PARTNERSHIP FOR STRONG COMMUNITIES

*Partnership for Strong Communities promotes equitable change in Connecticut housing policy by coordinating advocacy, advancing research, and uniting diverse partners*

**TESTIMONY BEFORE THE HOUSING COMMITTEE**
**SEAN GHIO, POLICY DIRECTOR**
**PARTNERSHIP FOR STRONG COMMUNITIES**

**FEBRUARY 27, 2025**

**H.B. No. 7037 (RAISED) AN ACT INCLUDING WORKFORCE HOUSING IN THE CALCULATION OF THE THRESHOLD FOR EXEMPTION FROM THE AFFORDABLE HOUSING APPEALS PROCEDURE.**

Representative Felipe, Senator Marx, Representative Scott, Senator Sampson and distinguished members of the Housing Committee, thank you for the opportunity to submit testimony today. I am Sean Ghio, Policy Director with the Partnership for Strong Communities. We are a statewide nonprofit research, policy and advocacy organization dedicated to ensuring everyone in Connecticut has a safe, stable home that is affordable to them in an equitable community of their choice.

**We respectfully request that the committee oppose H.B. 7037.**

The bill would include "workforce housing" in calculations of affordable housing for Section 8-30g. It defines workforce housing by reference to CGS Section 8-395 and its definition of "workforce housing development project." It is unclear whether all homes in a workforce housing development project would be counted for purposes of Section 8-30g. To the extent that units are subject to long-term affordability restrictions, they would already be counted for Section 8-30g, making the bill redundant.

If this bill is intended to include unrestricted units, it is inconsistent with the concept of the 10% exemption in Section 8-30g. Municipalities with large numbers of government-assisted and deed-restricted units can qualify for exemption in recognition that Section 8-30g is not a necessary remedy in these communities because a sufficient supply of affordable housing already exists there. Homes without affordability restrictions may be viewed as "affordable" relative to other homes in a municipality, but without income restrictions there is no guarantee that the homes would be accessible and affordable to lower income families. If the intent of the bill is to count these unrestricted homes as affordable, then the bill should be rejected as it undermines the purposes of Section 8-30g.