	MORRIN BELLO	N	CARNEY		
Y DATHAN	Y	NAPOLI	N	CARPINO		
Y DEFRONZO	N	OSBORNE	N	CASE	Y	RITTER
Y DELANY	Y	PARIS	N	COURPAS		
Y DEMICCO	Y	PARKER	N	DAUPHINAIS		
Y DIGIOVANCARLO	N	FOULOS	N	DECAPRIO	Y	CANDELARIA, J.
Y DILLON	Y	QUINN	N	DELNICKI	Y	GODFREY
Y DOUCETTE	Y	RADER	N	DUBITSKY	Y	HALL, J.
Y EXUM	Y	ROBERTS	N	FISHBEIN	Y	REYES
Y FARRAR	Y	ROCHELLE	N	FONCELLO	Y	ROSARIO
Y FAZZINO	Y	ROJAS	N	HAINES	Y	RYAN
Y FELIPE	Y	SANCHEZ, E.	N	HALL, C.	Y	SANTIAGO
Y FORTIER	Y	SANCHEZ, J.	N	HOWARD		
Y FOSTER	Y	SANTANELLA	N	HOXHA	Y	BUTLER
Y GAIIEWSKI	Y	SANTOS	N	JENSEN	N	GONZALEZ
Y GARIBAY	N	SHAKE	N	KENNEDY	Y	MUSHINSKY
Y GAUTHIER	Y	SHANNON	N	KLARIDES-DITRIA	Y	PAOLILLO
Y GEE	Y	SIMMS	N	LANOUE		
Y GENG	N	SMITH	N	MARRA	Y	ELLIOTT
Y GILCHREST	Y	STAFSTROM	N	MASTROFRANCESCO	Y	GIBSON
Y GUCKER	N	STEINBERG	N	MCGORTY, B.	Y	GRESKO
Y HADDAD	Y	SWEET	N	NUCCIO	Y	LINEHAN
Y HEFFERNAN	Y	TURCO	N	O'DEA	Y	NOLAN
Y HORN	Y	WALKER	N	PAVALOCK-D'AMATO	Y	SANCHEZ, R.

FINAL VOTE:

Yea 84

(84 Democrats)

Nay 67

(All 49 Republicans +
18 Democrats)

15 Democrats who voted YES on Democratic Amendments & NO on Final Bill - They got a HALL PASS ON THE FINAL BILL from leadership!

2 Democrats Absent on Democratic Amendments so did not vote on them & Voted NO on Final Bill

1 Democrat who Voted NO on Democratic Amendments, Yes on Republican Amendments and No on the Final Bill

NOTE: DEMOCRATS HAVE
A 2/3 SUPERMAJORITY
IN THE HOUSE

WHICH DEMOCRATIC STATE SENATORS PASSED HB5002 IN THE SENATE?

Vote for HB-5002 Sequence Number 323

Taken on 5/31

Senate Tally - FINAL VOTE 5/31, Saturday Morning, 2:13AM

The following is the result of the vote at 2:13 a.m.:

Total Number Voting	35
Necessary for Adoption	18
Those voting Yea.....	20
Those voting Nay	15
Those absent and not voting	1

Democrats who voted NO

The following is the roll call vote:

Y 1 JOHN W. FONFARA	N 15 JOAN V. HARTLEY
Y 2 DOUGLAS MCCRORY	N 19 CATHERINE A. OSTEN
Y 3 SAUD ANWAR	Y 20 MARTHA MARX
Y 4 MD RAHMAN	N 21 JASON PERILLO
Y 5 DEREK SLAP	N 22 SUJATA GADKAR-WILCOX
Y 6 RICK LOPES	N 23 HERRON GASTON
N 7 JOHN A. KISSEL	Y 24 JULIE KUSHNER
Y 8 PAUL HONIG	Y 25 BOB DUFF
Y 9 MATTHEW L. LESSER	Y 26 CECI MAHER
Y 10 GARY WINFIELD	Y 27 PATRICIA BILLIE MILLER
Y 11 MARTIN M. LOONEY	N 28 TONY HWANG
Y 12 CHRISTINE COHEN	Y 29 MAE FLEXER
Y 13 JAN HOCHADEL	N 30 STEPHEN HARDING
Y 14 JAMES MARONEY	N 31 HENRI MARTIN
N 15 JOAN V. HARTLEY	N 32 ERIC C. BERTHEL
N 16 ROB SAMPSON	A 33 NORMAN NEEDLEMAN
Y 17 JORGE CABRERA	N 34 PAUL CICARELLA
N 18 HEATHER S. SOMERS	N 35 JEFF GORDON
	N 36 RYAN FAZIO

FINAL VOTE:

Yea 20

(20 Democrats)

Nay 15

(All 11 Republicans
+ 4 Democrats)

ABSENT 1

(1 Democrat)

NOTE:

DEMOCRATS
HAVE A 2/3
SUPERMAJORITY
IN THE SENATE

WARNING: deleted language that was in LCO 8974 required "financial incentives" from municipalities to ensure that "realistic opportunity" was provided. It was struck in LCO

9294 language, but no doubt will be back from the majority legislators in future sessions.

2) No minimum parking requirements for any RESIDENTIAL development under 24 units.

Under 24 units, developers alone decide how much parking to provide - municipalities cannot require any onsite parking at all unless there is a health and safety concern. This means under 24 units, towns and cities and ultimately taxpayers, state and local, are subsidizing parking for developers. Can't we learn from the failed local parking policy in Bridgeport? Bad for Bridgeport is also completely unworkable for every Connecticut town and city.

WARNING: HB 5002 Proponent Eleni Kavros-Degraw stated that the House "struck a deal" with the Senate - likely Senator Duff - at an arbitrary 24 units threshold for parking. So the Senate Majority Party negotiated with the house and is ok with only 24 units and over requiring P&Z parking approvals for parking. This means there is little hope this bill will be amended and MUST BE KILLED!

At over 24 units, a developer hires a "consultant" to state what parking is appropriate - the paid for consultant will do the bidding of the developer, and a municipality can require no more than 110% of what was stated in the consultant's report. This is not based on a national transit standards, but rather yet another gift to developers and will result in our entire state being under parked!

You think there's no parking in your community now? Wait until developers add extreme density with the numerous "as of right" mandates in this bill. There's no onsite parking on the many projects under 24 units that may pop up in the middle of of YOUR town. Then consider all that new residential parking dumped onto your already-congested narrow streets, or state roads with little to no on street parking at all, which limits pedestrian walkways or bike and EV access. In addition, it eliminates the ability to require developers to provide fee in lieu of parking - funds municipalities could have used to create public parking in downtowns! That's ok, let the residents pay for it in their higher property taxes instead - this is just another developer handout.

