

## Testimony in Opposition to HB 6633

My name is Kim Healy. I am a Selectwoman and resident of Wilton. I write on my own behalf and not as a representative of Wilton.

To Chairs Moore and Luxenberg, and the members of the Housing Committee I am writing to convey my strong opposition of Fair Share Legislation, House Bill 6633 .

CT is a wonderful, diverse state and I believe that is what still draws people to move here. I grew up in the suburbs of NYC but my mother now lives in Ocean County, New Jersey. I have seen firsthand what New Jersey's state imposed fair share mandates have done to her community. Except for increasing density, not affordability, there is nothing positive to say about it. The schools are overwhelmed, underperforming and declining, taxes have increased dramatically, entire dense wooded areas have been destroyed and the air quality from all the increased traffic is horrific. No state should pass legislation that forces "fair share" development without looking at New Jersey to see that it does not work

House Bill 6633 as written will guarantee that every municipality will have to budget tremendous amount of its limited funds for litigation. At a time when our residents are all struggling with record inflation, increased state taxes and utility costs, to expect residents to foot the bill for state mandated lawsuits is unconscionable .

This bill would effectively double the 8-30g affordable unit mandate of our municipalities and my town of Wilton's allocation could be up to approximately 1,100 units. Who will pay to expand our roads to accommodate all the extra traffic? Is our state government, which speaks regularly about the environment, planning to replace the diesel, polluting South Norwalk/ Danbury trains? Who will pay to build or expand our schools?

I implore you to stand strong against the pressure of DesegregateCT and provide some alternative information to support opposition of this bill.

**WestCog** released a study in July 2020 by Gunnan and York; author Dr. Donald Poland. His conclusion was that the problem of housing affordability in CT is more of a problem of income than need of housing, cost or supply. In the near term, housing needs could be covered with additional vouchers. His opinion was what needs to happen is that we must address the accessibility to employment opportunities, accessibility to education opportunities, accessibility to transportation opportunities. These must be addressed first.

Developers cannot provide affordable housing for the households with greatest need (30% Average Median Income) in CT because of the high cost of land, materials, taxes, labor. CT must focus first on its failing transportation, education systems and focus on policies that will improve CT's business environment which stands at 48<sup>th</sup> nationwide.

Only after these issues are addressed should the state intervene and only if housing has not been created naturally which should happen.

**CCM 2022 Housing Issue Bulletin:**

- CT population growth in a decline so the need for new, additional housing should not be an issue
- Employment Growth below national trends
- Property taxes are 2 x national average

Affordability must also be addressed in CT but it is multifaceted and forcing housing at the numbers suggested in this bill will be catastrophic and only push CT 's economy further into a decline.

I also suggest you travel around the state, especially in Fairfield County, and see the many developments under construction.

Thank you.