

**HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
COMPILATION OF PUBLIC COMMENTS**

Submitted to the Committee on Land & Resource Management
For HB 3919

Compiled on: Thursday, April 3, 2025 2:33 PM

Note: Comments received by the committee reflect only the view of the individual(s) submitting the comment, who retain sole responsibility for the content of the comment. Neither the committee nor the Texas House of Representatives takes a position on the views expressed in any comment. The committee compiles the comments received for informational purposes only and does not exercise any editorial control over comments.

Hearing Date: April 3, 2025 8:00 AM

Sylvia Coulson
self- Dietitian
Waxahachie, TX

I strongly oppose this bill. Local control matters. It is the local people who should make these decisions, not someone in Austin!

Vickie Dillow
Self
Waxahachie, TX

Strongly oppose, these decisions a should only be made on a local level where we elect leadership to make local development decisions.

Sharon Tryon, Mrs
Self
Waxahachie, TX

This bill is overreach. I am against this bill. What is happening to Texas? This is government overreach at its finest. We are becoming so corrupt. More of us will be showing up down there!!!

Daniel Southerland
Self. Business Owner.
Red Oak, TX

I strongly oppose the bill!

Jolyn Potenza
Self
Southlake, TX

Please vote AGAINST this detrimental bill that will tie local officials' hands from governing their communities. I elected my state rep to minimize government control, not create more.

Linda Ricks
Self
Midlothian, TX

Dear Members,
I STRONGLY oppose this bill
Thank you,
Linda Ricks

Jennifer Zarate
Self
Maypearl, TX

I do NOT support this bill. Local control matters!

Kathy Ponce
Self
Maypearl, TX

Taking away the local control over zoning and lot sizes will not help with "housing affordability". Look to CA on that issue. About 18 years ago CA passed similiar legislation and has it helped with affordability? No. CA is still the highest price average home in the nation.

What this bill and companion bill SB15 does is bring in more density. Density is the #1 way to change voter demographics. So all you republicans supporting these horrible bills will eventually get voted out of office via the legislation you pass. Less government means less state control. Which means leave the decisions to the governing body closest to the people.

Joseph Dingman
self
Dallas, TX

There are two reasons to do this. First, and most important, it both increases the supply of housing and lowers the cost by requiring less land per home. Second, it eliminates the negative tendency by political decision makers to fence out the marginal consumer, those for whom this makes a home possible.

Bettie Gray
Self
Waxahachie, TX

No, no, no, I do not support this bill!!

Melody Allen
Self - Logistics Manager
Waxahachie, TX

I am submitting this comment to express my strong OPPOSITION to House Bill 3919, authored by Representative Gates. This bill threatens the principles of local autonomy by imposing state-mandated restrictions on residential lot size and density requirements, undermining the ability of municipalities to address the unique needs of their communities.

Local governments are best equipped to make decisions about land use, zoning, and housing policies. They have a deep understanding of their residents' priorities and the specific challenges their communities face. HB 3919 erodes this critical local control by dictating one-size-fits-all regulations from the state level, which fail to account for the diverse economic, geographic, and social circumstances across Texas.

By removing flexibility in planning decisions, this bill stifles innovative approaches to addressing housing affordability, sustainable growth, and infrastructure development. Furthermore, the authorization of fees places additional financial burdens on municipalities and residents, further complicating local efforts to foster equitable and inclusive communities.

It is essential to preserve the principle of local governance, allowing municipalities to retain the tools and authority necessary to serve their constituents effectively. HB 3919 would not only hinder this process but also set a troubling precedent for state overreach into local matters.

For these reasons, I urge the committee to reject this legislation and support policies that respect and empower local governments. Protecting local control is vital to ensuring that Texas communities can thrive and address their unique challenges independently. Thank you for considering my comments.

Rachel Hanes
Greater Edwards Aquifer Alliance
San Antonio, TX

The Greater Edwards Aquifer Alliance (GEAA) appreciates the opportunity to submit these comments on behalf of our sixty-two member groups that are allied in advocacy for the preservation of our ground and surface water resources in twenty-one counties within Central and South Texas. We submitted a card "on" the bill this morning as we had not yet seen the committee substitute. After hearing the explanation of the committee substitute, we are in favor of this bill as it was laid out in that explanation, with the additions related to the protection of land located in aquifer recharge zones and continued ability to adopt and enforce ordinances related to the protection of aquifers.

The Greater Edwards Aquifer Alliance is grateful to the chairman and members for their continued work to address the challenges Texas is facing as it confronts a lack of housing and affordable housing. GEAA is generally supportive of efforts that work to increase density in the urban core, prevent sprawl, and protect agricultural, conservation, and heritage lands. The committee substitute as presented this afternoon for HB 3919 can help support these efforts without endangering critical water supplies.

Lot size regulations are crucial to cities' ability to protect critical groundwater supplies. Dense, small lot developments over aquifer recharge zones increases impervious cover, which can both limit recharge and put water quality at risk of degradation. The Edwards and Trinity aquifers supply over 2 million Central Texans with water and are incredibly vulnerable to contamination from stormwater runoff and to development that limits their ability to recharge. The two changes presented in the committee substitute – increasing population size requirements for applicability and ensuring aquifer protection - will not affect most of the areas highlighted by this bill, ensuring that the bill is still able to spur increased urban density and hopefully reduce sprawl. The two changes would, however, be instrumental in protecting the water quality and availability of water supply for over 2 million Texans.

Thank you,
Rachel Hanes, Policy Director
Greater Edwards Aquifer Alliance

Teri Bates
Self
Corsicana, TX

Absolutely no to taking away local control of city planning and giving it to the swamp in Austin. Stop with the liberal nonsense!!!!

Roger Queen
Self
Waxahachie, TX

I am totally against this bill. Not a good idea at all.

