

Housing Committee JOINT FAVORABLE REPORT

Bill No: SB-151 / [Bill Status](#) / [Public Hearing Testimony](#)

AN ACT PROHIBITING CERTAIN LAND USE AND ZONING LIMITATIONS ON

Title: HOUSING.

Vote Date: 3/10/2026

Vote Action: Joint Favorable

PH Date: 2/17/2026

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:

Housing Committee

REASONS FOR BILL:

This bill would create a five thousand square foot or 0.11-acre minimum lot size requirement into law and prohibit municipalities from adopting and/or enforcing certain zoning ordinances as it relates to lot size and setbacks. The legislature hopes that by adopting this legislation, more starter homes will be created for young first-time homebuyers and seniors seeking to downsize.

RESPONSE FROM ADMINISTRATION/AGENCY:

None Expressed.

NATURE AND SOURCES OF SUPPORT:

[SDO, Martin Looney and Bob Duff, Senate President Pro Tempore and Senate Majority Leader](#) submitted testimony in support of this legislation sharing their belief that it would spur housing construction in the state, while allowing municipalities to do it in areas where it makes sense and where infrastructure is already in place. They noted that this legislation would do disrupt historic districts, agricultural lands, or conserved lands. They emphasized that it would also not impact areas of the state that are reliant on septic tanks or well water.

The following submitted testimony in support of this legislation noting it takes thoughtful and necessary steps to remove some of the most common regulatory obstacles to housing production. She continues adding that allowing a broader range of housing types will increase housing supply, support workforce housing, promote economic growth, and create more

attainable homeownership opportunities. She emphasized that some municipal requirements function as de facto density limits, which increase land costs per unit and make smaller, more attainable homes financially unfeasible. She points out that this legislation allows homes to be built at a scale that aligns with today's market realities while still preserving public health, safety, and infrastructure considerations. She said that by limiting unnecessary mandates, this bill helps lower construction costs and improve project feasibility, particularly for workforce and middle-income housing. She emphasized this legislation does not eliminate local control but establishes reasonable statewide parameters to ensure that zoning supports housing opportunity:

[MCR Property Management Inc., Gabrielle Armstrong, General Manager](#)
[CTAA, Lauren Tagliatela, GRC Co-Chair](#)

[Open Communities Alliance, Hugh Bailey, Policy Director](#) pointing out that the devastating effects of the winter season on homeless individuals, saying it is unacceptable for a state with as many resources as Connecticut to have levels of homelessness that have been the case in recent years. He says that we must spend what is necessary to keep people off the streets and prevent them from becoming homeless in the first place. He expressed that large lot-size minimums are a serious hinderance to affordability, and it is sensible to change laws that require large minimum lot sizes, especially in areas served by public water and sewer. He believes that the state is in an affordability crisis.

[Thomas Broderick](#) submitted testimony in support of this legislation sharing a CBIA report that notes the state's housing shortage substantially impacts middle-income and moderate-income households who are fully employed but increasingly priced out of suitable housing options. The report continues stating that the economic consequences of this housing deficit are substantial. Thomas expressed that this bill is about choice, freedom, flexibility, and affordability for towns, friends, and families.

[Sara C. Bronin](#) submitted testimony in support of this legislation sharing that the state's most influential constraint on residential development is the minimum lot size. She stated that five thousand square foot lots would allow for detached homes with yards and townhouses. She notes that this legislation does not eliminate health and safety protections, nor does it override building codes or fire codes. She emphasizes this legislation does not mandate density but offers options for property owners seeking to contribute to a more affordable, accessible way of life in the state to subdivide their larger lots into lots of a more reasonable size. She stated that this prevents environmentally wasteful land consumption in infrastructure-served areas and facilitates the creation of more housing that the state needs.

[Greater Hartford Gives Foundation, Senecal and J. McBride Public Policy Team](#) submitted testimony in support of this legislation sharing their foundation's desire to address disparities and remove barriers that keep Connecticut residents from reaching their full potential to achieve equity. They stated that based on their foundation's investments in housing stability and security and advancing access to affordable housing and economic mobility.

[Jennifer Callery](#) submitted testimony in support of this legislation sharing her experience growing up in upper Fairfield County with "classist, misguided zoning" that prevented her and her husband from being able to afford a home or an appropriately sized lot to build due to large-lot and minimum home size requirements. Jennifer noted that it is impossible for new homeowners to enter the market as they do not have extreme equity.

[Peter Clarke](#) submitted testimony in support of this legislation noting that it would enable Connecticut communities to provide starter homes for young people and homes that seniors can downsize into. He stated that as a young person, he is worried about his ability to purchase a home. He also pointed out that he has parents who would like to downsize but have few options for smaller homes in town.

[Peter O'Connor](#) submitted testimony in support of this legislation sharing that smaller homes served his parents throughout the phases of their life and continues to serve families throughout the phases in their lives. He stated that cities and towns are not independent law-making entities, they are political subdivisions of the State of Connecticut.

[Enfield Planning and Zoning Commission, Chris D'Antonio, Vice Chair](#) submitted testimony in support of this legislation sharing that it could stand to see some tweaks, but is ultimately strong, as it will make the state and municipalities stronger. He noted that there is nothing that precludes property owners from retaining their current medium and large size lots or buying adjacent lots and expanding as they see fit. Chris emphasized that if one desires large amounts of space and distance from neighbors, that freedom exists, and always should.

