

# Housing Committee JOINT FAVORABLE REPORT

**Bill No:** HB-5362 / [Bill Status](#) / [Public Hearing Testimony](#)

AN ACT IMPLEMENTING THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE MAJORITY

**Title:** LEADER'S ROUNDTABLE.

**Vote Date:** 3/10/2026

**Vote Action:** Joint Favorable Substitute

**PH Date:** 3/3/2026

**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 legislation seeks to enact the recommendations of the Majority Leader's Roundtable on Affordable Housing. The Roundtable is a task force that meets throughout the year and was designed to reach solutions on affordable housing, which are outlined in this legislation. These recommendations intend to benefit property owners and tenants, while promoting affordable housing policies that will expand housing opportunities to a broader swath of renters and homebuyers in the state.

## **SUBSTITUTE LANGUAGE:**

Section 7 which clarifies that the Council on Housing Development can only reject a housing growth plan if that plan did not follow the guidelines as outlined in the legislation. This seeks to ensure municipalities are complying within the framework of this legislation.

Sections 11-13 establishes any housing growth plan would supersede other municipal planning documents. This seeks to clarify that any housing growth plan would take precedent over other municipal plans.

## **RESPONSE FROM ADMINISTRATION/AGENCY:**

**Connecticut Department of Housing, Seila Mosquera-Bruno, Commissioner** submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation noting that it would allow for the consideration of units with abbreviated affordability periods, impose a stay on appeals actively being heard by the Superior Court, if those appeals are open during consideration of a municipal request for

a certificate of affordable housing creation, like a request for a moratorium. She added that it also includes providing a temporary from the appeal provisions of those statutes to any municipality whose moratoria were to expire between passage and adoption of the new municipal housing growth plan authorized under **Public Act 25-1**. She stated that this legislation would require the Department of Housing to be subject to local planning and zoning procedures associated with a public hearing around potential construction of affordable housing on land owned or controlled by the state, which contradicts Connecticut caselaw. She emphasized that these are contrary to the mission and work of the Department of Housing and would have the effect of delaying the production of additional affordable housing units in the state and exacerbate the growing need for housing.

#### **NATURE AND SOURCES OF SUPPORT:**

**HDO, Jason Rojas, House Majority Leader** submitted testimony in support of this legislation sharing that it comes from the Majority Leaders' Roundtable on Affordable Housing. He notes that the bill would create opportunities for new deed-restricted units, granting municipalities applying for a moratorium from developments submitted through Section 8-30g in good faith a reprieve from new developments following an application's submission, and require the Department of Housing to collaborate with municipal bodies to create a database of developments appealed through Section 8-30g. He emphasized that this legislation represents the collaborative efforts of various state agencies, municipal leaders, and legislators.

**SRO, Jeff Gordon, State Senator** submitted testimony in support of this legislation sharing that Connecticut should refocus on housing affordability rather than relying on quota-driven mechanism that haven't proven to produce balanced or sustainable results. He believes that Section 8-30g has created tension between municipalities and the state and that one-size-fits-all quotas and "fair share" formulas do not account for the distinct characteristics of individual communities. Sen. Gordon thinks that expanding and modernizing the Housing Unit-Equivalent (HUE) framework would be more constructive, as it rewards towns for practical housing solutions they already provide or could be incentivized to provide. He states that incentive-based approaches that recognize real progress are more effective than rigid numerical targets. He shared that he has submitted legislation to establish an additional affordability category informed by the United Way of Connecticut's ALICE data, which represents working households that earn above subsidy thresholds but still struggle with necessities. He says if the goal is housing affordability, this segment of the population must be addressed.

**CWCSEO, Werner Oyanadel, Policy Director** submitted testimony in support of this legislation noting that longstanding disparities in income and wealth fall unevenly across the population and directly affect access to opportunity. He stated that that places an emphasis on the need for deeply affordable housing of high quality. He continues noting that this legislation provides municipalities with clear and achievable pathways to make progress, which encourages local participation, regional coordination, and helps ensure that the homes being created respond to the needs of resident who are currently most cost-burdened, while also maintaining a collaborative relationship between the states and municipalities. He expressed that this legislation does not eliminate the affordable housing appeals procedure or alter the ten percent affordability threshold as outlined in Section 8-30g. He said that this legislation combines accountability with clearer incentives for municipalities to support the

development of affordable housing. He emphasized this legislation strengthens planning, improves transparency, and places greater value on the creation of housing that is not only affordable, but of quality to support strong and inclusive communities.