Christopher Page
Self, Homewood Heights Neighborhood Association President
Austin, TX

The proposal to enable 70% impervious cover on residential lots should be rejected because of its obvious negative impacts on Texans' lives. This proposal would undermine our State's long-term sustainability and resilience. The most obvious problem is stormwater management. Allowing impervious surfaces to cover up to 70% of a land area greatly reduces our environment's capacity to absorb rainfall and sustain vegetation. This leads to increased surface runoff volume and velocity, overstrains existing drainage infrastructure, and elevates the risk and severity of localized and downstream flooding, particularly during heavy precipitation events. And the parallel cost of retrofitting large fully built cities would impose an unbearable financial burden on current and future generations of taxpayers. Effective land use planning always considers the need to manage runoff carefully and avoid these known risks to property and public safety, and this proposal does not. Next, there's a well-documented relationship between extensive impervious cover and the urban heat island effect (see: <https://www.epa.gov/heatislands/what-are-heat-islands>). Materials common in development, like pavement and roofing, absorb and retain more solar radiation than natural vegetation. They subsequently release this stored heat and increase local ambient temperatures on average around 6°F hotter, but as high as 22°F hotter. At 70% impervious cover, urban heat island will make our communities far hotter, overburden energy infrastructure, worsen local air quality, and create temperatures that are medically dangerous to otherwise healthy people during our months of extreme heat. Finally, the implicit ecological loss caused by this proposal also demands rejection. Reducing permeable land cover to just 30% significantly reduces the habitat that allows families with children to thrive. We'll lose the human health benefits that green spaces provide, such as natural water infiltration which helps recharge and filter our water sources, fresh oxygen-rich air, and temperature moderation from the shade and transpiration of tree canopy that took generations to grow. In sum, the proposal for a 70% impervious cover threshold on residential lots must be rejected. Inflicting floods, deadly heat, and vast ecological losses on many Texas communities will make them unsustainable, and in many cases, unlivable. Nothing justifies this attack on millions of voting Texans.

Steve Mayer
Self
Georgetown, TX

I am a resident of Georgetown . I think that our city should not be required to allow 31 units per acre of tiny homes. It would add to the congestion which we are already experiencing. We are not against apartment complexes as long as they comply with City regulations. This allows for the City to plan and build transportation that will not overwhelm our community. It might be appropriate for some areas but a one size fits all does not work for an area like ours. The residents would suffer at the benefit to the builder. At the very least it should be approved only if the City finds an appropriate area within the city could accommodate this

Carol Spencer
self, retired
Cedar Creek, TX

DO NOT PASS THIS BILL. To read my full blog post on it, use this link: <https://republicancarol.org/why-do-i-feel-like-im-back-in-nj/> Along with 5 citizens, I started a citizens group to fight mandated low and moderate income housing in NJ in the 1980s. I spent 8 years on the Planning Board, 6 years on the Town Council and 4 years as Mayor in Denville Township NJ as a result. I never thought I'd see this in Texas. Here, it's y'all in the legislature. There, it was the courts. The density given to developers in our case was 6 or 7 units/acre. This TX bill forces THIRTY ONE units per acre! The Senate fiscal report totally ignores the consequences to local municipalities and the State of Texas for such forced high density. There are those that actually cost taxpayers: schools, roads, police, healthcare, other municipal services. Then there are the resources: water, sewage treatment, loss of wetlands, runoff, flooding, parks, open spaces. This bill mandates 31 units/acres on 5 acres OR MORE.

Let's talk water requirements: According to the EPA, "The average American uses around 82 gallons per day per person in the household. That means a family of four would use around 10,000 gallons in a 30-day period." And, in dryer areas like Texas, that use is higher. Small lot zoning of 1,400 square feet, 31 to the acre, would require 310,000 gallons of water per month per acre. That is 1,550,000 gallons of water per month for just one such 5-acre development. For 2 people per household, that's still 775,000 gal/month/5-acre development. And, these bills don't limit that density to just five acres. Imagine the water needs of that density across a 20-acre development!

Schools? According to TEA, average state revenue to school districts and charter schools per student is \$5,809. In the US, there are an average of 1.94 children per household. Even if we use only 1 child per household for these small homes, on average, that's 31 children per developed-acre added into a school system. The cost to the State of Texas? \$900,395 in required state funding for one 5-acre development. And, then there's the local property tax contribution to a child's education. How many of these developments will there be? According to 2020 census data, there are 19 affected municipalities. How long before those numerical restrictions change? Next session? Or the one after that? How long before a developer sues over the population applicability of this proposed statute should it become law? And, what if they win so every developer gets this benefit in every municipality? The legislature will have created a nightmare in Texas.

NJ is the only state with property taxes higher than TX. And forced high-density low & moderate income housing did nothing but drive them up. This is the same old story. Developers get more density, make millions, and taxpayers are left paying the bill. Please tell me I'm reading this bill wrong because if not, this is a horrible idea.

Kathy Prough
self, software consultant
Richardson, TX

Please do not pass any bills that disallow limits for single-family homes or allow multi-family apartments without zoning changes or city oversight. We are losing our single-family family neighborhoods at an alarming rate, and cramming too many people into small spaces, as well as exacerbating traffic.

Laura Klein Plunkett
Self-Retired
Georgetown, TX

I am adamantly opposed to HB3919. The bill prohibits cities from enforcing lot size minimums, limits regulations on "small lots," bans mandates for covered parking, and restricts other zoning rules like open space or building height limits. While Texas needs affordable housing, there is nothing in this bill that ensures the small homes permitted by this bill will align with housing affordability goals. There are many negatives to this bill, however, including reduced control over city planning, which could lead to denser, less uniform neighborhoods, straining infrastructure like roads, sewers, and schools. Cities also face legal risks, as the bill allows lawsuits from affected individuals or housing organizations with remedies like damages and attorney's fees which potentially increasing litigation costs and undermining municipal budgets, and increasing resident taxes. The waiver of governmental immunity further exposes cities to financial liability.