[Daniel Darbandi](#) submitted testimony in support of this legislation sharing that it will increase opportunities for young people to obtain homeownership and for seniors to downsize within their communities.

[Trio Properties, Jeff Feron, President](#) submitted testimony in support of this legislation sharing that it supports housing creation rather than unintentionally preventing it. He stated that this legislation does not eliminate local zoning authority. He expressed that the state cannot close its housing gap without making it feasible to build more homes. He emphasized this legislation helps create the conditions necessary to expand supply, support workforce housing, strengthen the economy, and provide more pathways to homeownership and stable rental options.

[Garden Homes, Richard Freedman, President](#) submitted testimony in support of this legislation discussing legislative attempts in the 1960s by Sen. Edward Marcus to enact modest zoning reform. He noted that during those debates, the House minority leader testified the state had "no moral right" to interfere with community self-determination noting the state's strong tradition of home rule. He stated that argument solved nothing then and solves nothing now. He advises that this legislation could be defeated by several local regulations. He suggests addressing concerns about impervious coverage and stormwater management, issues which are addressed in areas with denser zoning than in this legislation.

[CTFCCC, Michelle Gagliardi, Coalition Leader](#) submitted testimony in support of this legislation noting it would lead to the establishment of new childcare centers by empowering homeowners to use their existing space without needing new construction. She also noted that it protects current infrastructure. She expressed that licensed family childcare is a residential use of a home. Michelle advises adding explicit protections from HOA restrictions is a logical necessity to ensure the spirit of the law is not undermined by private associations.

[Partnership for Strong Communities, Sean Ghio, Policy Director](#) submitted testimony in support of this legislation noting it would make homeownership more affordable for

Connecticut families. He suggests the committee consider an amendment to Section 1 of the bill to expand the types of missing middle housing permitted to include duplexes, triplexes, and quadplexes. He stated that Connecticut's outdated and overly restrictive zoning regulations continue to stand in the way of a more prosperous Connecticut.

[Regional Plan Association, Pete Harrison, Connecticut Director](#) submitted testimony in support of this legislation stating it supports reasonable three-story height restrictions consistent with existing building and fire code standards for single-family homes and townhomes, and these developments would fall under existing state and/or local conservation and stormwater management laws. He noted that this legislation has reforms that would unlock significant new production of starter homes in areas that are well-suited for housing growth, both economically and environmentally. Pete provided suggested tweaks to the legislative language in the bill. He expressed that this legislation complements the goals of economic prosperity, racial equity, and environmental conservation. Pete emphasized it also complements the goals of [Public Act 25-1](#) to help the state make wise infrastructure investments that will support towns and cities with their Housing Growth Plans.

[Jordan Knight](#) submitted testimony in support of this legislation but gave suggested guardrails. The first was to clearly define "starter home". The second is to adjust the setback quotas as laid out in the legislation. He finally advises a targeted regulatory flexibility for small homes only when in a cottage cluster, or pocket subdivision. He stated that starter homes are modest, efficient, community-scaled housing that address the needs of citizens who are currently shut out of the homeownership market because Connecticut town's have acted to prohibit them.

[Miles Lasater](#) submitted testimony in support of this legislation noting it would promote affordability and family formation, economic development, and fairness and equity. He noted that it is also environmentally responsible and eliminates arbitrary and exclusionary standards.

[New London Human Services Network, Jeanne Milstein, Co-Convener](#) submitted testimony in support of this legislation sharing her belief that restrictive zoning has exacerbated the housing crisis within the state. She notes that home rule has kept out young adults, families, seniors, black, indigenous, and other people of color and others at the lower end of the income ladder. She emphasized that things will not change unless the state acts.

[MCR Property Management, Janice Miner, Chief Operating Officer](#) submitted testimony in support of this legislation stating that it would allow for a broader range of housing that will increase housing supply, support workforce housing, promote economic growth, and create more attainable homeownership opportunities. She emphasized that by establishing reasonable statewide guardrails, this legislation allows for homes to be built at a scale that aligns with today's market realities while preserving public health, safety, and infrastructure considerations. Janice noted that this legislation does not eliminate local zoning.

[Casey Moran](#) submitted testimony in support of this legislation sharing that the state is short 250,000 homes and amending state law to allow them to be built in walkable accessible places is the most prudent way to welcome new growth to our state. They noted that the only way out of the housing crisis is to reform regulation to allow homes to be built again and

enabling lot splitting and small lot development is one of the best, most cost effective, and affordable ways to do that.

[People Friendly Stamford, Zachary Oberholtzer](#) submitted testimony in support of this legislation noting that it would increase property rights and allow homeowners more flexibility, reduce their tax obligation, and raise money through sale of owned land. He emphasized that density is environmentally friendlier than sprawl.

[HBRA of CT, Jim Perras, CEO](#) submitted testimony in support of this legislation sharing that it improves predictability for municipalities, residents, and housing producers while preserving local review and oversight. He expressed that this legislation does not prescribe density targets or direct where development must occur, but rather ensures that otherwise appropriate residential housing cannot be excluded solely through regulatory design. Jim noted that there should be careful collaboration to advance housing production goals while respecting the planning objectives and unique characteristics of the state's municipalities.