**CT Chapter of American Planning Association, John Guskowski, Government Relations Officer** submitted testimony in support of this legislation sharing that it provides necessary organizational and administrative clarifications concerning the increasingly complex network of statutes, processes, and requirements for municipalities developing housing or addressing affordable housing plans. John noted that there is no "silver bullet" to solving the state's housing crisis, as that can only be accomplished through a combination of market incentives, zoning reform, and enabling diverse housing options beyond single-family homes can begin to move the needle on this pressing issue.

**CT Realtors, Jim Heckman, General Counsel** submitted testimony in support of this legislation noting that it reflects a good-faith effort to move collaborative discussions into workable policy. He added that these recommendations make efforts to resolve tensions in the affordable housing appeals process and prioritizes an incentives approach.

**Open Communities Alliance, Erin Boggs, Executive Director** submitted testimony in support of Section 8 of this legislation noting that throughout the years, there have been various amendments to the Connecticut General Statutes Section 8-37bb that exempted the Department of Housing from the state's law requiring affirmatively furthering fair housing data reporting and an analysis of efforts to promote housing choice, leaving the Connecticut Housing Finance Authority to undertake those obligations. She stated that Section 8 of the legislation proposes that the state's Department of Housing be subject to its fair housing reporting law. Erin noted that this could be done in partnership with the Connecticut Housing Finance Authority and involve producing a single report that encompasses other reporting obligations to streamline the work. She emphasized that housing vouchers are segregated, and that this proposal will assist the state in addressing the fact it is one of the most racially, ethnically, and economically segregated in the country.

**COST, Betsy Gara, Executive Director** submitted testimony noting support for provisions in the legislation that would grant municipalities seeking a moratorium a stay from new Section 8-30g applications, create clearer linkages between planning compliance and relief under Section 8-30g. She added she is also supportive of the bill's clarifying provisions regarding housing unit-equivalent (HUE) points relative to transit community middle housing in residential zones. She is concerned about Section 7 of the legislation noting that it gives the Council on Housing Development broad authority to reject a housing growth plan if it does not conform to Section 8-13bb of the general statutes. She stated that under **Public Act 25-1**, the Council may modify or approve a plan if OPM does not, but this legislation appears to permit the Council to reject the plan regardless of whether OPM has acted.

**Lena Gionaj** submitted testimony noting her support and opposition for certain parts of the legislation and changes that she wishes to see in the language.

**WestCOG, Francis Pickering, Executive Director** submitted testimony noting his support for sections 2 and 3 of the bill as it improves procedural clarity within the affordable housing appeals process and reinforcing the statute's incentive-based structure. Francis also supports section 5 of the legislation as it harmonizes Section 8-25 with the revised moratorium

framework and clarifies that the one-quarter housing unit equivalent point awarded for residential-zone transit community middle housing is awarded in addition to other applicable points. He stated some concerns with section 7 of the bill, as it could have legal consequences.

## **NATURE AND SOURCES OF OPPOSITION:**

**Open Communities Alliance, Hugh Bailey, Policy Director** submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation noting that without Section 8-30g there would have been little to no affordable housing developed in some of Connecticut's most exclusive towns. He believes that this legislation would have a weakening effect that could be detrimental to Section 8-30g and Connecticut's desire to build affordable housing.

**Calcagni Real Estate, Jennifer DeVivo, Broker & COO** submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation stating that Section 8-30g is one of the regulatory mechanisms that consistently allows housing projects to move forward when local barriers would make them infeasible, it provides predictability and a viable path to approval. She believes that Connecticut faces a housing crisis and housing production is already constrained by high land costs, labor shortages, material prices, and regulatory complexities. She believes that incremental changes that reduce the effectiveness of Section 8-30g risk making it harder to build homes. She says that until the state can establish a workable alternative that reliably results in housing approvals and production, weakening Section 8-30g would only further constrain housing supply and increase costs for renters and homebuyers. She advises that the committee approach any changes to Section 8-30g with caution and prioritize policies that support actual housing production rather than adding new uncertainty or delays.