For residents, the bill reshapes residential development in applicable municipalities by encouraging smaller, denser lots. If implemented, this bill creates a real risk of overcrowding, as fewer parking spaces and minimal setbacks could aggravate traffic and parking issues, particularly in downtown areas. Less open space, increased noise, and pressure on public services like water and waste management (especially if stormwater mitigation isn't universally enforced) could negatively impact quality of life and enjoyment of property for existing residents. Additionally, the shift toward developer-friendly zoning will likely prioritize profit over community aesthetics and neighborhood cohesion, leaving residents with less influence over neighborhood character. Local residents, through their local elected officials, should govern local development, not the state.

Lindsay Lee
Self, Marketing Manager
Austin, TX

I oppose the section of HB3919 that requires only 30% permeable cover on small lots, raising the impervious cover from 45% to 70%, which greatly increases flood risk in our community

diane nousanen
self - retired
austin, TX

Austin has enough of a flooding problem in heavy rains. Do not increase impervious cover.

Alison Jones
Self & family
Austin, TX

"I oppose the section of HB3919 that requires only 30% permeable cover on small lots, raising the impervious cover from 45% to 70%, which greatly increases flood risk in our community. It will further reduce biodiversity and increase already existing heat effects which threaten the health and safety of our people.

MARCUS HENRY
self
WAXAHACHIE, TX
Vote NO

Anne Griffin
Self
Red Oak, TX

I do NOT support the passage of HB 3919.

Beverly Gatlin

Self

Italy, TX

I strongly oppose!

Michele Wallace, Mrs.

Self

Waxahachie, TX

No, no, no!!! I am against this bill!!!

Wanda Anderson

Self/Retired Teacher

Spring, TX

Vote for HB 3919. By increasing the number of homes available for ownership, more families could own their homes. This would provide stability for young families to have ownership in their place of residence.

Randy Fromberg, AIA

Self

Austin, TX

I oppose the section of HB3919 that requires only 30% permeable cover on small lots, raising the impervious cover from 45% to 70%, which greatly increases flood risk in our community. Reducing the amount of landscape area will also reduce carbon sequestration.

Jeffrey Walsh

Self

Waxahachie, TX

I strongly oppose this bill as centralized government has never worked in the best interest of its citizens . The entity has zero knowledge as it relates to localized issues and is better served by a localized more knowledgeable governance . This bill's intentions are for a " uniformity" end result and that my friends is exactly not what the premise of this nation was founded upon . This bill is setting up more" uniformity" laws to come and needs to be strongly voted down .

Tammy Baker

Self

Corsicana, TX

I am writing to provide my opposition for HB3919. I request a NO Vote for this Bill. This Bill MUST NOT Pass!!

Lisa Healy

Self

Midlothian, TX

I do not support this bill. Local control is imperative with the massive growth cities and counties are facing. The local control will keep the integrity of a community and protect the property rights of people who have bought their homes there because of it. Please do not vote it out of committee. Thank you for your consideration.

Cheryl Engle

Self retired

Lewisville, TX

No

Samantha Buford

Self

Palmer, TX

I do not support this Bill.

Betsy Greenberg

self/retired

Austin, TX

70% impervious cover is a terrible idea. It is damaging to the environment and causes flooding. Austin already allows 1,800 sq ft lots. Please do not pass this bill.

Kevin Cole

Mayor - City of Pearland

Pearland, TX

On behalf of the citizens in the City of Pearland, I would like to express my opposition to House Bill 3919 as it is written. In the case of Pearland, and cities like ours, decades of planned and unified development standards are being pre-empted, without consideration for the variety of negative impacts on our communities. As introduced, House Bill 3919 would almost quadruple anticipated population growth through 2040, in addition to a variety of other unplanned community resources that would be needed to provide adequate services.

Considering the public safety personnel standards in place for most communities, Pearland would have to add 380 uniformed police personnel by 2040, instead of the 268 associated with the current population estimate. Our overall staffing would have to increase to 2,159 employees, as opposed to the projected 1715, and the impact to the operating budget forecast for 2040 shows an increase of \$60,223,716. This is almost 30% more than our long-term, multi-year forecast projects for Pearland in the next 15 years, which challenges our ability to continue on the same path our historical planning and community development principles have led us to.

With about 15% of our land undeveloped, 35% of which would be impacted by House Bill 3919, Pearland would otherwise be on its tail end of related community development and planning concerns and shifting its capacity to focus on maintenance and operations. The measures being proposed to pre-empt our communities' ability to manage our local concerns not only creates a new, unplanned approach to shaping our community as intended, but destroys the ability for mayors and city council members to live up to the very objectives citizens in our communities have elected us to enact.

I implore this Committee to rethink its perspective about the impacts these laws can have on communities like Pearland, or we quickly become subject to community conditions that our existing residents have not signed up for. The density proposed in House Bill 3919 would create unexpected and unfunded infrastructure hardships on communities across the state.

With that said, I implore the House to further increase the population threshold in this bill to cities with populations of 250,000 or greater, in counties with a population of 500,000 or more. This way, affordability gains can be measures over time, and future legislatures can take additional action to improve the law in the coming years.

I thank you for your consideration and support. Please continue the good work that ALL Texans expect from our lawmakers, as we are here to help us move forward during these challenging times.