[Connecticut Legal Services, Raphael Podolsky, Attorney and Policy Advocate](#) submitted testimony in support of this legislation sharing that municipal zoning restrictions make it more difficult to build the kind of housing that would attract first-time homebuyers and seniors. He stated that he supports the reasonable use of zoning to promote the development of lower cost housing.

[Town of Guilford, Larry Rizzolo, Planning and Zoning and Affordable Housing Commissions](#) submitted testimony in support of this legislation noting that current zoning laws impede the state's economic growth and prosperity. He expressed that the delegation of some authority to local governments sets up a dynamic tension between the state's imperative to create more housing and the municipality's interest in maintaining local control. He emphasized this legislation would be beneficial for young people who are looking for their first home and for seniors who are looking to downsize. He noted that local control would still exist under this legislation.

[CTAA, Dondre Roberts, Member](#) submitted testimony in support of this legislation noting it would allow for more housing types in more places. He stated that zoning rules have limited the types of homes that can be built, which has restricted supply, increased housing costs, and reduced opportunities for working families in the state.

[Connecticut Voices for Children, Eli Sabin, Legislative Coordinator](#) submitted testimony in support of this legislation noting it would expand options to missing middle housing, which the state needs. He pointed out that these starter homes can be for young families looking to buy a home or for seniors looking to downsize. He expressed that when thinking about the root causes of homelessness and housing insecurity, it is important to acknowledge that an increase in housing stock and salaries that allow people to lead dignified lives are central to the solution.

[Connecticut General Assembly, Zachary Smith, Legislative Intern](#) submitted testimony in support of this legislation noting that the state has one of the most strained markets in the country. He stated that towns should have a say in housing, but should not be legally allowed to continuously say no. He noted that he believes the state would like to see younger people live, grow, and stay in the state, but local opposition to housing is so strong that scenario is less likely as time goes on.

[Eric Steinlauf](#) submitted testimony in support of this legislation noting that large minimum lot sizes lead to increased infrastructure expenditures and taxes, delayed emergency services, environmental degradation, loss of agricultural land, loss of historic character, and lacks adaptability to changing demands. He stated that he believes zoning decisions are best when made locally, but this legislation addresses a critical issue. He advises the committee to consider the implications of "design, architectural or aesthetic elements for a single-family home" on Line 78, as it could unintentionally prohibit Form Based Zoning.

[Tim Vilinskis](#) submitted testimony in support of this legislation sharing there is no indication that this would create public health or safety issues, harm community character, or lower property values. He shared that the committee should also look at lot size reform for areas with only central water and those with just well and septic. He advises four fixes to the [HB 8002](#) framework: grant an immediate 8-30g moratorium when a municipality adopts an approved Housing Growth Plan, legalize missing middle housing at the state level, revise the builder's remedy, and adopt reasonable housing targets. He says this legislation accomplishes the legalization of missing housing at the state level aspect.

The following submitted general support for the bill:

[James M Armstrong](#)

[Clara Biesel](#)

[William Marut](#)

[Susan Propheter](#)

[Friendship Service Center, Caitlin Rose, CEO](#)

[Santini Villa Apartments, Kevin Santini, Landlord & Property Manager Developer](#)

[Benjamin Schwartz](#)

[Jerry Silber](#)

[CT Coalition of Property Owners, John Souza, President](#)

[Adam Weber](#)

The following testimonies seek for the bill to be amended from an appropriation of \$33.5 million to \$123.9 million through the Prevent, Respond, House method. They note this added funding is to backfill federal cuts and that without the proper appropriation, there is a risk for housing loss, provider closures, and major system disruptions. They emphasized the importance of expanding housing options to solve homelessness:

[Homes with Hope, Carmen Ayala, Director of Diversion Services](#)

[New Reach, Kellyann Day, CEO](#)

[Alpha Community Services YMCA, Jenita M. Hayes, Board of Directors](#)

[Homes with Hope, Helen McAlinden, President and CEO](#)

[Liberty Community Services, Jim Pettinelli, Executive Director](#)

[Christian Community Action, Fateria Sheats, Landlord Engagement Specialist](#)

[Homes with Hope, Katharine Weldy, Senior Director of Supportive Housing](#)

NATURE AND SOURCES OF OPPOSITION:

[SRO, Stephen Harding, Senate Minority Leader](#) submitted testimony in opposition to the bill. He notes that the bill erodes local control and local decision making and believes it does not make the state's housing more affordable. He states that first responders, mayors, and land use officials oppose the legislation, and that the bill will endanger natural resources and public health. He urges the committee to reject the bill.

[SRO, Tony Hwang, State Senator](#) submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation noting that it overrides local planning tools that protect public health, safety, and fiscal stability. He notes that infrastructure capacity is measurable and must be addressed before density is compelled. He expressed that this legislation does not require affordability and increased density does not guarantee homes will be more attainable. He stated that environmental and watershed protections are also weakened by removing local discretion without adding state safeguards. Senator Hwang expressed that this legislation compels housing form and subdivision outcomes while narrowing municipal review.