**CT Coalition to End Homelessness, Sarah Fox, Chief Executive Officer** submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation noting that Section 8-30g is one of the few statewide mechanisms to ensure affordable housing can be built in communities that have not met their fair share. She believes that while Section 8-30g is not the entire solution, it is a critical production tool. She stated that reducing the effectiveness of housing production policies would undermine our ability to prevent further growth. She believes that we must protect tools that expand housing supply and invest in interventions that move people from crisis to stability.

**Partnership for Strong Communities, Sean Ghio, Policy Director** submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation noting that it is intended to weaken Section 8-30g and make it Page 3 of 4 HB-5369 easier for municipalities to avoid creating affordable housing, something that runs counter to Connecticut's housing needs. He says the state needs more homes; not procedural changes that will result in fewer homes being built. He believes that the fact more municipalities have not been awarded a moratorium is not a flaw in the statute but rather an unwillingness of some communities to meet their responsibilities under the Zoning Enabling Act to "promote housing choice and economic diversity in housing, including housing for both low and moderate-income households. Sean thinks that Section 8-30g is a crucial tool in expanding affordable homes and reducing economic and racial barriers across the state. He points out that the exemption calculation is already based on straightforward, verifiable data on income-restricted and subsidized housing. He believes the real issue is the continued refusal by municipalities to approve housing applications, not the method used to count

affordable units. He states that if a task force is established, then the membership should include individuals with direct expertise in housing development, existing housing programs, the Department of Housing, the Connecticut Housing Finance Authority, and housing advocates. He says those perspectives are essential to ensure any recommendations are grounded in practical knowledge and aligned with the state's housing needs.

**Hinckley Allen, Timothy Hollister, Attorney** submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation sharing lines where he has concerns and comments on the bill. He stated that reducing the minimum duration of affordability restrictions from 40 to 20 years because a municipality owned the land before it was developed, as it serves no purpose and only reduces affordable housing units in the long term. As it applies to a judge shall apply a stay on a Section 8-30 appeal if the municipality applies for a moratorium, he asks a series of questions about potential problems that may arise due to that. He stated that **H.B. 8002** was designed to complement not substitute Section 8-30g. He expressed that the limitations to housing plans program will make it easy for municipal officials to block adoption of those plans. He explained that anything impacting Section 8-30g that is tied to municipal housing growth plan deadlines is a recipe for confusion and without housing production. He pointed out that in several lines throughout the legislation there are fixes needed in the housing growth plan program.

**Jennifer Kleindienst** submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation sharing it puts up more obstacles toward housing being built. She noted that section 8 of the legislation should be supported and included in a separate bill.

**CT Citizen Action Group, Natasha Kuranko** submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation noting that it would weaken Section 8-30g, which she describes as one of the state's most reliable tools for producing affordable homes and opening communities that have long shut people out. She noted that 30 out of the state's 169 towns meet the goal currently. She voiced her concern over section 2 of the legislation, sharing that it is a meaningful shift from the current Section 8-30g practice, where a moratorium generally applies going forward and does not automatically stop a denial that is already being appealed in court. She shared that a town's ability to arbitrarily hit "pause" on any affordable housing proposal would slow or stop projects that would create affordable housing by delaying the appeal during state review and potentially wiping the housing development appeal out entirely. She noted there are provisions of the bill that she supports like the requiring of public notice when a Section 8-30g appeal is filed and the establishment of the statewide database of Section 8-30g cases by the Department of Housing.

**Commons CDC, Robert Mangiafico, President** submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation noting that it would weaken Section 8-30g. He believes that weakening one of the state's only tools of producing affordable housing during the housing crisis is the opposite of what the state needs. He stated the bill would make it easier for towns to avoid creating affordable housing. He believes we need more housing not procedural changes that will result in fewer homes being built. Robert says that weakening Section 8-30g would deepen regional inequalities and reinforce segregation. He points out that this legislation is a way for certain towns to avoid allowing people of different financial means access to live in their community, furthering income inequality in Connecticut.

**Open Communities Alliance, William Marut** submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation, sharing that he is against any law that would undermine Section 8-30g because the state has a lack of affordable units. He states that we need to make changes that encourage more affordable housing to be built. He notes that there is no alternative, stating without Section 8-30g there would be no way to get affordable housing built in many towns. He believes that with a moratorium, towns can plan for future housing with meaningful community input.