WARNING: CT will be the only state with this unworkable and reckless statewide parking policy. It is a complete outlier in the U.S. and will forever ruin the quality of life for every municipality our state: cities, suburbs and rural communities.

3) "As of right" conversions of commercial to an undefined amount of "middle housing."

Any as-of-right means no public hearings: no evidence of environmental harm or unique traffic patterns in the neighborhood, no ability of the zoning board to put conditions of approval on it, no ability of a zoning board to use special exceptions to consider if it will harm property values or if they're just isn't the street infrastructure in terms of sidewalks, lighting, width of the road to accommodate the project safely, and in the best interest of the health and welfare of the local community.

"middle housing" was any development under 9 units.

Overreaching as of right policy and reckless policy that creates onerous density in areas not intended for residential development in local POCDs. "As of right" prohibits land use commission reviews or any public hearings and again the only consideration provided is for the municipality's building department health and safety review. It may also prevent any mixed use development in downtowns since only a residential conversion under can circumvent the standard P&Z reviews and permitting process. Can cause town main streets to be converted into all residential, destroying revenue sources for municipal budgets with developers being encouraged by the bill to develop 100% residential in downtowns to avoid zoning reviews. Should be encouraging mixed use instead!

3) Deseg's Transit Communities requires opting in and ceding all local zoning decisions to a "zoning czar" in Hartford and getting rid of public hearings and muting any local voices – the most democratic process that we have - in order to be "prioritized" for many important state funding resources.

4) Harms our natural resources and our ability to protect open space. Any as of right approval process of multifamily whether in a Transit District or anywhere else is unacceptable from an environmental point of view.

A. Prevents use of CEPA- It is highly doubtful if the Connecticut Environmental Protection act (CEPA) would be able to be used for "as of right" development because there's no public hearing, no opportunity to present expert witnesses or to become a party to an administrative proceeding. The public will not really know what's going on in their municipality to be able to file an intervention into whatever process the zoning staff uses to rubber stamp applications.

B. Wetlands -on both tidal wetlands and Inland wetlands there is no statewide requirement of any particular buffer size to protect these important natural resources.

Inland Wetlands are regulated by the local Wetlands agency and while this role is not being disturbed by the bill, the extreme development pressure will end up encroaching up to and within the buffers - most towns do allow development within their established Wetlands buffer and it is allowed by law. This bill will ensure that we will never be able to

expand the wetlands buffers in the future because the land will already be developed

Tidal wetlands- Our tidal Wetlands require undeveloped land to migrate to as the sea level rises and literally drowns them.

The recommendation is for at least a hundred feet of buffer undisturbed but again development is allowed to take place and often is allowed well within that buffer - Fairfield just passed development with construction activity only 15 ft from a tidal wetland. These decisions are up to the local zoning commission which acts on behalf of the state to protect our tidal resources under the coastal area management act. Extreme development pressure will prevent protection or any expansion of these buffers in the future.

Once Inland Wetlands or tidal wetlands are gone because of degradation or sea level rise they are lost forever along with all the ecological services that they provide for free including drought mitigation, flood control, cleansing of stormwater, temperature regulation, wildlife habitat, and carbon absorption. Both tidal wetlands and inland wetlands provide nature-based solutions to climate change. We degrade them and impair their natural protective buffers at our peril.

C. Open Space- As of right means no public hearings no discretion by the zoning Commission - and having a state official oversee local zoning regulations will restrict a Town's ability to require open space. Even though Wetlands regulations won't be affected by this bill, the state takeover of our local zoning boards ability to pass its own customized regulations which control density, coverage, and open space, will lead to environmental harm. Towns know where they need open space and this bill if passed will prevent towns from preserving adequate open space.

The state of Connecticut has a target of 21% of all land mass to be preserved as open space. This target will never be reached based on the development pressure and the usurping of local zoning authorities ability to preserve open space by taking away home rule over their own regulations and by allowing as of right development. CT is the 3rd smallest state in the U.S. and already the 4th most densely populated. Are we looking to turn all of CT into a boroughs of our cities just like New York? Is that what why people moved to CT?

Many components of the bill will interfere with a local planning and zoning' boards ability to protect open space and historic resources. Most towns have an open space set aside - if you build a certain number of units you must preserve a percentage of the original lot as open space. But as of right does not allow that. Watershed towns such as Easton have minimal two and three acres zoning to keep development to a minimum so that the water that's outside of the protected water company land will be able to absorb into the Earth and cleanse it and have it be better able to satisfy our drinking water quality and quantity.

5) Developers can recoup legal costs on 8-30g appeals if the towns lose if it is seen as a delay tactic. This will essentially prevent local P&Zs from denying any 8-30g developments with serious concerns for fear of having to pay the developer's legal costs. Why not have this go both ways? If an developers uses 8-30g as a cudgel with an outsize development that does not adequately consider historical or other environmental/wetlands concerns and loses, they should be made to reimburse the municipality for its legal expenses.

6) Zoning protest petitions are essentially gone forever in yet another giveaway to large development interests at the expense of homeowners. This reverses 65 years of the protest petition statute - which our Supreme Court has acknowledged is needed to protect those in close proximity to a proposed zone change that would allow a different type of development from the current zoning a neighborhood allows. The Supreme Court recognizes that you are more impacted if you are closer to such a change in development. That is why a butting neighbors have standing to appeal such zoning changes.

Under a protest petition, it currently requires signatures of 20% of the ownership within 500 ft of a zoning change and requires 2/3 supermajority vote by the local P&Z to approve the zoning change. In other states one of these two may have been altered, but in CT this anti-property owner bill is altering both factors. A protest petition will now require 50% of signatures of the abutters and a simple majority (50%) of P&Z for approval. Both changes present are higher hurdle to overcome and anti-property owners and anti-residents, thus extinguishing the protest petition that we have had for 65 years. This is yet another complete giveaway to large development interest at the expense of homeowners.

7) How to address "health and safety" added by LCO 9294 is unclear and likely unenforceable since there is no real process in place and absolutely no consideration for public concern since the P&Z commission has been removed from the process entirely. Only land use and building department desk approvals are required for parking related matters under 24 units. The land use department can deny based on your municipality's health or safety departments - no planning & zoning meetings or public hearings where issues or concerns related to parking can be discussed in projects under 24 units. How would this work exactly? In the discussion of intent on the parking section, State Rep Eleni Kavros-Degraw stated in a tortured response that P&Zs can have "discussions" on health and safety concerns with the building departments BUT with no P&Z commission meetings by these duly elected and appointed local leaders - how will this work exactly?

