

**STATEMENT OF OPPOSITION TO SB 1024  
BY PETER McGUINNESS**

Thank you for the opportunity to state my strong objection to SB 1024.

As you know the Bill SB 1024 eliminates local control by allowing certain types of development to take place, overriding local zoning authority and without a public hearing.

As to mandated “accessory apartments” that will house an additional family unit:

1. Would the utilities serving the accessory apartment be just “piggy-backed” from the main home? Would the owner of the property be required to upgrade electrical service; for example, from 110 amps to 220 amps? Under SB 1024, town officials could not require a separate electrical meter or water meter to the “accessory apartment”, so “piggy-backing” utility services seem to be encouraged. These provisions are a recipe for inferior building techniques and will do a great disservice to the future renters of these units and the affected communities.
2. Would a separate sewerage line be required to be separately run to the “accessory apartment” or would it merely be added to the main house? How about if there is a septic tank? SB 1024 is an ill-conceived Bill and does not consider the building and lot infrastructure needed to support additional family units. Local zoning officials are in the best position to decide these issues.
3. Why is there no requirement to have separate bathrooms in the “accessory apartment”? Can a separate “accessory apartment” exist without a separate bathroom? Under most other legislation, a place of abode must consist of a bathroom and a kitchen. Have the drafters of SB 1024 forgotten about the necessity of a bathroom?
4. Shared driveways are common on many lots. Would one of the homes now be required to share his or her driveway with now two or more families? Local zoning officials are best able (after a relevant public hearing) to hear from any affected neighbors.
5. In many communities, there are aging water supply and sewerage lines. Have the drafters of SB 1024 considered the effect of their proposed legislation on the local communal infrastructure? Local town officials understand the age of their underground infrastructure and are in the best position to understand the nuances of their communities.
6. Is there any research that has been done on the effect of local school systems, town services and emergency medical support services that might need to be borne by towns experiencing unexpected population growth by virtue of this legislation? Do the drafters even care? Apparently, not.
7. The below information are quotes from the Connecticut Official State Website, on why people should move to Connecticut: see:  
<https://portal.ct.gov/ChooseCt/Live>

**QUOTES BELOW FROM THE CONNECTICUT OFFICIAL STATE WEBSITE:**

***“Connecticut residents may have the highest personal income in the country, but the state is still more affordable to live in terms of housing costs in the northeastern U.S. region, when compared with the Boston and New York markets. At the same time, the benefits of living in the state include a very high quality of life, with top-performing schools, healthier lifestyles, easier access to transportation and safer towns and cities than the U.S. average.”***

***“From starter homes to condos to repurposing historic structures into dynamic rental residences, Connecticut can offer a variety of diverse housing options. This includes thoughtful development in town centers that put transit, schools, shopping and services in easy reach.”***

Sounds to me from the above that local zoning officials have done an EXCELLENT job in making Connecticut a great place to live and work. Why usurp them from their authority to continue to manage their communities in a thoughtful way?

Let local zoning officials retain their control on local zoning issues. SB 1024 should be soundly rejected.

Peter McGuinness  
PO Box 4724  
Stamford, CT 06907