

Planning and Development Committee JOINT FAVORABLE REPORT

Bill No: HB-5288 / [Bill Status](#) / [Public Hearing Testimony](#)

AN ACT CONCERNING UTILITY CONNECTIONS FOR ACCESSORY
Title: APARTMENTS.

Vote Date: 3/6/2026

Vote Action: Joint Favorable Substitute

PH Date: 2/27/2026

File No.:

***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:

Planning and Development Committee

REASONS FOR BILL:

HB 5288 main goal is to further define what accessory dwelling units are, designate locations or zoning districts within the municipality in which accessory apartments dwelling units are allowed and set a maximum net floor area of more than thirty per cent of the net floor area of the principal dwelling or one thousand square feet (whichever is lower).

This bill intends to create more affordable housing within the state with specific regulations for accessory dwelling units.

SUBSTITUTE LANGUAGE (IF APPLICABLE):

The substitute makes the provisions of the bill applicable to towns that exercise zoning powers pursuant to a special act.

RESPONSE FROM ADMINISTRATION/AGENCY:

N/A

NATURE AND SOURCES OF SUPPORT:

[Home Builders & Remodelers Association of CT, CEO, Jim Perras](#) expresses support for HB 5288 as he believes makes important clarifications to state law that remove unnecessary cost and regulatory barriers to ADU construction. In addition, this bill would reinforce statewide consistency in ADU policy, limits the imposition of additional local standards beyond those

authorized in statute, and preserves appropriate health, safety, and building code requirements.

[Connecticut Chapter of the American Planning Association, Government Relations Officer, John Guskowski](#) strongly supports HB 5288 as they believe is a necessary step towards helping facilitate the production of more accessory dwelling units throughout Connecticut and removing unnecessary barriers. He proposes a small edit to change the ten-year income restriction to forty years as Special Session Public Act 25-1 recently changed this provision.

[Lower Connecticut River Valley Council of Governments, ACIP Executive Director, Samuel S. Gold](#) supports HB 5288 as he believes this bill may make constructing accessory dwelling units cheaper to build and maintain. He mentions that according to this bill that the definition of an Affordable Accessory Dwelling Unit requires a deed restriction of only 10 years while under PA 25-1 only dwelling units with a deed restriction of 40 years can be considered affordable in Affordable Housing Goals and Housing Growth Plans. He believe this is a small discrepancy and should be looked at further.

NATURE AND SOURCES OF OPPOSITION:

[CT Water Works Association, Executive Director, Elizabeth Gara](#) opposes HB 5288 as she believe it would raise issues in the near future for private water entities. In its current state private water entities would be prohibited to consider an accessory dwelling unit as a new residential use for the purposes of calculating connection fees or capacity charges for utilities, including water and sewer service as well as requiring the installation of a new or separate utility connection directly to an ADU or imposing a related connection fee or capacity charge. She mentions how existing water service to the main house may not have sufficient capacity or pressure to support an ADU and would need another utility connection She strongly believes that the language strikes the appropriate balance between supporting the creation of ADUs and protecting the safety, availability, and quality of public water supplies.

[Serenity House Elkanah Ministry, Meriden, CT, Rev. Ernestine Holloway](#) opposes HB 5288 and he strongly believes that it is not wanted and or necessary. He believes that CT taxpayers pay enough as is and wishes that the Planning and Development Committee vote against this bill.

[Town of Litchfield, First Select Chairman, Denise Raap](#) strongly opposes this bill as they argue HB 5288 would prohibit municipalities and water pollution control from charging sewer connection fees for accessory apartments. She explains how removing this revenue stream would weaken the financial position of Litchfield's Water Pollution and Control Authority which could lead to higher user fees for all residents or deferred maintenance. Additionally, she believe that this bill would be removing local discretion and that a one-size-fits-all mandate isn't realistic for CT towns similar to Litchfield.

Reported by: Rachel Casasnovas

Date: 3/9/26