5/22 HB5002 LCO 8974 BILL HAS NOT BEEN CALLED YET - it was expected to be called on Thursday 5/22 with less than 24 hours to review the 92-page bill. When legislators read the actual language on Wed. night/Thurs. AM, what it contained was NOT what was verbally stated by the Majority Leader and they pushed back. [Legislators had issues along with CCM, COST, YANKEE INSTITUTE and CT169STRONG.](#)

Legislators: do not vote until you have read the actual language, do not rely on leadership's talking points or what is said at a presser.

- Majority Leader Rojas is counting votes and cutting deals to keep his caucus on board and pass the most onerous & overreaching version of HB5002 possible.
- There will be SOME edits, but we are told no major changes are expected.
- Will Rojas make public any revised language with adequate time for review prior to the bill being called? Although statements were made Thursday 5-22 that revised language would be available by Friday, 5-23 that has not happened. Revised language in the 92 page "Aircraft Carrier" bill may not be public until called on the floor of the House, possibly Tuesday! Legislators, residents, press will once again not have adequate time to read and understand what's in the bill.
- **NO OTHER STATE HAS PASSED A NO REQUIRED ONSITE MINIMUM PARKING MANDATE - IT IS UNWORKABLE POLICY STATEWIDE!** Just check the linked U.S. map above. Rojas told legislators he is unwilling to remove Sec.6: no required onsite off-street parking on developments.
- **Senator Duff stated: This is nothing but cities (we would say ALL municipalities) and residents subsidizing parking for developers!**
- HB5002 drafting has not been a transparent, collaborative or inclusive process or policy making. Drafters are not listening to input from municipal leaders and local land use experts who understand their municipalities best. Leadership is ignoring well reasoned concerns and the lived experience of local leaders & residents.
- Bridgeport's 17 of 19 City Council members sent a letter to Rojas saying do not pass a statewide no required onsite parking mandate because it has been a failure in Bridgeport since it passed there in 2021 and it has negatively impacted the quality of life for Bridgeport's residents. (Bridgeport City Council members are trying to get a text amendment change to local zoning regs to allow their P&Z to require onsite parking, but the City's leadership & pressure from insider developer interests are trying to stall or prevent that from happening - even trying to exclude P&Z members from meetings & discussions on the need for changes!)
- Follow us on [Twitter](#) & [Facebook](#) for faster breaking news and updates as share!

WHAT CAN YOU DO? REACH OUT TO LEGISLATORS NOW! KEEP SHARING OUR EMAILS, FACEBOOK POSTS AND TWEETS WITH FRIENDS, NEIGHBORS, RELATIVES. Send our quick Petition: <https://ct169strong.org/petition-2025/>

- HB5002 TAKES AWAY LOCAL MUNICIPAL ZONING DECISION MAKING AND IMPOSES ONEROUS UNFUNDED MANDATES ON MUNICIPALITIES.
- THIS IS THE WORST BILL WE HAVE SEEN TO DATE.
- LET YOUR LEGISLATORS KNOW YOU ARE WATCHING AND THAT THEY ARE SUPPOSED TO REPRESENT YOUR INTERESTS, NOT PLAY POLITICS.

UPDATE MEMORIAL DAY 5/26 1:45PM UPDATE HB5002 AMENDMENT LCO 9293:
SUMMARY:

****Combined Summary of House Bill 5002 (2025) as Amended by LCO 8974 and LCO 9294****

This document summarizes all proposed changes to Connecticut law included in HB 5002, incorporating the full content of the strike-all amendment (LCO 8974) and the modifying amendment (LCO 9294). It includes only statutory insertions (underlined or marked "(NEW)") and deletions (in square brackets), organized by topic and statutory section where applicable.

SUMMARY OF WHAT'S IN HB5002 (Version LCO 8974 from 5/22) & LCO 9294 for 5/26 COMMENTS IN RED NOTE: THE SECTION NUMBERS DO NOT AGREE TO THE FINAL BILL - due to the 2nd amendment LCO 9294, which deleted some sections entirely. The comments on the section content however are current.

§	Topic / Program	What it does	Effective date
1 –	Housing- authority transparency (HB6946)	SECTION 1: Enhances Housing Authority reporting requirements. Adds rent-level/rent-change data to each authority's annual report, number of rental units of the HA, units at each price level, as a % of the AMI, by each housing development. The annual change in price levels and when the units qualified as affordable	1 Oct 2025
2	& definitions	SECTION 2: DELETED PER LCO 9294	
3 – 4	Housing- authority governance & tort notice	SECTION 3&4 DELETED PER LCO 9294 Leaves boards at five members but: • requires new-commissioner training • modernizes quorum rules (3 of 5; 4 of ≥ 6) • lets the mayor/first-selectman fill vacancies if fewer	1 Oct 2025

		than two seats are already mayoral; also changes “chairman” to “chairperson” in tort-notice statute. DELETED SECTIONS	
5	Core zoning statute rewrite (CGS § 8-2) From bills: HB7112, HB7061, HB7148	SECTION 5, line 216 LCO 9294 Changes “residential and mixed use” to “middle housing” and line 219 changes “residential” to “middle housing” line 322 adds the word: any “residential” development = Removes mandate for no parking requirement on any commercial, or industrial project so limiting it to ONLY residential - will this cause developers to avoid mixed use in TODs just to keep as of right development! LCO9294 is silent on this point. * **Inserted:** Section 5(b)(11) (modified by LCO 9294) mandates that municipalities allow "middle housing" as-of-right on lots zoned for commercial use, subject to site plan conformity and no substantial public health or safety impact. * **Inserted:** Section 5(d)(8)-(10) prohibits: * Numerical caps on middle or multifamily housing. * Use of "character of the district" unless based on physical standards. * **Inserted (Modified):** Sec. 5(d)(9) allows municipalities to require parking only as provided in Section 6 Statewide Top-Down MANDATE eliminating local (a) minimum-floor-area rules, (b) numeric caps on multifamily or middle housing, (c) all mandatory parking minimums; and requires every municipality to allow duplexes, triplexes, cottage clusters, etc. as-of-right on any commercially zoned lot for MIDDLE HOUSING = UP TO 24 UNITS! VERY ONEROUS DENSITY TOP DOWN STATE MANDATE!!!! Concerning - does not consider the possible hazardous and environmentally concerning uses of a commercial property if they have not been properly remediated. Towns must allow middle housing (e.g., duplexes, triplexes, quadplexes, cottage clusters) UP TO 24 UNITS! as-of-right in commercial zones—reducing the power of P&Z commissions to block or condition these developments. THIS IS ONEROUS DEVELOPMENT! • Zoning commissions cannot deny applications for insufficient parking unless there’s a proven health/safety threat. • Developments over 24 units only require a “parking needs assessment”, not compliance with existing minimums. Residents will not be able to voice their concerns since there is not P&Z review and no public hearing under “as of right”	1 Jul 2026

		development, so would not have an opportunity to file a CEPA (CT Environmental Protection Act) claim.	
--	--	--	--