Cheney Crow, PhD

self, retired UT faculty, writer (35 year Austin resident)

Austin, TX

Having lived in Austin since the late 1980s, I've witnessed the flooding that happens in streets, downtown, even residential neighborhoods with little impervious cover. I am shocked to see the City may be willing to increase impervious cover for small lots, up to 70%? How can an increase in impervious cover benefit anyone if there is increased flooding as a result? Already we've seen the flood-zone map in Austin expand (100 and 500 year floods) in the last few years. I oppose this bill because there is no logic to inviting more flood encroachment on properties, particularly small ones that may house low-income families. Please make note of my strong opposition.

Sincerely,

Cheney Crow

linda bailey

self

Austin, TX

Opposed.

Sandra Palacios, Ms

self

Austin, TX

"I oppose the section of HB3919 that requires only 30% permeable cover on small lots, raising the impervious cover from 45% to 70%, which greatly increases flood risk in our community."

Robbin Trusty

self, retired

Austin, TX

oppose the section of HB3919 that requires only 30% permeable cover on small lots, raising the impervious cover from 45% to 70%, which greatly increases flood risk in our community.

Jenny Grayson

Mckinley Heights

Austin, TX

Hi, my name is Jenny. I am a supporter of flood-free family-friendly neighborhoods. I oppose the increased impervious cover on small lots allowed in HB3919, which would increase significantly the risk of flooding in our community. I urge the representative to remove the section of the bill that requires only 30% permeable cover.

paula linderman

self, programmer

austin, TX

Hi, my name is Paula Linderman. I am a firm supporter of flood-free family-friendly neighborhoods. I oppose the increased impervious cover on small lots allowed in HB3919, which would increase significantly the risk of flooding in our community. I urge the representative to PLEASE remove the section of the bill that requires only 30% permeable cover.

Karen Clary, Dr.

Self-Retired

Austin, TX

"I oppose the section of HB3919 that requires only 30% permeable cover on small lots, raising the impervious cover from 45% to 70%, which greatly increases flood risk in our community."

Don Lautner
Self
Mansfield, TX

I am against HB 3919.

While the intent of the Bill is admirable, it has various flaws that will result in the objectives not being achieved.

This Bill requires that cities must allow rowhouses * to be developed on any Single-Family zoned five acre (or more) tract of land in the city that has not yet platted.

* The Bill never uses the term “rowhouses” but given the lot size constraints on the property, that is the only type of “single-family” dwelling that could be constructed.

The Bill also establishes several size constraints on the lots where the constraints are not physically consistent. As a result, a rewrite of the Bill would be needed to clarify the size constraints.

The main problem however with this Bill is that due to layout of the land, due to available street capacity, water and sewer capacity, school capacity, police and fire response time, etc; any city required to implement this density on the mandated land could be facing significant expenditure of public funds that would be paid for with ad valorem taxes imposed on the other residents increasing their housing costs.

This assumes that the five+ acre tract can even support the required density due to terrain issues or other local factors. For example, terrain features that could not be built on is not allowed to be allocated to a Lot due to the Bill’s Lot size constraints. The Bill is misguided.

Finally, history of housing development economics has already shown that the rowhouses or townhomes that will be constructed on this State-mandated land will NOT be affordable housing. The developers will construct expensive townhomes to maximize their ROI. There is nothing in HB 3919 requiring these high density, small lot townhomes to be affordable.

All that this Bill accomplishes is to benefit a few developers and remove the ability of cities to control where rowhouses / townhomes can be feasibly built.

Benjamin Hartman
Self, Engineer and Planner
Mansfield, TX

Support - cities are socially engineering communities with large lot developments. The only downside i see to this is it allows large investment groups to buy large swaths of affordable homes for rentals. Suggest creating a law that would enable small lots with starter homes that MUST be owner occupied.

Jason Brown
Dallas City Homes (DCH)
Dallas, TX

As a Community Real Estate Developer, I strongly support Texas HB 3919. As we all know, land is finite, and with rising costs in labor, materials, and overall development, it is critical that we support policies that promote lower-density real estate communities to expand housing opportunities for all.

This bill plays a vital role in ensuring that we can continue creating attainable housing solutions while balancing economic and infrastructure demands. By fostering responsible growth and development, HB 3919 helps provide more options for homebuyers and renters, ultimately contributing to a more sustainable and inclusive housing market.

I urge you to support this legislation and help advance policies that encourage housing affordability and accessibility across Texas.

Aaron James
Self/ mason
Wht Settlemt, TX
I oppose HB 3919.

Michael Garner
City of Conroe, Texas
Conroe, TX

Honorable Gary Gates
Texas House of Representatives
Chair of the Land & Resources Committee

Please accept this communication on behalf of the City of Conroe in reference to today's committee discussion and testimony on H.B. 3919 related to size and density requirements for residential lots in certain municipalities.

As written now, the Bill will cap a municipality's ability to limit single-family residential lots to 1,400 square feet but no wider than 20 feet or no deeper than 60 feet. This one size-fits-all approach will allow the construction of nearly four single-family homes on a lot where currently one single-family home would be allowed. This number of homes built in such proximity will prohibit setbacks from streets and neighboring structures, bringing in row houses that you would see in large cities such as Philadelphia. Furthermore, such high-density residential requirements will prevent a municipality from properly planning for and providing essential services and infrastructure to include already strained water and sewer capacity.

Ideally, this bill should be amended to include only cities with populations of 750,000 or more. But at the very least, the City of Conroe would ask that the Land & Resource Committee amend H.B. 3919 to reflect the current population requirements of S.B. 15 (municipalities with a population of 150,000 or more as located in a county with a population of more than 300,000 people). This population size requirement will allow smaller communities like the City of Conroe to maintain their character while better managing its limited resources, especially the City's limited water and sewer infrastructure, unlike those in Texas's larger municipalities.