[SRO, Jeffrey Gordon, State Senator](#) submitted testimony in opposition to the bill. He states that each municipality has unique characteristics and features, and so therefore that municipality can most effectively determine what is best for them. He believes that the state should allow municipalities to retain their autonomy when it comes to land use zoning, and that this bill will eliminate that ability. He goes through individual sections of the bill and his issues with them in his written testimony.

[Town of Greenwich, Fred Camillo, First Selectman](#) submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation sharing that it would do nothing for towns, but everything for developers and Hartford legislators who continue to try to force punitive and self-defeating policies down the collective throats of suburban towns. He stated that with congestion and flooding becoming increasingly more problematic for most towns, this bill would exacerbate these areas of municipalities that are vulnerable to more density, impervious surfaces, and congestion. First Selectman Camillo noted that in his position, he has heard from first responders who have access issues in some of the more congested parts of town, and this legislation would only exacerbate those areas' accessibility.

[Town of Easton, Dan Lent, First Selectman](#) submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation noting he has concerns about the environmental impact and usage of environmental resources it would have if implemented. First Selectman Lent noted that a carbon score or impact of a building project should be computed. He expressed that this legislation is bad public policy and unsafe to the public to not consider environmental impacts. He submitted a [second testimony](#) further elaborating his concerns.

[Town of Ridgefield, Rudy Marconi, First Selectman](#) submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation noting it would prohibit municipalities from enforcing certain lot sizes, setbacks, and design standards for single-family homes. He noted that a one-size-fits-all mandate does not adequately account for the differences between municipalities. He expressed there is no assurance that newly built homes will be within reach of working families, seniors, or first-time buyers. He stated if we are serious about affordability, there are ways to address it but it should not be accomplished by broad prohibitions on municipal authority.

[Town of Fairfield, Christine Vitale, First Selectperson](#) submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation sharing that adding new mandates at this time places an unnecessary strain on town staff, disrupts planning processes already underway, and requires new levels of community engagement that will slow the process of good faith affordable housing efforts. She stated that when new legislation is so quickly proposed, there is a risk of confusing residents, which is

complicated by a feeling that the goal posts are being moved before municipalities have had a fair opportunity to carry out the requirements as laid out in [HB 8002](#).

[Gail Aiello](#) submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation noting that this bill undermines local zoning discretion without necessary consideration of the actual local on-site circumstances within areas that have existing or planned public water or sewer. She noted that this bill mandates lots of no greater than .11 acre for single family or townhomes. She stated there is no requirement for affordability or modest attainable starter homes, but to encourage exponential high density larger homes. She expressed this legislation will cause the teardowns of currently existing naturally occurring affordable housing, to be replaced by high density luxury units.

[Rick Aiello](#) submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation sharing he believes it violates the Connecticut Environmental Protection Act and home rule. He says that this legislation fails to consider whether utilities have the capacity for new connections for all areas with public sewer and water. He continues noting the legislation also does not consider the school capacity needs with density expansion in every municipality wherever there is water and sewer or planned water and sewer. He stated that there is no funding for water or sewer expansion in this bill and some municipalities that have sewer capacity provided by nearby cities or towns. He questions how municipalities without their own sewer plants permit the development mandated in all areas with public sewer and water if the other municipality providing sewer is unwilling/unable to provide additional sewer capacity. He expressed there is also no consideration of the surface runoff generated by such a large increase in impervious surface, nor its impacts on flooding and water quality. Rick noted that there are no requirements that the housing built in this bill be affordable and developers will build the largest scale possible on each unit to maximize their profits, which will lead to an increase in luxury housing, but no increase in affordable housing. He added that this legislation creates a one size policy that cannot fit all and is trying to turn suburban areas with sewer and water into dense cities, while ignoring infrastructure needed to support that density. He points out that forcing cars to be parked on-street can present a danger to pedestrians, bicyclists, and vehicles by limiting sight lines and in cases of emergency as emergency vehicles may be impeded.

[Debbie Alterio](#) submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation sharing that appropriate planning of towns is essential and that is why there are zoning laws. She noted that overstressing schools, police departments, and fire companies is not about affordability. She added that it is important to preserve the powers of local Zoning Boards.

[Brian Bagley](#) submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation sharing that this will have a negative impact on towns. He stated that there are portions in the bill that will need to be looked at further as restriction for water, waste, sanitary and some others fall entirely in different situations on mobile home parks. He added that there are portions of the bill where the communities affected have a right to share their opinion. He expressed that there are financial decisions that people make and are now potentially being wiped away by legislative means.

[Jeff Becker](#) submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation sharing that it would only prove to drive up costs, strain resources, will make roads that are already badly congested even worse, and will raise taxes. He noted that in attempting to develop, there are questions

that need to be answered around environmental concerns. Jeff stated that the bill ignores the results of overdevelopment. He adds that if there are only impervious surfaces, flooding becomes epic. He suggests that paying people a living wage makes housing affordable.

[Town of Killingly, Jonathan Blake, CZEO](#) submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation noting that shrinking lot sizes does not guarantee attainability for our workforce or young families. He notes that the legislation promotes density for density's sake rather than affordability. He adds that reduced setbacks increase construction costs and puts public and first responders at risk. He expressed that this legislation overrides local consensus.

[Kirk Carr](#) submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation sharing that when statutory guardrails are reopened annually, municipalities face structural uncertainty. He adds that uncertainty increase fiscal risk and discourages long-term cooperation. He noted that housing production ultimately depends on collaboration between state and local governments.