6	STATE Top-Down MANDATE - No required minimum onsite parking on developments and DELETES the current policy of MAXIMUM Onsite Off-street parking requirement: 1 parking spot for Studio & 1BRs and 2 parking spots for 2+ BRs. (Note: municipalities were able to opt out of this state Maximum parking policy by 1/1/2023 and many did to allow for greater flexibility in the future in their local parking regulations.) Read our writeup: 2025 - 2-28 - HB7061 NO OFF-STREET PARKING REQUIREMEN TS.docx	LCO 9294 in line 23 &33 , adds “zoning enforcement officer” to line 333 and 341 in LCO 8974 LCO 9294 adds lines 27-29 “unless such officer or commission finds that a lack of such parking will have a specific adverse impact on public health and safety.” After LCO 8974 line 337 * **Inserted (Modified):** Development proposals may not be rejected for lacking off-street parking unless a specific adverse health/safety impact is found. * **Inserted:** For developments ≥24 units, developers must submit a parking needs assessment. Municipalities may condition approval on no more than 110% of assessed need. A commission may not deny a RESIDENTIAL project for lack of off-street parking<24 units; for projects ≥ 24 units (or large commercial equivalents) it may order a developer-funded parking-needs study and require at most 110 % of demonstrated need. <u>THIS POLICY HAS NOT BEEN ENACTED STATEWIDE ANYWHERE IN U.S.</u> There is a clear lack of knowledge of proper planning process by the House leaders pushing this policy. Majority leadership is pushing this completely onerous & completely unworkable one size fits all policy STATEWIDE. • Mandates municipalities and residents to subsidize parking for developers =A HANDOUT! Developers can create larger outsized projects to maximize density and profits, does not improve affordability • Potential inadequate parking for residents, no accommodation for guest parking, deliveries, etc. • A remedy already exists to developers to reduce the amount parking required on a site-specific basis. An Appeals can be made to the Zoning Board of Appeals to reduce the parking required based on financial hardship. Planners have stated that these requests are generally honored. A Solution seeking a problem?	1 Jul 2026
---	--	---	---------------

		• Narrow roads (city, suburb & rural) now forced to have on-street parking only may not be able to accommodate increased sidewalks or biker lanes and lack transit • Policy adopted locally by Bridgeport in 2021 has been a failure and caused significant quality of life and safety issues for residents there. 17 of 19 Bridgeport DEMOCRATIC City Council Members signed a letter to the Majority Leaders to NOT pass this concept! BAD for Bridgeport, BAD for all of CT! • Quality of life safety and accessibility issues for elderly, handicapped, families with small children, safety concerns with after hours needing to search for on-street parking at off hours. • CT lacks public mass transit that offers frequent service (weekends, holidays and Sundays and after 9PM) easily accessible and offers endpoint to endpoint access for ALL life activities. • This is bad for all of CT, but especially cities where residents employed in service industries, restaurants, hospitals, etc and work after 9-5 hoursbut especially cities where residents employed in service industries, restaurants, hospitals, etc and work after 9-5 hoursbut especially cities where residents employed in service industries, restaurants, hospitals, etc and work after 9-5 hours. • Municipalities with narrow roads face safety hazards due to lack of sightlines with forced on-street parking, endangers bikers and pedestrian traffic. Potentially inaccessible areas for fire, police & ambulance • Creates town public works issues - prevents proper cleaning of streets, trash removal, snow plowing	
7	Mobile showers & laundry pilot	DSS must deploy ≥ 3 shower trailers <i>and</i> ≥ 3 laundry trucks in at least three towns; report and sunset 1 Jan 2027.	Upon passage
8	Protest-petition rule Our writeup: W 2025 - 2-2...	To force a protest, vote now requires signatures from 50 % of the land area or owners (was 20 %); if met, the zone change passes on a simple majority instead of $\frac{2}{3}$.	1 Jul 2025

		Diminishes ability to protest zoning changes, potential environmental damage and limiting property rights of neighbors.	
9	Municipal affordable-housing plans	LCO 9294 Line 51-52, changes LCO 8974 “affordable housing units” to “Residential and Mixed Uses, not including.” Reinforces this is not about affordability, just about density development and developer favored legislation. LCO 9294 Lines 52-59 Adds more detailed definition of “Developable Land” after LCO 8974 line 409: “(A) Land already committed to a public use or purpose, whether publicly or privately owned; (B) existing parks, recreation areas and open space that is dedicated to the public or subject to a recorded conservation easement; (C) land otherwise subject to an enforceable restriction on or prohibition of development; (D) wetlands or watercourses as defined in chapter 440; and (E) areas exceeding one-half or more acres of contiguous land that are unsuitable for development due to topographic features, such as steep slopes;” LCO 9294 Line 76 changes “and make it financially feasible” to “and the administrative burdens” at LCO 8974 Line 443 and deletes “without administrative burdens” at line 445 LCO 9294 Line 79 changes “in a determined time frame” to “in a time frame that shall be consistent and” at line 447 LCO 9294 Line 84-85 requires municipalities to only provide for the creation of a sufficient supply of affordable housing by meeting “25%” of the municipality’s total fair share affordable housing allocation. LCO 8974 line 530. LCO 9294 line 92 adds “or disability to LCO 8974 line 539 LCO 9294 Affordable Housing Planning (CGS §8-30j) * **Inserted:** Priority Affordable Housing Plans required for towns in the top 80% of adjusted ENGLC. * **Inserted:** Plans must: * Identify developable land. * Include unit type quotas (e.g., ≥50% family units, ≥25% rentals, ≤25% age/disability-restricted, ≤20% studios/1BRs). * **Inserted:** Ties approval of plans to eligibility for state discretionary infrastructure funding. Maintains the five-year plan cycle and, for “priority” (generally wealthier) towns, adds a Priority Affordable Housing Plan	1 Jul 2025