Sincerely,
Duke W. Coon, Mayor and
Harry Hardman, Mayor Pro Tem
City of Conroe, Texas

Patrick Kennedy

Self - Urban Planning and Development

Dallas, TX

My name is Patrick Kennedy, I am a resident of Dallas, Texas, an urban planner, real estate development and transportation consultant, and professor in Southern Methodist University's Lyle School of Engineering.

As I cannot attend this hearing in person, I wish to submit this written statement in SUPPORT of HB3919.

Since I have lived in Dallas over twenty-plus years, the Dallas-Fort Worth region has grown rapidly adding nearly 3 million people. I cannot say the same for the city of Dallas, which has added slightly over 100,000 new residents. Meanwhile, Houston, which has adopted much smaller minimum lot sizes for single family homes has added approximately 350,000 new residents during that time.

More recently, population estimates for 2024 suggest both the city of Dallas and Dallas county may be in fact losing population. We can attribute some measure of the lack of growth to the overly restrictive zoning laws, driving up housing costs, and forcing families to "drive 'til they qualify," meaning search for housing further and further away from jobs.

Some data points in Dallas:

Since 2000, median home values have increased by 228%, while home value to median household income has increased from 3.1 times to 4.3 times income. Thus, home ownership continues to decline from 46% to 41% since 2010.

37.58% of homeowners in the city of Dallas are cost burdened, paying over 30% of gross household income towards their mortgage. With more renters but overall housing stock not keeping up with demand means they are paying more than ever to put a roof over their head, with 48.13% of renters cost burdened and a staggering 22.72% extremely cost burdened paying over 50% of gross income towards monthly rent.

Due to local opposition and burdensome land use regulations, we are simply not accommodating enough of the regional growth within the city nor providing the first step in the stepladder of opportunity and generational wealth that affordable starter homes can provide; pushing families further and further outside of the city and thus imposing tremendous transportation cost burdens as well as longer commutes and less time with their family.

While this bill is one step in the right direction, we will need the passage and many others like it to expand the choice of housing types in our cities.

Steven Gassenberger
Reason Foundation
HOUSTON, TX

Chair Gates, Vice Chair Lalani, and members of the Land and Resource Management Committee, thank you for the opportunity to submit comments regarding House Bill 3919. We share the same goal as Representative Gates: strengthening property rights and improving housing affordability in Texas. House Bill 3919 would do both.

Both buyers and sellers of homes have a wide range of preferences for lot and house sizes, if local zoning allows variety. While a large portion of the market is for fairly standard sized 2-3 bedroom homes on standard-sized lots, there is a substantial appetite for smaller homes on smaller lots, especially in the densest parts of larger cities.

Housing developers must keep building further and further from downtowns due to local government restrictions on density, which means individuals and families often have few choices but to buy homes far from work and accept long commutes. Zoning that also limits density makes it so virtually all development is similar sized homes on similar sized lots. It is rare to see local zoning rules that allow developments that provide different lot and home sizes to meet different customers' needs and wants. A crucial antidote to this problem is allowing higher density development. This gives homebuyers who want smaller homes on smaller lots an alternative to the low density and uniformly similar developments and allows developers to build to provide that choice. HB 3919 would allow this kind of choice.

Importantly, HB3919 does not require such housing to be built. HB 3919 simply prevents local governments from preventing developers from building projects with varying housing and lot sizes if they think there are customers who want them.

It is a fundamental exercise of property rights to allow landowners to build and homeowners to buy such housing. There is little reason for local governments to suborn property rights and restrict such housing. HB 3919 provides useful provisions for managing the few exceptions, a far better approach than blanket zoning rules preventing such housing from being built.

In addition, allowing for some housing projects to provide denser housing with small houses on small lots is a simple and environmentally friendly way to increase the housing supply at lower price points and improve a region's housing affordability.

HB 3919 would strengthen property rights in Texas and provide home builders and home buyers with greater choices in homes, including smaller homes on smaller lots that are largely missing from the current market, and improve housing affordability.

Respectfully submitted,

Dr. Adrian Moore
Vice President
Reason Foundation
adrian.moore@reason.org

Steven Gassenberger
Sr. Policy Analyst
Reason Foundation
steven.gassenberger@reason.org

Caryn Moore, Mrs
Self
Waxahachie, TX

Heck no! I do not support this bill. We want local control!!

Robin Matthews

Cherry Creek Village Neighborhood Assn.

Austin, TX

As President of the Cherry Creek Neighborhood Assn., I am voicing the Association's unanimous opinion that HB3919 will have worse negative effect than President Trump!

HB3919 will cause a gradual shift away from Austin and movement to small peaceful towns close by. The Bill will cause harm to the environment in Austin and downstream. My Association is totally flabbergasted at this NB3919 and cannot imagine any positive outcome.

You are being a dis-service to Austinites.

Respectfully,

Mr. Robin Matthews

President of the Cherry Creek Neighborhood Assn.

6303 Berkeley Cove

Austin 78745

Becky Davis

self and neighborhood

Austin, TX

I oppose the section of HB3919 that requires only 30% permeable cover on small lots, raising the impervious cover from 45% to 70%, which greatly increases flood risk in our community." I have watched density increases create flooding in two different neighborhoods where I have owned a home. Sadly it tends to be lower socioeconomic owners or rentals impacted for whom flooding is a catastrophic life change.

Roy Atwood
Self, Pastor
Dallas, TX

I respectfully urge Texas legislators to support HB 3919, which restores the fundamental right of property owners and developers to build modest, reasonably sized homes — often called “starter homes” — without unnecessary local interference. This bill is a common-sense measure that aligns with core Texas values: individual freedom, local stewardship, and the dignity of work and homeownership.

