

S2272 In Opposition Michelle Komar

Chair Bissaillon and Members of the Senate Committee on Housing & Municipal Government,

I am opposed to S2272 The MultiHousing Act for the following reasons:

The bill makes false assumption that allowing multi-family development on residential single-family zoned properties reduces traffic. A greater number of residents generally equates to more cars. Providence is perhaps the most "walkable" RI municipality, and perhaps only just over 10% of its residents walk to work; what is the actual percentage for Providence and for all other municipalities with over the 40,000 population criteria in this bill?

The bill allows for increased residential density development in single-family zoned areas when, at least in Warwick, proposed duplexes and other multi-family required Planning Board approvals and public hearings. In older platted communities such as Warwick, small lots of 7,000 square ft and even smaller platted substandard lots of record exist. Recent State laws allow for single-family zoned substandard lots of record to be developed. Bill S2272 "springboards" from these recent State laws and allows to at least double the residential development. This bill would be inconsistent with municipal zoning and Comprehensive Plans, increase residential development density in single-family zoned areas in potential haphazard manner inconsistent with surrounding existing single-family residences.

The bill doesn't identify or consider where actual "live/work/shop" areas exist within existing single-family zoning. Most residents in RI commute and not walk to work or to shop and are dependant on automobiles that they own or Uber-type services. Is RIDOT able to optimize their traffic signals to better accommodate increased traffic in already traffic congested urban areas? Is RI public transportation structured to with routes to attract and accommodate potential doubling of residents on a single-family zoned property?

The bill doesn't take into account or address increased on-site parking needs for these multi-family developments in residential single-family zoned properties nor parking during street parking bans for snow storms and special community events.

The bill doesn't take into account the effects upon capacity of sewer pump stations and sewage treatment plants to accommodate the doubling or more of residents. Sewer tie-

ins from the street mains to private properties were planned and installed for a single-family house in areas zoned single family.

The bill doesn't address RIDEM approvals for larger on-site septic systems to accommodate the design criteria for increased number of bedrooms on each unsewered property.

The bill doesn't address the added demand on municipal services with the potential doubling of residents--water, schools, police & fire, roadway maintenance and other community services.

This bill is "cart before the horse". Infrastructures need to be improved and/or expanded to support the potential doubling of residents as this bill would allow.

The bill is devised to be an "one glove fits all" municipalities with population of 40,000 or greater. S2272 reads as an enabling act and is not necessary. Each RI municipality may adopt zoning regulations which are best tailored to the community.

I respectfully request that the Committee cast unfavorable vote for S2272.

Thank you.

Michelle Komar

Warwick resident