[Keep Oxford Green, Tanya Carver, Co-Founder](#) submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation stating that a cookie cutter approach to affordable housing regulations does not work. She emphasized that Connecticut cities like New Haven, Waterbury, and Bridgeport and towns like Oxford, Southbury, or other rural towns do not have the same landscape.

[June Logie](#) submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation sharing that it undermines local zoning authority and fails to adequately consider the site-specific conditions crucial to sustainable development. She noted that this legislation has no affordability requirement, erodes local design standards, and will lead to a loss of historic and open spaces. June stated that this bill poses a threat to rural and suburban communities, as the legislation does not consider infrastructure, water capacity, or environmental protections.

[SPC Advisors, Sheri P. Chromow, Founder](#) submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation sharing that as a New York City dweller, she bought a home in Connecticut because she missed the foliage, peace and quiet, clean air, community, and sense of belonging. She added that this legislation is extreme and there should be a way for residents of the state to work with lawmakers to find a happy medium.

[Shawn Connelly](#) submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation noting that there are opportunities and means to either create affordable housing or enable people to live more affordably without affecting rural areas and smaller towns that lack the appropriate infrastructure to support high density. Shawn noted that this could be accomplished by providing infrastructure for businesses to increase remote workers, thereby freeing up office space to convert into affordable homes while also giving workers more options to live.

[Wendy Costa](#) submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation stating that Connecticut is not an attractive place for out-of-state individuals to desire to move to. She noted that the issue of setbacks and lessening them presents a safety issue. Wendy expressed that residents value their open space, rural character, and continue to pay for that privilege through property taxes. She pointed out that towns cannot support significant changes, as they do not possess the infrastructure to support significant growth that is possible under this legislation. She emphasized that one size does not fit all.

[Nicolas Dacey](#) submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation sharing that it would lead to the erosion of municipal diversity. He points out this legislation would lead to homogenization and remove the choice to live in a low-density suburb which would lead to the flattening of the regional market. He noted that 70% of Connecticut's tax revenue comes from a single county in the state, and stripping away predictability, as would be done with this legislation could lead to capital flight. He noted that the bill could also lead to the neglect of existing cities. He stated that in the 1920s Secretary Commerce Herbert Hoover and his Advisory Committee on Zoning understood that unregulated development was a threat to the American economy, and that municipal zoning provided predictability. He said that people entered long-term financial commitments based on the zoning laws of their communities, and this legislation would shatter that stability. He advises that if the state wants more housing, we must take a slower, tamer, and more localized approach that respects Home Rule.

[Mark Davis](#) submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation noting that it would erode public confidence in future planning efforts. He stated that materially scaling back current setback and lot coverage limitations will incentivize developers to build oversized single-family detached homes, which contrasts with the purpose of the bill. He advised that the bill allow towns to require larger lot size minimums than 5,000 square feet if the town can provide empirical evidence that the infrastructure cannot support additional homes. He also advises that towns can require reasonable, minimum off-street parking requirements.

[Judith de Graffenried](#) submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation sharing it represents an unconstitutional nullification of local zoning rights. She noted that towns are designed with multiple categories of lot sizes in their zoning ordinances to accommodate the wide range of topographical, environmental, and infrastructural characteristics of that municipality. Judith stated that towns do not have the infrastructure to support greater water and sewer demands for high density housing. She pointed out that high property taxes and increasing homelessness drive the elderly out of the homes they have paid off. She emphasized the environmental impacts this legislation would have.

[Maxwell Decataldo](#) submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation noting that it is important to maintain local control to ensure that the state does not force urban sprawl on every municipality in the state. He said that what makes the state a special and desirable place is the greenery, nature, and peace and quiet. He stated that there is a place for density, in cities and the surrounding suburbs but expanding that to rural areas will impact farmland and stress local infrastructure that can have broader environmental, health, safety, and sustainability implications. Maxwell pointed out in other states developers have come in, built neighborhoods, and did not sell them, as they wanted to maintain ownership and rent them for steady income. He stated that there are other methods to addressing housing affordability. He emphasized that this legislation would hurt the average Nutmegger and benefit large developers, big corporations, and private equity.

[RiverCOG, Frank C. DeFelice, Chair](#) submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation noting that it would not reduce building costs. He stated that density is not sustainable as laid out in Lines 69-72. He asked why only immediate threats on Lines 97-98. He emphasized that we would be better served to facilitate the creation of affordable starter homes which are smaller and lower in cost.

[Kathryn Farnsworth](#) submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation noting that it does not require affordability or guarantee of modest, affordable starter homes. She noted that this bill fails to consider the infrastructural capacity of municipalities.

[Justen Fisher](#) submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation sharing he does not believe that creating a "city-style" density in areas that are not suited for it benefits Connecticut residents. He stated that when land is covered with buildings and pavement, the earth loses its ability to act as a natural sponge, reducing groundwater replenishment. He expressed there should be a reasonable middle ground for residential density. He advised repurposing and refurbishing existing buildings to meet housing needs while preserving open space and minimizing environmental impact.