For generations, Texans have prided themselves on self-reliance and the ability to carve out a better life with their own two hands. But across our state, burdensome zoning rules have crept in, artificially inflating housing costs and shrinking opportunity — particularly for younger Texans, working families, and older adults seeking to live near their children. HB 3919 rightly pushes back against excessive red tape that prevents property owners from meeting the real housing needs of our communities.

The bill ensures that on parcels of five acres or more, developers are free to offer homes that reflect what people actually want and can afford — not just what a local ordinance deems acceptable based on outdated preferences. It maintains safety and infrastructure standards while prohibiting extreme restrictions on lot size, setbacks, or parking that drive up costs and suppress supply. This is not a mandate — it is a guarantee that the market and homeowners, not centralized regulations, will guide how land is used.

One of the underappreciated benefits of this approach is that it significantly reduces the pressure to upzone or densify existing single-family neighborhoods. By creating more attainable housing options in new developments, we can accommodate population growth without disrupting the character of established communities. It’s a balanced way to meet the needs of today without sacrificing the neighborhoods of yesterday.

Homeownership remains one of the clearest paths to financial independence and long-term stability. Yet today, many hard-working Texans are being priced out of that dream — not because of market forces, but because of arbitrary rules that benefit the few at the expense of the many. In cities like Houston, we’ve already seen the positive results when these restrictions are lifted: more diverse housing, greater affordability, and healthier growth patterns.

By supporting HB 3919, the Legislature can help ensure that Texas remains a place where liberty isn’t just a slogan, but a lived reality — where every Texan has a fair shot at building a life, starting with a home.

April Stockwell
self/Project Manager
Austin, TX

I oppose the section of HB3919 that requires only 30% permeable cover on small lots, raising the impervious cover from 45% to 70%, which greatly increases flood risk in our community. My neighborhood is on a dramatic hill and flooding is already an issue. Several neighbors and myself have had to rework back yards and create barriers for water due to the living on a hill. If the city allowed less permeable cover, we would be constantly fighting flooding in our homes. Being that we live in the Hill Country, I know we are not the only neighborhood that would be negatively impacted by this and ask that you do what's best for our community and re-think such a blanket decision.

Nancy Walker
Self
Austin, TX

I oppose the section of HB3919 that requires only 30% permeable cover on small lots, raising the impervious cover from 45% to 70%, which greatly increases flood risk in our community.

John Vondrak
supporters of flood-free family-friendly neighborhoods
Austin, TX

I strongly oppose the section of HB3919 requiring only 30% permeable cover on small lots. Increasing impervious cover from 45% to 70% greatly increases flood risk in our community.

Elva Hernandez
Self
Austin, TX

"I oppose the section of HB3919 that requires only 30% permeable cover on small lots, raising the impervious cover from 45% to 70%, which greatly increases flood risk in our community."

Teri Bates
Self
Corsicana, TX

NO NO NO NO NO! It is not the business of g9vt to provide mass housing! Stop with the liberal California bills. This is not what Texas voted for! Get back to Republican priorities or keep the consequences. This means you Cody Harris. We don't want your California bills!

Cyral Miller
Self
Austin, TX

I oppose the section of HB3919 that requires only 30% permeable cover on small lots, raising the impervious cover from 45% to 70%, which greatly increases flood risk in my community. please delete that section. Thanks!

JANIS REINKEN, Ms.
SELF/ATTORNEY
Austin, TX

I oppose this Bill and you should too. This is a serious overreach of state control over local land use management in communities where people live and work. I support flood-free family-friendly neighborhoods. I oppose the increased impervious cover on small lots as allowed in HB3919, which would increase significantly the risk of flooding in our community. Let local planners and officials determine what is the best land use pollicy for the particular community rather than the state placing its heavy hand on management of this local matter. VOTE NO and do not advance this Bill.

Katrina Aulson
Self
Waxahachie, TX
No. Never.

Denise Hogan
Self
Georgetown, TX

I oppose the section of HB3919 that requires only 30% permeable cover on small lots, raising the impervious cover from 45% to 70%, which greatly increases flood risk in our community."

Barbara McArthur

self scientist

Austin, TX

I live in Austin in a neighborhood that is #2 in localized and riverine floods. We have woefully inadequate storm drain infrastructure, and the city has no funds to increase the capacity. I am asking you amend the section in the second part of HB 3919 that only requires only 30% pervious cover, or as usually stated allows 70% impervious cover, and remove that entitlement. The city of Austin, in passing the H.O.M.E. initiative set the minimum lots size at 1800 square feet. The city is working to expedite the re-subdivision of lots. So Austin could become filled with lots less than 4,000 square feet. The current standard for residential lots in Austin is 45% impervious cover. Austin has had significant riverine and localized urban flooding. Allowing a large increase in impervious cover combined with inadequate drainage infrastructure will greatly increase our chance of flooding in residential areas, when combined with our inadequate drainage infrastructure.

Recent studies show that impervious land cover yields higher percent changes up to 240% more than increased rainfall. We need to need to hold the line in changes in urban land cover from infill development and redevelopment. An increase of 25% in allowed impervious cover will have an extremely detrimental impact on my community and other urban areas in Texas. A recent study by Texas A&M showed that every 10% increase in impervious cover typically yields a 140% increase in flooding. They studied Houston, San Antonio and Austin and discussed important local regulations that restricted impervious cover in decreasing the risk of flooding.

I ask you to please amend the bill and remove the increase in impervious cover from HB3919. All cities in Texas do not have the same flood risks, and they should not be treated the same.

Sylvia Campbell

self

The Woodlands, TX

Dear Committee Members,

It is becoming more and more expensive to purchase a home in Texas, and I believe the biggest impact on our state is that of lack of sufficient affordable housing. Not only would more affordable housing enable people to purchase homes, it would have a resulting impact on homelessness, by freeing up existing affordable housing options. Please vote YES on HB 3919. It will allow more families to live in a stable home environment.