		tied to state infrastructure-fund preferences. Arbitrary deadlines using alphabetical listing of towns.	
10	State mandated "fair-share" allocation Link to our worksheet to see your municipality's Fair Share Allocations: x What's Yo... Link to detailed writeup of Fair Share Concept: w 2025 - HB... Link to FAIR SHARE CONSULTANT FINAL REPORT: Final Report & Results	LCO 9294 line 129 requires "every 10 years thereafter" to update fair share allocations at LCO 8974 Line 632. LCO 9294 lines 145-181 added to LCO 8972 after line 647. 1) requires using Fair Share Study Alternative Approach A 2) Mandates municipalities to inventory their vacant and developable land 3) Municipalities can propose an alternative Fair Shares to the Roundtable 4) Roundtable to analyze the results & can recommend alternative Fair Shares 5) Legislator both houses must approve those Fair Shares ** OPM must assign a "municipal fair share allocation" every 10 years. ** Through 2034, must use "Alternative Approach A" from May 2025 Fair Share Housing Study. ** Municipalities may submit alternative allocations with vacant land inventory INCONSISTENCY IN BILL DRAFT LANGUAGE: Although the bill states implementation of Study Alternative A, it conflicts with other language in the bill that states no fair shares to Poverty Cities and no fair share percentages greater than 20%. Alternative A INCLUDES ALLOCATIONS ABOVE 20% AND ALLOCATIONS TO THE POVERTY CITIES. LCO 9294 Line 229 sets submission of methodology deadline as not later than 1.1. 2035 and every 10 years thereafter and requires legislative vote of approval. We have stated the methodology is flawed, so why allocate 25% of a flawed methodology that never considers whether municipalities have the infrastructure and developable land to support such density development? OPM must set a 10-year affordable-unit target for each town (cap = 20 % of its housing stock) based on wealth, poverty, housing mix, and grand-list strength.	10 Oct 2025

		• Total Housing Need being allocated is # of residents spending > 30% of annual income on housing costs. The flawed assumption is each of those people need a brand-new apartment rather than focusing on finding ways to make CT more affordable to residents. • The Majority Leader chose the Baseline Approach (which failed in 2 prior sessions - too onerous). It allocates total housing need to every municipality except 6 cities with over 20% poverty. • Methodology is based on 3 highly correlated wealth factors and multifamily %, & caps fair share at 20% max • Fair Shares are deeply <u>AFFORDABLE</u> units • Bill language mandates upzoning for very dense development to give DEVELOPERS a “<u>reasonable opportunity</u>” to build the allocated “fair shares.” • For builders to develop affordable, would require 80-95% of total units in a project to be market value and remaining 5%-20% would be the affordable • Rezoning would require planning for ALL units (market value + fair shares) that would permit doubling of existing housing stock in almost every municipality! • ALL allocations are unrealistic and unattainable, regardless of methodology used • Majority leader chose the baseline approach intentionally, the only version that exempts the 6 poverty cities despite that the technical experts that were part of the study recommended Alternative #2 instead which based allocations instead on Commuter access to jobs, regional growth and regional	
11	Ban on hostile architecture	Municipalities may not install, and must remove on complaint, devices primarily intended to keep unhoused people from sitting or lying (e.g., bars, spikes, “armrests”). A solution looking for a problem: per the 2024 Homeless point in time report CT has only 574 unsheltered homeless statewide and CT has the lowest chronic homelessness in the U.S. This is yet another unnecessary unfunded mandate on municipalities.	10 Oct 2025
12	Middle-housing grants	DOH may fund housing-authority projects that add duplexes, triplexes, etc. in towns ≤ 50 000 population.	1 Jul 2025
13	Direct rental-assistance pilot	Authorizes nonprofits (including authorities) to give short-term cash help to voucher wait-list households; ends 1 Jul 2028 with a performance report.	1 Jul 2025

14	Open-Choice Voucher relaunch	Revives the mobility pilot that pairs 20 rental assistance certificates with the inter-district Open-Choice school program through 2026-27.	1 Jul 2025
15	Regional Planning Incentive Account	Beginning FY 26 each COG receives \$200K for housing/land-use staff plus \$200K for either regional stormwater or solid-waste coordinator , + existing \$7 M formula aid pool.	1 Jul 2025
16	Statewide wastewater-capacity study	DEEP & DPH must map available plant and septic capacity to guide future housing growth. Should also account for needed capacity to meet stormwater runoff due to more violent and extreme storm activity due to climate change. Also does not address if the storm water runoff is also being handled by the wastewater treatment plants, which would require additional infrastructure investment to address these deficiencies.	10 Oct 2025
17	First-time-home-buyer savings	Creates tax-deductible savings accounts; payroll deposit option; adds matching subtraction on the income-tax side.	1 Jan 2026(tax year '26)
18	Jobs Fund - Housing-Construction	Establishes union-pension-backed revolving fund for affordable housing requiring project-labor agreements. Raises the labor costs on affordable projects, more expensive to build	10 Oct 2025
19	CHRO/Attorney-General enforcement	Extends civil-rights authority to zoning decisions that have discriminatory intent or impact . Concerning overreaching expansion to powers given to the Attorney General.	10 Oct 2025
20	8-30g appeals standard	LCO 9294 Lones 267-270 adds to end of Section 20 of LCO 8974 at Line 1657: "provided the total number of units in the affordable housing development or affordable dwelling units in the set-aside development ordered by the court to be built is at least ninety per cent of the units proposed in the original application of such person to the commission." A commission must (i) show <i>sufficient record evidence</i> for each reason it cites <i>and</i> (ii) satisfy one of the two statutory defenses; courts may award attorney's fees if a denial was in bad faith or meant to delay. This is only one sided, does not account for developers who abusing 8-30g to build outsized projects in historic areas and in wetlands. Should the developers lose their 8-30g appeals, they should be forced to pay the municipalities legal fees.	10 Oct 2025
21	Algorithmic rent-setting ban	Bars landlords from using revenue-management software that shares confidential rental data (e.g., YieldStar, RealPage).	10 Oct 2025

22 – 24	Transit-Oriented Community (TOC) program & Inter-Agency Housing Council Read writeup: w 2025 - HB...	Towns that opt in must adopt TOC zoning within 18 months or repay priority infra-grants; Office of policy and management acts as the zoning czar: sets density and mixed-income minima inside TOCs; creates a state council to coordinate policy. Those lack transit and do not opt in are deprioritized for funding resources. Requires 3 onerous “as of right” mandates in the transit area on municipalities that opt in: 1) up to 9 units as of right with no affordable 2) 8-30gs in transit area 3) 100% affordable built by the municipality, state, housing authorities, non-profits, churches or developers. For existing TODs: Does not provide a true “grandfathering” from these 3 as of right mandates – they must request to be exempted from the state zoning czar for these 3 as of right mandates and found to “reasonably” comply with the requirements. Vague and uncertain that the decisions will be made consistently for all municipalities with existing transit. All municipalities can request to be exempted from all the other yet to be named regulations, but they must be approved by the zoning czar.	10 Oct 2025
25	COG bike/transit project grants	OPM may fund COG-led transit, bicycle, and pedestrian improvements that support housing growth. With the no onsite parking under 24 units, does not address the safety and sightline issues created due to the lack of adequate parking.	1 Jul 2025
26 – 28	Housing-growth -zone & accessory-unit tweaks	Broadens the statute on “housing-growth zones”; overrides previous local opt-outs for accessory dwellings inside TOCs; lets long-time (3 years) owners add ADUs even where towns opted out. Arbitrary - treats some property owners inequitably.	1 Jul 2025
29	Add'l wastewater-capacity directive	Requires DEEP to publish plant-upgrade cost estimates and priority areas for capacity expansion. Does not provide actual funding needed, just targets municipalities.	10 Oct 2025
30	School-construction bonus Writeup: w 2025 - HB... Spreadsheet: x 2025 - SB...	DELETED BY LCO 9294 Strikes this entire section, we agree! Adds +5 %, +3 %, +2 % reimbursement tiers for districts in towns that reach 10 %, 8 %, 6 % deed-restricted housing under 8-30g. Inequitable funding mechanism, not based on rising student enrollment or capacity needs. Wasteful state	10 Oct 2025