[RiverCOG, Samuel Gold, Executive Director](#) submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation sharing that with very short setbacks and no lot coverage limits, there will be greater gentrification in the places that are already most unaffordable. He stated that prohibiting height restrictions, maximum lot coverages, and five/ten foot maximum setbacks will under the Connecticut Reiver Gateway Commission's ability to protect the "natural and traditional" river scene along the lower Connecticut river. He advises a simple solution would be to exclude properties located within the Gateway Conservation Zone. Samuel noted that this bill would allow townhouses in all single-family residential zoning districts, he says this should be clarified, since in [PA 25-1](#) dictates the maximum units of middle housing that shall be approved by summary review in other zoning districts. He pointed out that a reasonable way to clarify this would be to allow a municipality to set regulations for allowing townhouses and other forms of middle housing in single family zoning districts, that are not stricter than those for a single-family home. He expressed that nothing in this bill gives municipalities additional tools or assistance to facilitate the construction of new affordable housing or preserves existing affordable housing. He advises a state pilot fund could be established to provide help to residents of starter home communities with their property tax bills and improve affordability.

[Geoffrey Gwin](#) submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation noting that it ignores on ground realities and mandates density without addressing practical questions. He wants to know how societal needs will be met with an increase in density. He noted that this legislation does not consider economic viability, public safety, and what is realistically workable.

[Easton RTC, Darrell Harris, Chair](#) submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation sharing that it is not planning, it is a statutory override that strips local commissions of their ability to evaluate certain unique characteristics of each municipality. He stated that this legislation discards that framework in favor of a blanket mandate that treats every serviced area as interchangeable. He expressed this legislation is an erosion of both local control and sound planning.

[CRCOG, Matthew W. Hart, Executive Director](#) submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation noting that it is not timely, as the legislation just recently passed [Public Act 25-1](#).

[Tolland Planning & Zoning Commission, Amanda Hickey, Chair](#) submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation noting there are infrastructure limitations in implementing it, and that towns may be mandated by law to allow higher density, but physically unable to do so

due to lack of infrastructure. She noted that there are also architectural and aesthetic standards that would be undermined by this legislation.

[Margaret Kelleher](#) submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation noting that it would take away private property rights and place a strain on infrastructure that residents would have to fund through taxes. She expressed that high tax paying residents will increasingly flee the state because they have the resources to do so.

[Town of Greenwich, Rachel Khanna, Selectwoman](#) submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation sharing that it fails to protect endangered environmental and natural resources, manage stormwater, and weakens important resiliency initiatives to protect communities from flooding and severe storms. She stated that coastal communities are facing unprecedented challenges due to climate change. She pointed out that zoning is one of many tools to create affordable housing, which is a critical need in the state, but that should not undermine efforts to promote environmental resiliency in the process.

[Higgins Group Private Brokerage, Matthew Lahey](#) submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation noting that his town of Fairfield is already overwhelmed with overdevelopment. He notes there is no requirement for affordability, or requirement for modest attainable starter homes. He expressed that developers would seek to build the largest scale possible on each unit to maximize their profits, which will increase the supply of luxury housing not affordable housing. He notes this legislation will lead to a loss of trees, natural landscape, and cause irreparable environmental harm.

[Amybeth Laroche](#) submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation noting there are several places in the bill that create ambiguity and are overbroad. She stated that this legislation does not require affordability, starter homes, or impose income-based pricing, but by removing density controls while failing to require affordability, the bill incentivizes high-density, high-cost housing on small lots. She stated this legislation removes essential tools from municipalities without ensuring that statewide housing goals are met. She pointed out there are ways to increase housing supply without dismantling local safeguards.

[Publisher, Jackie Lightfield](#) submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation sharing that people prefer a house with a yard, front porch, and room to explore nature over a skyscraper with ornamental trees, and chemically treated strips of lawn. Jackie noted that developers do not build homes because they are altruistic, they build to maximize profit.

[Christine Linford](#) submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation sharing that there is no proof that smaller homes will be built because of this bill, as there is no requirement for affordability and no requirement for modest attainable starter homes. She noted that in recent years there have been too many starter homes purchased by developers and turned into luxury apartments or townhouses. She stated that this only makes developers richer and eliminates generational wealth and the ability for future generations to own homes. She emphasized it also stresses town resources and threatens natural resources and open spaces. She expressed that the state needs to properly invest and rebuild urban cities that already have the infrastructure to support the added density and stop attacking local zoning.

[Beth Love](#) submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation sharing her concern if her neighbor were to sell their home to a developer who could erect an apartment building that is inconsistent with the rest of the neighborhood.

[CCM, Zachary McKeown, Advocacy Manager](#) submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation noting the committee should seek to partner with municipalities to successfully implement the statute instead of more mandates and restrictions on towns and cities. He stated that statewide limitations on local zoning controls do not consider public safety concerns, traffic patterns, infrastructure maintenance, and environmental conservation.

[Kristin Nick](#) submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation sharing it has very little community safety, taxing, environmental and local zoning control measures considered in it. Kirstin believes this bill does not effectively address affordable housing as there is not a reasonable rental rate or limit for the required affordable allotment.

[Danny Nunez](#) submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation noting he believes it is unconstitutional. He expressed that it would limit freedom for people and does not help create more housing and opportunities. He stated what will help is more jobs and less regulations and advises the state should be more like Florida and Texas to allow growth to happen.