Thank you for your consideration,

Sylvia Campbell

Kay Broline, Dr retired

Self

Texas, TX

Increased impervious cover for 4000 sq ft lots will only increase flooding.

Born in Austin in 1947 i have witnessed flooding along Shoal creek numerous times. The May 1981 Memorial day flood affected our home and many across Austin from North Austin to Balcones drive and to the river! You must not make thus city and residents subject to flooding with this flawed bill 3919!

Stephanie Thompson

Self, Visual Artist

Austin, TX

I oppose the section of HB3919 that requires only 30% permeable cover on small lots, raising the impervious cover from 45% to 70%, which greatly increases flood risk in our community.

Linda Reardon

Retired

Austin, TX

I oppose the section of HB3919 that requires only 30% permeable cover on small lots, raising the impervious cover from 45% to 70%, which greatly increases flood risk in our community.

Frances Grund

Self

AUSTIN, TX

I oppose the section of HB3919 that requires only 30% permeable cover on small lots, raising the impervious cover from 45% to 70%, which greatly increases flood risk in our community.

Michael Smuts

Self / Retired

Austin, TX

I oppose the section of HB3919 that requires only 30% permeable cover on small lots, raising the impervious cover from 45% to 70%, which greatly increases flood risk in our community.

Vicki Ford

Self/Marketing

Austin, TX

I oppose the section of HB3919 that requires only 30% permeable cover on small lots, raising the impervious cover from 45% to 70%, which greatly increases flood risk in our community.

Linda Anderson

Self

Austin, TX

I oppose the section of HB3919 that requires only 30% permeable cover on small lots, raising the impervious cover from 45% to 70%, which greatly increases flood risk in our community

Marie Case

Self

Austin, TX

I oppose the section of HB3919 that requires only 30% permeable cover on small lots, raising the impervious cover from 45% to 70%, which greatly increases flood risk in our community which is already an issue

Claire Kent

Self

Austin, TX

I oppose the section of HB3919 that requires only 30% permeable cover on small lots, raising the impervious cover from 45% to 70%, which greatly increases flood risk in our community.

Emily Risinger

Self

Austin, TX

I oppose the section of HB3919 that requires only 30% permeable cover on small lots, raising the impervious cover from 45% to 70%, which greatly increases flood risk in our community.

Jon Filardi, Dr

Self

Austin, TX

"I oppose the section of HB3919 that requires only 30% permeable cover on small lots, raising the impervious cover from 45% to 70%, which greatly increases flood risk in our community.

Laurence Ouellette

Self counselor

Austin, TX

Austin's infrastructure has not kept up with growth, and the consequence has been a city in slow decline, crumbling. I oppose the section of HB3919 that requires only 30% permeable cover on small lots, raising the impervious cover from 45% to 70%, which greatly increases flood risk in Austin. This city is selling its character, distinctive character, and quality of life for profit. Please stop.

JOHN RIBBLE

Self-Retired

Austin, TX

I oppose the section of HB3919 that requires only 30% permeable cover on small lots, raising the impervious cover from 45% to 70%, which greatly increases flood risk in our community. PROTECT OUR PROPERTIES AND NEIGHBORHOODS OR BE VOTED OUT OF OFFICE!

Amanda Braziel-Holleman, Rev.

Self

Austin, TX

I oppose this bill. I am concerned about the increase in impervious cover on small residential lots in our neighborhoods, and the impact it will have on flooding in our community. Water is a precious resource and we need to allow it to soak into the ground and not cause damage, pick up pollution, and flood away downstream.

Margaret Hill, Ms

self

Austin, TX

I oppose the section of HB3919 that requires only 30% permeable cover on small lots, raising the impervious cover from 45% to 70%, which greatly increases flood risk in our community.

Victoria Brunow

Self

Austin, TX

I am totally against HB 3919. Austin is already a heat island. We do not need a greater amount of imperious ground cover on residential lots, making Austin EVEN hotter in temperatures.

Pratibha Shenoy

Self, attorney

Austin, TX

I oppose the section of HB3919 that requires only 30% permeable cover on small lots, raising the impervious cover from 45% to 70%, which greatly increases flood risk in our community.

garret nick

self

Austin, TX

We are experiencing a prolonged drought across Texas with groundwater levels dropping everywhere. Our springs and creeks are running dry. Our river banks and cities are experiencing massive erosion and flash floods. This bill only serves to compound the problems and make Texans less safe so that builders can squeeze a few more bucks out of each investment. This bill is shortsighted and destructive. Vote NO.

Cammi KLIER

Self

Austin, TX 78735, TX

I am against this bill mostly due to the change in impervious cover for residential lots less than 4000 s.f. I have lived in the City of Austin since 1990. At the time I was working for an architectural company, designing homes and drafting document drawings for construction and permitting. It was a very innovative time in our city, I was particularly familiar with Save Our Springs and the SOS ordinance, which prescribed 45% max impervious cover for all residential lots in the City limits or annexed lots. Austin was a very proactive, environmentally driven city with the Green Building Program, SOS, and many other very sustainable and environment concepts in place to help people reduce their energy consumption, water use, and responsible waste management. What has happened in the last decade is a slow creep of change which in the last 5 years has produced some of the most unsustainable and un-environmentally responsible laws and ordinances. I am against HB 3919 due to the proposed change of impervious cover from 45% to 70% for lots 4000 and less. Given that the city council wants to allow people to subdivide lots, this means that many if not all, residential lots in the city of Austin may be allowed to change their impervious cover to 70%. Where will we be when the next flood happens, which will rush flood water in our streets and neighborhoods because it is not absorbed in to the ground? This is a very irresponsible and dangerous change to our city building regulations. We need to get back to the environmental city we used to be, say NO to HB 3919.