		spending - favors city municipalities who received state subsidies for affordable development over the last 30+ years.	
31	See § 18 Jobs Fund	(integrated—no separate date) LCO 9294 Changes the effective date to 1/1/2026	
32	Fair-rent commissions Writeup: W 2025 - HB...	LCO 9294 Change fair rent commissions to only municipalities with a population of over 15K at the last decennial census and a regional fair rent commission can set their own form and manner for complaints to be made to that commission. Every municipality must have a local, joint, or regional commission by 1 Jan 2028 . Unfunded mandate for fair rent commissions, even for municipalities with few/no rentals and a population of over 15K.	1 Jan 2028 deadline
33	Adaptive-reuse “summary review”	LCO 9294 DELETED THIS SECTION COMPLETELY A commercial building vacant ≥ 1 year or ≤ 50 % occupied may convert to housing through a 65-day review; existing non-conformities stay; property-tax assessment frozen for 3 years.	10 Oct 2025
34 – 38	Tenant and safety protections	Lengthens eviction grace and cure periods; updates mobile-home-park rules; mandates annual elevator inspections in multifamily buildings; several notice/abandoned-property tweaks. Anti-landlord policies limit the number of residents willing to rent out ADUs and prevent smaller “mom and pops” from purchasing 2-family homes for risk of losing their home on non-payments by renters. Will lead to more hedge fund real estate purchasers and less end user ownership and increasing home and rental prices as the investment sector with deep pockets will compete/crowd out homeowners for purchases.	10 Oct 2025
39	8-30g moratorium points	Awards ¼-point credit for by-right middle-housing units when calculating a moratorium; other technical fixes.	10 Oct 2025
40	CALL TO ACTION: MORATORIUM - CALL DEMOCRATIC GOVERNOR CHERIE DODD FOR SEND OUR QUICK	LCO 9294 LIMITS the “review” of 8-30g to the “exemption threshold” We believe for many reasons that 8-30g has to be completely reworked. See red graphic on next page! LEADERSHIP (ROJAS, LOONEY, DUFF, RITTER): 860-240-8500 LAMONT: 860-566-4840 SEND OUR QUICK PETITION: https://ct169strong.org/petition-2025/ OPM must study replacing the %-of-stock moratorium trigger with a flat-unit number and report to the legislature. May attempt to make moratoriums more difficult to achieve, when only 14 municipalities have ever achieved a moratorium, this would stifle municipalities that may have decided to follow the	Upon passage

CONTACT YOUR LEGISLATORS SAY NO TO HB5002

- “FAIR SHARES” QUOTA WILL DOUBLE YOUR TOWN’S ENTIRE HOUSING STOCK
- NOT ALLOWED TO REQUIRE PARKING ON PROJECTS < 24 UNITS
- NO P&Z REVIEW OR PUBLIC HEARINGS ON ANY COMMERCIAL CONVERSIONS TO APARTMENTS
- DEVELOPERS GET LEGAL FEES IF TOWNS LOSE AN 8-30G APPEAL
- DEPRIORITIZED FOR STATE FUNDING IF DON’T OPT IN TO ZONING CZAR
- HIGHER LOCAL PROPERTY TAXES: NUMEROUS UNFUNDED MANDATES, INFRASTRUCTURE & SERVICES OVERWHELMED

HOUSE VOTE AS EARLY AS 5/22

EXISTING 8-30g LAW IS EXTREME & NOW HB5002 ADDS MORE ONEROUS ONE SIZE FITS ALL STATE MANDATES!

ChatGPT 4o

No other state has a tool quite as powerful or far-reaching as Connecticut’s CGS §8-30g. While many states have inclusionary housing policies, fair share mandates, or override mechanisms, Connecticut’s statute is uniquely aggressive in:

- Shifting the burden of proof to municipalities
- Overriding local zoning in any district
- Allowing private developers to initiate the override
- Enabling by-right development unless narrowly justified health/safety concerns apply

ChatGPT 4o

Conclusion

Connecticut’s §8-30g remains the most developer-empowering, override-based affordable housing statute in the United States. Massachusetts’ 40B is closest in form and history, but still offers municipalities more discretion. California’s “builder’s remedy” is potentially as sweeping, but its scope is conditional and its judicial enforcement is less mature.

This makes Connecticut’s approach—though controversial—a national outlier and a model of enforceable, binding state-level override authority in the affordable housing space.

TAKE ACTION NOW- SIGN PETITION

<https://ct169strong.org/petition-2025>

HISTORY OF HB5002 (PRIOR TO THE AIRCRAFT CARRIER CURRENT LANGUAGE) THIS BILL WAS THE ORIGINALLY A HOMELESS PLACEHOLDER DUMMY BILL WITH NO DETAILED LANGUAGE = POOR LEGISLATIVE PROCESS

General Assembly

January Session, 2025

Proposed Bill No. 5002

LCO No. 1013



Referred to Committee on HOUSING

Introduced by:

REP. RITTER M., 1st Dist.

REP. ROJAS, 9th Dist.

AN ACT CONCERNING HOUSING AND THE NEEDS OF HOMELESS PERSONS.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives in General Assembly convened:

- 1 That the general statutes be amended to lower housing costs, increase
- 2 housing options and better support homeless persons.

Statement of Purpose:

To lower housing costs, increase housing options and better support homeless persons.

TIMELINE:

2/13- DUMMY BILL PUBLIC HEARING - BECAUSE THE SUBJECT MATTER DETAILS ARE UNKNOWN - NO SPECIFIC BILL LANGUAGE FOR RESIDENTS TO SUBMIT DETAILED TESTIMONY = POOR LEGISLATIVE PROCESS!

