



**TESTIMONY OF THE
CONNECTICUT FAIR HOUSING CENTER
IN OPPOSITION TO H.B. 6521**

The COVID-19 pandemic has exacerbated several longstanding problems in Connecticut including the need for affordable housing. Accessory dwelling units can help meet that need in suburban communities with little affordable housing while at the same time promoting integration. As a result, we support the portion of the bill that would allow ADUS as of right.

However, the Center cannot support this bill as it is currently written. The Committee has already heard testimony on S.B. 804 that will open zoning more widely to ADUs. That is an appropriate bill for addressing ADUs. H.B. 6521 would impose unnecessary conditions on permitting ADUs. Evidence from communities across the nation that have permitted ADUs more broadly shows that imposing excessive conditions on ADUs results in very few new dwellings being created. Unfortunately, his bill includes conditions that will limit communities' ability to create additional accessory dwellings in communities across the state. We ask that any bill which makes it easier to created ADUs not include 1) the requirement that there be an interior door between the primary and accessory dwelling and 2) specifying a parking requirement maximum of one space per ADU.

In addition, we ask that the Committee not make the changes to the Affordable Housing Appeals Act (Section 8-30g) which are included in H.B. 6521. These changes would shorten the affordability period for deed restricted developments from forty to thirty years. Over time this would have a disastrous impact on the supply of deed restricted housing in the state as housing developments would more quickly reach the end of their deed restrictions and convert to market rate housing.

This bill also increases the point value of unrestricted units in a set-aside development from $\frac{1}{4}$ point to one point for each unrestricted unit for purposes of achieving a four-year moratorium from Section 8-30g – a 400% increase and equal to the point value of a restricted dwelling unit. This change would make it much easier for towns to achieve a moratorium from

Section 8-30g without taking any additional actions toward expanding the supply of affordable housing in their community. This has the potential to slow even further the growth of new deed restricted housing development in the state.