**Larew, Doyle, & Associates, Jeffrey Miller, Senior Vice President** submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation sharing that while Section 8-30g is not a perfect tool, it remains one of the only regulatory mechanisms that allows housing projects to move forward when local barriers would make them infeasible. He noted that the state is in a severe housing shortage, and housing production is already constrained by several factors. He advises that incremental changes that reduce the effectiveness of Section 8-30g risk making it even harder to build homes. He stated that until the state establishes a comprehensive, workable alternative framework that reliably results in housing approvals and production, weakening Section 8-30g will only further constrain housing supply and increase costs for renters and homebuyers. He suggests that the committee approach any changes to Section 8-30g with caution and prioritize policies that support housing production.

**Journey Homes Inc., Adriana Negron, Homeless Prevention Manager** submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation, noting that as a homeless prevention manager, she witnesses how critical affordable housing is to prevent an inflow of homelessness. She notes that the primary cause of homelessness is affordability. She believes that weakening Section 8-30g would be the opposite of what Connecticut needs, as it would make it easier for municipalities to avoid building affordable housing, thereby undermining the state's efforts to quell homelessness. She says that every day she works with households that do everything right but still can't find a unit in their budget. Adriana stated that without units, there's an inability to divert families from shelters and prevent eviction from turning to homelessness. She believes that to reduce homelessness, the state must strengthen policies that lead to affordable housing production.

**Connecticut Legal Services, Raphael Podolsky, Attorney and Policy Advocate** submitted testimony noting his support for section 8 of the bill and stating no position on sections 4,5,6,7, and 9. He opposes sections 1, 2 and 3 of the legislation. For section 1, he notes that if incentives are needed to induce a private developer, the incentive should be through the price of the land, not the duration of income restrictions. For section 2, he stated a stay is highly unfair and may raise constitutional questions. He stated that this provision invites towns to submit last second moratorium applications to obstruct a Section 8-30g application. He expressed that this legislation should incentivize Section 8-30g applications, not block them, and should not block them when they are already in court. For section 3, he adds that the moratorium extension is not based on actual housing production but rather on preparation of a plan, which contradicts the purpose of the moratorium.

**Town of Guilford Planning and Zoning and Affordable Housing Commissions, Larry Rizzolo, Member** submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation noting that Public Act 25-1 added more tools to the toolbox and some of them relax Section 8-30g requirements, but further relaxation would go too far. He noted that the state needs more housing options at all price points. He shared that Guilford has two Section 8-30g projects which are helping the

town move toward their moratorium. He emphasized that the point of Section 8-30g is not for towns to have 1-% of their housing stock as affordable, but rather for towns to devise ways to reach a moratorium, so that new development can occur where towns would like it to be.

**Elm City Communities, Johnny Shively, Policy Manager** submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation, noting that it would contribute to less affordable housing. He adds that if municipalities do not build affordable housing throughout the state, then affordable units will continue to be concentrated in urban centers, something he describes as codified racial and economic segregation. He states that the primary driver of homelessness is lack of affordable homes.

**Sunwood Development Corp, Bob Weidenmann, Builder** submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation, stating that while Section 8-30g is not a perfect tool, it remains one of the only regulatory tools that allows housing projects to move forward when local barriers make them infeasible. He believes that incremental changes that reduce the effectiveness of Section 8- 30g only further constrain housing supply and increase costs.

**Garden Homes Management, Richard Freeman, President** submitted testimony voicing his support for section 1 of the legislation though its application is so narrow as to not be usable. He noted that a shorter affordability period on municipally owned land, or privately-owned land passed through municipal ownership to take advantage of this provision, could attract more private developers to use Section 8-30g. He shared his opposition to section 2 of the legislation sharing that if a town does not have an active moratorium, their application must be heard, voted on and adjudicated if appealed, but a town without an active moratorium could file for one after a developer has filed their Section 8-30g application and gone through a lengthy set of public hearings and had a vote to block the Section 8-30g application if the moratorium were granted. He also expressed concerns over section 3 of this legislation noting that any town ever granted a moratorium would have its moratorium automatically reinstated and last until the town filed its housing growth plan, which could take years.

The following submitted general opposition to the bill:

**Joseph Braunstein**

**GHIAA, Christine Graesser**

**Euro Estates LLC, Mo Lev**

**Universal Health Care Foundation, Quinn Meehan, Community Organizing and Policy**

**MSW Intern**

**Reported by: Tyler Fisher**

**Date: 3/25/2026**