3/4- IT WAS VOTED OUT OF COMMITTEE AS A DUMMY BILL TO BE DRAFTED.

3/6- NEW SUBSTITUTE LANGUAGE ADDED TO THE BILL AND VOTED OUT OF HOUSING COMMITTEE AGAIN (IRREGULAR) AS IT IS STILL A DUMMY PLACEHOLDER. STILL NO DETAILED LANGUAGE! THIS BILL HAS A LARGE NUMBER OF DEMOCRAT SPONSORS LISTED- LIKELY VERY BAD CONCEPTS ARE DUMPED INTO THIS PLACEHOLDER TO BE CALLED FOR A VOTE ON THE FLOOR OF THE HOUSE. **SEE SUBSTITUTE LANGUAGE LCO 5861 BELOW**

5/2 VOTED PLACEHOLDER BILL JOINT FAVORABLE BY MAJORITY IN FINANCE COMMITTEE WITHOUT ANY LANGUAGE THAT REQUIRES ANY FUNDING = A BLANK CHECK! BAD PROCESS (SEE COMMITTEE MEMBER VOTES BELOW)

**5/16 VOTED PLACEHOLDER JOINT FAVORABLE BY MAJORITY IN
APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE WITHOUT ANY LANGUAGE THAT REQUIRES
FUNDING = BLANK CHECK! (SEE COMMITTEE MEMBER VOTES BELOW)**



Referred to Committee on HOUSING

Introduced by:
(HSG)**AN ACT CONCERNING HOUSING AND THE NEEDS OF HOMELESS PERSONS.**

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives in General Assembly convened:

- 1 Section 1. (*Effective from passage*) The Commissioner of Housing shall
2 conduct a study on initiatives to lower housing costs, increase housing
3 options and better support persons experiencing homelessness in the
4 state. Not later than January 1, 2026, the commissioner shall report the
5 results of the study, in accordance with the provisions of section 11-4a
6 of the general statutes, to the joint standing committee of the General
7 Assembly having cognizance of matters relating to housing. Such report
8 may include the commissioner's recommendations for legislation
9 regarding lowering housing costs, increasing housing options and
10 better supporting persons experiencing homelessness in the state.

This act shall take effect as follows and shall amend the following sections:

Section 1	<i>from passage</i>	New section
-----------	---------------------	-------------

Committee Bill No. 5002**Statement of Purpose:**

To lower housing costs, increase housing options and better support homeless persons.

[Proposed deletions are enclosed in brackets. Proposed additions are indicated by underline, except that when the entire text of a bill or resolution or a section of a bill or resolution is new, it is not underlined.]

Co-Sponsors: REP. RITTER, 1st Dist.; REP. ROJAS, 9th Dist.
REP. CONCEPCION, 4th Dist.; REP. REYES, 75th Dist.
REP. COMEY, 102nd Dist.; REP. GAUTHIER, 38th Dist.
REP. MARTINEZ, 22nd Dist.; REP. MCGEE T., 116th Dist.
REP. NOLAN, 39th Dist.; REP. SWEET, 91st Dist.
REP. SANCHEZ J., 6th Dist.; REP. LUXENBERG, 12th Dist.
REP. BROWN M., 127th Dist.; REP. ROBERTS, 137th Dist.
SEN. ANWAR, 3rd Dist.; REP. SANCHEZ R., 25th Dist.
REP. ELLIOTT, 88th Dist.; REP. FARRAR, 20th Dist.
REP. CHAFEE, 33rd Dist.

5/1 Oppose: THIS BILL WILL NOW POTENTIALLY BE AN "OMNIBUS" "AIRCRAFT CARRIER" "FRANKENSTEIN" "TORJAN HORSE" BILL AND CAN HOLD MANY OF THE BAD BILLS WE HAVE ALREADY SUBMITTED TESTIMONY ON BEFORE INCLUDING THE FOLLOWING CONCEPTS:

UPDATED NOW 5/1 AS A QUICK PETITION ON OUR CT169STRONG.ORG:

Dear Legislators,

I urge you to VOTE NO on *any zoning CONCEPTS that:*

- Limit lots sizes to no more than one acre statewide*
- Allow up to 4 UNITS housing "as of right" on any lot statewide*
- Prohibit requiring any off-street parking on new projects*
- End local zoning in 1/2 mile transit areas until avg. density is 15 units/acre*
- Allow outside housing authority to build in towns without permission*
- Allocate unattainable fair shares and permit non-profits/developers to sue for not creating 'reasonable opportunity' to build fair shares*
- Churches can build As-Of-Right 8-30gs & 8 homeless/migrant SHEDS*
- Ban P&Zs from temporary multifamily moratorium for planning*
- Allow developers to extend sewer systems*
- mandate towns to provide shelters to remove homeless/migrant performing 'life activities' on public land*
- Deprioritize funding if don't opt in to state deciding all zoning in transit area & permit*

As-Of-Right 8-30gs in transit area

- End site specific zoning commission reviews on "as of right" multifamily development*
- Weaken resident rights to protest zoning changes*
- Weaken resident's CEPA rights to sue for environmental pollution concerns on developments*
- Ban conservation requirements on subdivisions*

Sincerely, Connecticut Resident

WILL A DUMMY BILL (HB 5002?) BE THE MAJORITY PARTY'S OMNIBUS TROJAN HORSE?

BAD CONCEPTS THAT END LOCAL ZONING DECISION MAKING:

- No more than one acre zoning statewide
- Allow 4 UNITS on ALL single family lots "As of Right" statewide
- Cannot require any off-street parking on developments
- Ends all zoning in 1/2 mile around transit until the average density for all transit areas in any municipality is at least 15 units per acre
- Outside housing authority can build in other towns without permission
- Allocate unattainable fair shares & permit non-profits/developers to sue for not creating a "reasonable opportunity" that fair shares are built
- Allow Churches to build "As of Right" 8-30gs and up to 8 homeless & migrant sheds without water, sewer or kitchens
- Bans P&Zs from temporary multifamily moratoriums for planning purposes
- Allows developers to extend sewer systems
- Bans removing homeless/migrant performing "life activity" on public land unless municipality provides alternative shelter = unfunded state mandate
- Deprioritized of infrastructure funding if a municipality does not opt in for OPM as zoning czar in transit oriented community & "as of right" 8-30g

CT'S HAS POOR ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION OF 80% OF PRIVATELY HELD LANDS IN WATERSHED & PUBLIC WATER SUPPLY. AND NOW INCREASE RISKS TO CT'S ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION & RESOURCES:

- "As of Right" on high density multi-family projects and conversions of industrial or commercial to residential = No zoning commission review
- Weaken & limit rights to protest zoning changes
- Weaken & limit CEPA rights to object on site specific projects for air, soil, water, noise pollution concerns
- No conservation land can be required on any subdivisions

WILL A DUMMY BILL (HB 5002?) BE THE MAJORITY'S OMNIBUS FRANKENSTEIN BILL?