[Christopher Paulin](#) submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation sharing that effective housing policy must include local input, infrastructure planning, environmental protection, and affordability solutions, which he believes this legislation does not. He lays out his concerns in his testimony.

[Western CT COG, Francis Pickering, Executive Director](#) submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation sharing that it mandates upzoning and eliminates lot coverage limits, setbacks and height limits, architectural and site design standards, and growth phasing authority.

[Denise Savageau](#) submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation sharing that it does not specifically address affordable housing. She noted that we cannot zone our way out of the affordability crisis, no matter how well intentioned. She expressed that rolling back land use regulations without a clear path to affordability and resiliency is not sustainable. She emphasized that we can have both affordable housing and protect the environment.

[Joseph Simoncek](#) submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation sharing that it will lead to a massive loss of already dwindling open space in towns. He noted it would lead to a loss of green spaces, reduce the number of trees and other vegetation, and will push out any remaining natural wildlife in communities. He emphasized that this legislation fails to consider infrastructure capacity and affordability.

[Anonymous](#) submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation sharing that they believe this legislation does not consider municipalities and local quality of life. They note this legislation fails to consider impacts on schooling, the environment, watershed protections, and traffic seeking to achieve urban sprawl. They stated that the state does not have a population issue, but a control of the people issue.

[Anonymous](#) submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation stating that it would override sensible local zoning controls and allow developers to build housing in communities that don't

want or need it and that don't have the infrastructure to support it. They stated that this legislation would ruin the character and quality of life in communities and accelerate the loss of the state's tax base as those with funds will flee for the quality of life that is undermined in this bill.

[Anonymous](#) submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation sharing their belief that taking control from local town and zoning commissions is a dramatic overreach by the state. They stated that having no height restrictions and dramatic reductions in setbacks is a clear money grab to overpopulate towns and turn every area into a city. They urge the committee to consider sight lines, flooding issues, sewer usage when large buildings are built.

[Anonymous](#) submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation sharing that allowing the subdivision of lots, allowing mega mansions and townhomes, and having no height limitations is irresponsible and only incentivizes developers. They continue noting that there are significant environmental concerns and energy cost issues that need to be considered in this legislation. They stated that the built environment needs to be balanced with the natural environment to absorb flood water and fight increasing extreme weather.

The following individuals submitted testimony discussing how this legislation undercuts the consensus backed policy of [HB 8002](#) that has not yet been allowed to succeed. They also note how this legislation jumps ahead of the required statewide wastewater capacity study, how problematic it is that this legislation relies on areas "connected or planned to be connected" to water and sewer systems, how environmental concerns are not addressed, and how open space and community needs are not met:

[CT Realtors, James Heckman, General Counsel](#)

[CT Realtors, Jim Heckman, General Counsel](#)

The following submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation sharing there is no requirement for affordability or for modest attainable starter homes. They note this will accelerate the decline of single-family neighborhoods by allowing the construction of townhouses and apartments. They add that this legislation removes the local authority's ability to protect historic structures not listed on the historic registry after July and will hasten the destruction of open space across the state through subdivision development:

[Suzanne Bohn](#)

[J. Cilo](#)

[Jill Cilo](#)

[Tina Dahm](#)

[Brian Matzke](#)

[Cristine Gangi](#)

[Anonymous](#)

The following submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation noting that it would undermine environmental and natural resource protection, stormwater management, public and traffic safety, infrastructure, and quality of life:

[Town of Old Saybrook, Carl P. Fortuna, Jr., First Selectman](#)

[Town of East Haddam, Todd Gelston, First Selectman](#)

[Town of Chaplin, James Harrington, First Selectman](#)

[Town of Canterbury, Chris Lippke, First Selectman](#)

[COST, Betsy Gara, Executive Director](#)

[Town of Southbury, Jordan Marcinko, Land Use Administrator](#)

The following submitted testimony emphasizing their support for local autonomy control over zoning:

[Town of Pomfret, Maureen Nicholson, First Selectman](#)

[Town of Oxford, George R. Temple, First Selectman](#)

[Town of Easton, Nick D'Addario, Selectman](#)

[Timothy Allen](#)

[Karen Banks](#)

[Killingly Town Council, Ulla Tiik-Barclay](#)

[Dana Benson](#)

[Lee Ann Berry](#)

[Kathryn L Braun](#)

[Eileen O'Brien](#)

[Robert O'Brien](#)

[Rachel Buchanan](#)

[NECCOG, Mary Calorio, Regional Town Administrator](#)

[Angela Cassidy](#)

[Jerry Cincotta](#)

[Harry Clark](#)

[Colin Cote](#)

[Linda Dalessio](#)

[Yankee Institute, Jack DeOliveira, Policy Director](#)

[Christina Dustin](#)

[Joseph Fernandez](#)

[Harry Fisher](#)

[Marlane Fitzgerald](#)

[Jason Fontaine](#)

[Keva Fothergill](#)

[Alex Frawley](#)

[Urs Broderick Furrer](#)

[Paula Gallo](#)

[Tara Garofalo](#)

[Lori Hamel](#)

[Scott Hobbs](#)

