

Housing Committee JOINT FAVORABLE REPORT

Bill No.: HB-7035

AN ACT PROHIBITING A MUNICIPALITY FROM IMPLEMENTING A BAN ON

Title: MULTIFAMILY HOUSING DEVELOPMENT.

Vote Date: 3/6/2025

Vote Action: Joint Favorable

PH Date: 2/27/2025

File No.: 245

***Disclaimer:** The following JOINT FAVORABLE Report is prepared for the benefit of the members of the General Assembly, solely for purposes of information, summarization and explanation and does not represent the intent of the General Assembly or either chamber thereof for any purpose.*

SPONSORS OF BILL:

Housing Committee

REASONS FOR BILL:

This bill will address the authorization of temporary bans to multi-family housing utilized in many Connecticut municipalities, which run afoul of CSG 8-2 that outlaws bans on multifamily housing. While some municipalities enacted temporary bans to deal with proper planning, often, these bans are reauthorized to prevent the possibility of any multifamily construction. Given the state of Connecticut's housing market, proponents of this bill argue its passage will help increase development and assist with housing insecurity.

RESPONSE FROM ADMINISTRATION/AGENCY:

None expressed.

NATURE AND SOURCES OF SUPPORT:

[Lauren Tagliatela, GRC Co-Chair, CTAA](#) – Lauren Tagliatela supported this bill because it protects existing multifamily housing and invites future construction, while preventing local zoning from prohibiting certain structures. One area of concern is that it, "prohibits zoning regulations from requiring special permits for childcare in residential areas." The CTAA has fought against bills that force housing providers to allow 'in apartment' daycares since it opens landlords up to liability and allows their properties to be utilized in unintended ways.

The following testimonies expressed similar support of the bill:

[Dondre Roberts, Housing Provider, CTAA](#)

[Jessica Doll, Executive Director, CT Apartment Association](#)

[Raphael Podolsky, Attorney, Policy Advocate, Connecticut Legal Services, Inc.](#) – Raphael Podolsky supported this bill and stated that bans on multifamily housing development are "inappropriate and counter-productive", particularly when there is a housing crisis. Podolsky stated that the requirements of municipal zoning to create opportunities for multifamily dwellings, promote housing choice, and economic diversity in housing – including both low- and moderate-income households – are not new requirements. Podolsky added that under C.G.S. 8-30j, towns have been required to prepare affordable housing plans.

[Jim Perras, CEO, HBRA of CT](#) – Jim Perras supported this bill, as it ensures no municipality can completely prohibit multifamily development, which exacerbates the state's affordability crisis. Perras stated this is essential for providing affordable housing options since multifamily housing is a key part of Connecticut's housing ecosystem. Perras shared that, "more than two-thirds of municipalities have zoning regulations that severely restrict or ban multifamily construction", and this bill would align with best practices in pro-housing states, "ensuring that towns cannot use zoning laws to perpetuate housing scarcity and drive up costs."

[Sean Ghio, Policy Director, The Partnership, PSC](#) – Sean Ghio supported this bill, as some municipalities abuse temporary bans on multifamily housing development by annually renewing them; for example, Trumbull, "recently voted to extend a moratorium on multifamily rental apartment developments larger than 50 units, marking the fourth consecutive year of this moratorium." Ghio added that these development bans are a, "convenient method to discriminate against the potential occupants of these apartments rather than the scale of the development."

[Frank DeFelice, Chairperson, RiverCOG RPC, Durham PZC](#) – Frank DeFelice supported this bill but questioned why the state of Connecticut continues to mandate minimum dimensions for "manufactured" residential housing, adding that if a dwelling meets the state building, housing, and other codes, then its size is irrelevant. DeFelice stated the language in line 23 of the bill should be changed to eliminate, "having as their narrowest dimension twenty-two feet or more and", to truly improve the affordability of housing in Connecticut.

The following testimonies expressed general support of the bill:

[Timothy Hollister, Attorney, Hinckley Allen](#)
[Joshua Caskey](#)
[Elizabeth Craun](#)

NATURE AND SOURCES OF OPPOSITION:

[Maria Weingarten, CoFounder, CT169Strong](#) – Maria Weingarten opposed this bill and stated that towns are not intending to be "bad actors" when they place a ban on developing multifamily housing; more likely, they are not prepared to handle the influx of applications, therefore discretion should be left to them. Weingarten named Ridgefield as an example, they recently used a temporary ban on multifamily development to address their zoning in a methodical way and updated zoning regulations to reflect those needs. Weingarten shared their belief that this is, "a proper tool to provide better strategic planning locally and should not be ended by state government overreach."

The following testimonies expressed similar opposition to the bill:

[Alexis Harrison, CT169Strong](#)

[Karen Fassuliotis](#)

[John Guskowski, Government Relations Officer, CT Chapt., Amer. Planning Assoc.](#) – John Guskowski opposed this bill as it is, "both redundant to other municipal zoning requirements within the statutes and removes an important regulatory tool that allows municipalities to properly plan for the orderly development of our communities." Guskowski stated the Zoning Enabling Statute already contains similar requirements, and preventing temporary bans does not allow the Zoning Commission, "time and space to properly plan for an improved approach to certain development regulations."

[Francis Pickering, Executive Director, WestCOG](#) – Francis Pickering opposed this bill and spoke on the important uses of temporary moratoriums in municipal planning, including, "to protect public health and safety, address infrastructure limitations, and prevent uncoordinated growth that could strain local resources." Pickering stated the pause to development created by these moratoriums is not a problem but a step toward a solution, allowing local leaders to fix any outdated or ineffective regulations that fail to meet the needs of the community. As a result of this bill, Pickering feared that, "municipalities may resort to more restrictive zoning changes, leading to more legal challenges from developers and less predictability in the planning process."

[Samuel Gold, Executive Director, RiverCOG](#) – Samuel Gold is in opposition to this bill and stated that it is confusing since the term "ban" is not clearly defined as referencing zoning or not. Gold added there may be good reasons to prohibit dense and intensive development in certain parts of a municipality, and it could be argued that an outright ban on multifamily housing cannot exist in Connecticut because, "under CGS section 8-30g, multifamily housing can be proposed, approved, and built in any municipality, if it meets minimum affordability requirements." RiverCOG suggests changes to the language that, "requires that zoning be amended to be consistent with the housing requirements in the statute for the creation of the municipal plan of conservation (PoCD)."

[Kirk Carr](#) – Kirk Carr opposed this bill because of a breakdown in collaboration between municipalities and the state. Carr stated that the temporary moratoriums were in response to 8-30g, and instead of addressing concerns through dialogue, this bill, "Prohibits municipalities from enacting a "temporary or permanent ban" on multifamily housing development." Carr added this, "back-and-forth cycle has created an increasingly adversarial dynamic, with each side feeling disempowered and compelled to take drastic action", and suggested collaboration as an alternative, to address creating a framework for responsible local planning, developing incentives (not just penalties) for towns to meet housing goals, ensuring zoning decisions respect both state housing priorities and local realities, and addressing legitimate concerns about school overcrowding, traffic congestion, emergency services, and infrastructure capacity.

The following testimonies expressed general opposition to the bill:

[Gina Carey](#)

[Lisa Bernier](#)

[Jerry Cincotta](#)

[Paul Arvoy](#)

**Reported by: Arianna Tsikitas, Clerk
Jasmine Jones, Assistant Clerk**

Date: 3/17/2025