BAD CONCEPTS THAT END LOCAL ZONING DECISION MAKING:

- No more than one acre zoning statewide
- Allow 4 UNITS on ALL single family lots "As of Right" statewide
- Cannot require any off-street parking on new project developments
- Ends all zoning in 1/2 mile around transit until the average density for all transit areas in any municipality is at least 15 units per acre
- Outside housing authority can build in other towns without permission
- Allocate unattainable fair shares & permit non-profits/developers to sue for not creating a "reasonable opportunity" that fair shares are built
- Allow Churches to build "As of Right" 8-30gs and up to 8 homeless & migrant SHEDS without water, sewer or kitchens
- Bans P&Zs from temporary multifamily moratoriums for planning purposes
- Allows developers to extend sewer systems
- Bans removing homeless/migrant performing "life activity" on public land unless municipality provides alternative shelter = unfunded state mandate
- Deprioritized of infrastructure funding if a municipality does not opt in for OPM as zoning czar in transit oriented community & "as of right" 8-30g

CT'S HAS POOR ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION OF 80% OF PRIVATELY HELD LANDS IN WATERSHED & PUBLIC WATER SUPPLY & FURTHER INCREASE RISKS TO CT'S ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AND RESOURCES WITH:

- "As of Right" on multi-family projects and on conversions of industrial or commercial to residential = Ends site specific zoning commission review
- Weaken & limit rights to protest zoning changes
- Weaken & limit CEPA rights to object on site specific projects for air, soil, water, noise pollution concerns
- No conservation land can be required on any subdivisions

CT 169
STRONG

PLACEHOLDER BILL LCO5861 TESTIMONY::

HB 5002 AN ACT CONCERNING HOUSING AND THE NEEDS OF HOMELESS PERSONS UPDATED LANGUAGE FROM - 3/6: HB5002 LCO5861:

Section 1: Another group to study "barriers" to building additional starter homes in the state; both at state and municipal level including zoning restrictions, subdivision requirements, building and fire codes and community regulations.

"Starter Home" is defined as affordable "single family residential dwellings.

The working group consisted of chairpersons of standing committees who may be subject matter experts such as housing and planning and development, Commissioner of Housing or commissioner's designee, or any professional with experience of housing, regional and local planning. **Flag: Housing advocates; no local zoning commissioners or local representatives.**

The working group shall submit its report no later than January 1, 2026.

On and after July 1, 2025, local school boards/towns may receive increased funding for school building projects for a 5-year period if they show to the Commissioner of Housing if they meet the following thresholds of affordable housing as provided in 8-30g, specified in subdivisions (1) to (3); 20 percent if the town meets or exceeds ten percent threshold of affordable housing, or 8 percent if the municipality for such board meets at least eight percent but less than ten percent of such threshold of affordable housing, and (3) five percent if the municipality for such board meets at least six percent but less than eight percent of such threshold of affordable housing. Language is connected to [HB7028](#). **Issues: 8-30g's 10 percent threshold is not attainable by most towns; Boards of Education do not have any statutory authority over zoning or home building and have little control of new affordable dwellings being built.**

The State Bond Commission may have the power from "time to time" to authorize the issuance of bonds not to exceed \$50M for the purpose of financing approved projects to create employment opportunities in construction to develop affordable housing. The Commissioner of Housing shall establish a pilot program to create such a program. In order to be part of the pilot program, the Commissioner of Housing may establish a criteria for awarding funds. To be eligible for funds, candidates must secure coinvestment funding by a union pension fund or commingled fund of union pension fund with a demonstrated recording of successful funding, the proposed project be covered by a project labor agreement, and (an applicant be committed to workforce training by adhering to state-registered apprenticeship standards and apprenticeship readiness programs

Issues: Why not be more prescriptive and provide the funding for towns which have less than 10 percent of affordable housing? How are the approved projects vetted? "Time to time" is vague. Why is it important to include a union pension fund? (Union pension funds are increasingly investing in affordable housing projects, often through partnerships with organizations like the AFL-CIO Housing Investment Trust (HIT), to create or preserve housing for working-class families and ensure union jobs in the construction process).

All housing built with funds received from the pilot program pursuant to this section shall remain affordable, through the use of 102 deeds containing covenants or restrictions that require such housing be 103 sold or rented at, or below, prices that will preserve the unit as housing, 104 for a period of not less than forty years.

Issues: Why not make affordable housing "forever" affordable?

Not later than six months following the date of completion of the 109 pilot program, the Commissioner of Housing shall submit a report on the efficacy of the program.

Issues: Consider having an outside, unbiased agency review the success of the program.

PUBLIC HEARING WAS HELD ON THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 13, 11AM ON THE DUMMY BILL. ORIGINAL SUGGESTED TESTIMONY AGAINST DUMMY BILLS:
- SIGN UP TO TESTIFY ON ZOOM OR IN PERSON ON 2/13:

https://zoom.us/webinar/register/WN_2wtjd4A0SWSZ1J9WjZMT5Q#/registration

LINK TO SUBMIT TESTIMONY IN HOUSING COMMITTEE:

https://www.cga.ct.gov/asp/CGATestimonySub/CGAtestimonysubmission.aspx?comm_code=HSG

Instructions:

- Click on the Testimony Form [HERE](#)
- Fill in your information
- Hearing date dropdown menu: choose Feb 13, 2025 at 11AM
- Choose Bill

You may type in your testimony using sample language below or attach your own testimony via Word or PDF.

(ORIGINAL DUMMY BILL DRAFT TESTIMONY)

Dear Co Chairs, Vice Chairs, Ranking Members and Members of CT's Housing Committee:

I am writing to urge you to vote NO on HB 5002 AN ACT CONCERNING HOUSING AND THE NEEDS OF HOMELESS PERSONS.

The only text in this bill is "[T]hat the general statutes be amended to lower housing costs, increase housing options and better support homeless persons." This is clearly a "dummy bill," meaning that the Committee intends to change the bill in its entirety and substantively after the public hearing process!

This practice of passing dummy bills is intentionally opaque to avoid controversial discussions with the public about an issue as critical as housing, land use and property rights, among others. The public can only assume the committee intends to enact sweeping reforms that will impact all citizens negatively in the cover of darkness. I urge you to reject the practice of secret lawmaking by overriding the public's right to be heard via "dummy bills," like HB 5002.

Thank you for your consideration of my request.