[Rebecca Huebner](#)

[Marliana Imperati](#)

[Wendy Irving](#)

[Edward Isenburg](#)

[Terri Isenburg](#)

[Ellen Jacob](#)

[Jay Koolis](#)

[Katherine Kuhn](#)

[C. Marcella Kurowski](#)

[Debbie Langdon](#)

[Jeanene Lyons](#)

[Edward Maccio](#)

[Lynne MacGregor](#)

[Aaron McCool](#)

[Peter McGuinness](#)
[Town of Oxford, David McKane, Selectman](#)
[Michael McMahon](#)
[Katherine Montgomery](#)
[Eleanor Murray](#)
[Paska Nayden](#)
[Stephanie Niles](#)
[Henry Orphys](#)
[Kara Papa](#)
[Angela Pelletier](#)
[Bria Pepe](#)
[Patricia Pogmore](#)
[Paul Pugliese, Architect Developer](#)
[Selina Rifkin](#)
[Dr. Joseph Santoro](#)
[Jan Schaefer](#)
[Kathleen Smith](#)
[SharonAnn Smith](#)
[Claire Stadtmueller](#)
[Town of Tolland Planning and Zoning Commission, Erin Stavens, Vice Chair](#)
[Cynthia Steckler](#)
[Angela Stock](#)
[Marie Suri](#)
[Town of Oxford Planning and Zoning Commission, Daniel P. Wall, Chairman](#)
[Mary Ann Turner](#)
[Ken Unfried](#)
[Hillary Ungerer](#)
[Michael Ungerer](#)
[Marianne Vochis](#)
[CT169Strong, Maria, Weingarten, Co-Founder](#)
[Samuel Winans](#)
[Fred Yankocy](#)
[Anonymous](#)
[Anonymous](#)
[Anonymous](#)
[Anonymous](#)
[Anonymous](#)
[Anonymous](#)
[Anonymous](#)
[Anonymous](#)
[Anonymous](#)
[Anonymous](#)
[Anonymous](#)
[Anonymous](#)

The following submitted general opposition to the bill:

[David Antonez](#)
[Dawn Baldassarri](#)
[John Boyle](#)

[Linda Czaplinski](#)
[Christina D](#)
[Kim DiCorpo](#)
[Jim Flood](#)
[Lena Gjonaj](#)
[George Harris](#)
[William Malone](#)
[Susan Monaghan](#)
[Michelle Murphy](#)
[Gerard OBrien](#)
[Kw Owner](#)
[Compass Connecticut, Mark Pruner, Realtor](#)
[Ned Simpson](#)
[Ellen S. Smith](#)
[Liz Tetu](#)
[Patricia Thatcher](#)
[Eric Treaster](#)
[Sarah Unfried](#)
[Lynn Wolf](#)
[Barbara Geddis Wooten](#)
[Kim Yannon](#)
[Anonymous](#)
[Anonymous](#)
[Anonymous](#)
[Anonymous](#)
[Anonymous](#)
[Anonymous](#)
[Anonymous](#)
[Anonymous](#)

GENERAL COMMENTS:

[CBIA, Grace Brangwynne, Housing Policy Director](#) submitted testimony noting the CBIA recognizes the need for all types of housing and construction of missing middle units that allows young professionals to begin establishing home equity while maintaining social mobility. She suggests that additional language allow each of these proposals be voted on by the local legislative body in the town or by municipal referendum. Grace adds that incentive-based initiatives as seen in the recently passed [HB 8002](#) are also viable options to move the needle and encourage more housing construction.

[William Dellacamera](#) submitted testimony noting his support for the need for housing while also emphasizing that farmland can be protected. He stated that housing policy must solve one problem without creating another. He also provided amendment language to provide agricultural protections.

[Grijalva Cattle Co., Kimberly Grijalva, Owner](#) submitted testimony noting that this legislation could improve feasibility for affordable multi-family and mixed-use projects, particularly in areas where infrastructure already exists. She noted her concern around the potential unintended consequences that may come along with adopting this legislation. Kimberly

stated that any effort to expand housing opportunities should include strong guardrails that protect working farmland, ensure developers bear appropriate infrastructure costs, and preserve local decision-making authority.

[CT Chapter of American Planning Association, John Guskowski, Government Relations Officer](#) submitted testimony noting that the effective date of October 1st is impractical, given the scale and scope of [Public Act 25-1](#). He stated there are many nuances and ambiguities in that legislation left to address in the 2026 short legislative session. He advises the limited time and energy for this short session is best spent addressing technical fixes to the current law to improve its clarity. He provided suggested tweaks to the legislative language in the bill.

[New Connecticut Farmer Alliance, Ellen Kennen Coordinator](#) submitted testimony stating that the state's housing law should advance two goals together: increasing the supply of affordable housing and protecting the state's rapidly diminishing farmland. She noted that housing priorities can be advanced, but it is also important to ensure that expanding housing opportunity does not unintentionally accelerate the loss of already-diminishing working agricultural land. She advises the committee to put in place mechanisms that allow needed housing while also safeguarding the unique public value of working farmland and high-quality agricultural soils.

[Michael Rossi](#) submitted testimony noting that any restrictions on local zoning regulations should be linked to affordable housing requirements.

Reported by: Tyler Fisher

Date: 3/24/2026