Donna Pedersen

Self/Small business owner

Austin, TX

I oppose the section of HB3919 that requires only 30% permeable cover on small lots, raising the impervious cover from 45% to 70%, which greatly increases flood risk in our community.

Cammi KLIER

Custom Design Services

Austin, TX 78735, TX

I am against this bill mostly due to the change in impervious cover for residential lots less than 4000 s.f. I have lived in the City of Austin since 1990. At the time I was working for an architectural company, designing homes and drafting document drawings for construction and permitting. It was a very innovative time in our city, I was particularly familiar with Save Our Springs and the SOS ordinance, which prescribed 45% max impervious cover for all residential lots in the City limits or annexed lots. Austin was a very proactive, environmentally driven city with the Green Building Program, SOS, and many other very sustainable and environment concepts in place to help people reduce their energy consumption, water use, and responsible waste management. What has happened in the last decade is a slow creep of change which in the last 5 years has produced some of the most unsustainable and un-environmentally responsible laws and ordinances. I am against HB 3919 due to the proposed change of impervious cover from 45% to 70% for lots 4000 and less. Given that the city council wants to allow people to subdivide lots, this means that many if not all, residential lots in the city of Austin may be allowed to change their impervious cover to 70%. Where will we be when the next flood happens, which will rush flood water in our streets and neighborhoods because it is not absorbed in to the ground? This is a very irresponsible and dangerous change to our city building regulations. We need to get back to the environmental city we used to be, say NO to HB 3919.

Marc Allen Connelly, Mr

Self

AUSTIN, TX

"I oppose the section of HB3919 that requires only 30% permeable cover on small lots, raising the impervious cover from 45% to 70%, which greatly increases flood risk in our community."

Thomas Pedersen

Self/Small business owner

Austin, TX

I oppose the section of HB3919 that requires only 30% permeable cover on small lots, raising the impervious cover from 45% to 70%, which greatly increases flood risk in our community.

Laurie Mills

Self

West Lake Hills, TX

I oppose the section of HB3919 that requires only 30% permeable cover on small lots, raising the impervious cover from 45% to 70%, which greatly increases flood risk in our community.

Suzanne Moses

Self

Austin, TX

I oppose the section of HB3919 that requires only 30% permeable cover on small lots, raising the impervious cover from 45% to 70%, which greatly increases flood risk in our community.

Walter Barfield

Self

Austin, TX

I oppose the section of HB3919 that requires only 30% permeable cover on small lots, raising the impervious cover from 45% to 70%, which greatly increases flood risk in our community. I own homes in both Austin and San Antonio, and I have witnessed first-hand the damages which occur from flooding due to increases in impervious cover to downstream property owners as well as the degradation to the quality of neighborhoods by permitting large increases to urban infill and impervious cover.

Allison Manfre

Self

Austin, TX

I oppose the section of HB3919 that requires only 30% permeable cover on small lots, raising the impervious cover from 45% to 70%, which greatly increases flood risk in our community. We really don't want our city turning into Houston do we?

Susan Moffat, Ms.

Self, Retired Editor

Austin, TX

I strongly oppose the section of HB3919 that would raise impervious cover limits on small lots to 70%. Many urban neighborhoods, including my own, are already experiencing localized flooding even with the current cap of 45% impervious cover. The new intensity and frequency of weather events combined with increased development are now putting several of my neighboring streets under water during severe storms. As recently as several years ago, this had not been a problem.

There may well be some areas where 70% impervious cover does not pose a threat existing homes, businesses, and lives. But to implement this as a one-size-fits-all edict is dangerous and irresponsible, given that both storms and development are likely to increase.

Please remove this reckless section of the bill and allow local jurisdictions to make their own decisions regarding the safety of their residents.

Amber Meinzer

Self - Risk Manager

Austin, TX

I oppose the section of HB3919 that requires only 30% permeable cover on small lots, raising the impervious cover from 45% to 70%, which greatly increases flood risk in our community.

Bryan King

Myself

Austin, TX

I am a supporter of flood-free family-friendly neighborhoods. I oppose the increased impervious cover on small lots allowed in HB3919, which would increase significantly the risk of flooding in our community. I urge to remove the section of the bill that requires only 30% permeable cover."

Jessica Becht

self, writer

Austin, TX

I oppose the section of HB3919 that requires only 30% permeable cover on small lots, raising the impervious cover from 45% to 70%, which greatly increases flood risk in our community. My neighborhood already suffers from inadequate drainage in heavy rains, and I am highly concerned that allowing additional paved surfaces and buildings will damage nearby homes. Austin must invest in infrastructure that supports density if it wants density. It is irresponsible to allow profit-seeking developers and speculators to cover nearly the entire surface of a lot in impermeable materials, especially in areas that have had no infrastructure upgrades in decades.

Bill Meacham

self (retired)

Austin, TX

Please vote against the section of HB3919 that requires only 30% permeable cover on small lots, raising the impervious cover from 45% to 70%, which greatly increases flood risk in our community.

Lynne Davis, Ms.

self, retired

Austin, TX

"I oppose the section of HB3919 that requires only 30% permeable cover on small lots, raising the impervious cover from 45% to 70%, which greatly increases flood risk in our community."

Cody Whittle
Self / Construction Company Vice President
Seabrook, TX

Members of the Committee,

I am submitting this written testimony in strong support of HB 3919, which seeks to restore the property right to build starter homes in new neighborhoods across Texas. As a representative of the construction industry in Houston, I recognize the urgent need for policies that promote housing affordability and expand homeownership opportunities.

The ability to build starter homes is essential for ensuring that hardworking Texans, including young families and first-time buyers, have access to attainable housing options. Overly restrictive regulations have limited housing supply, driving up costs and putting homeownership out of reach for many. HB 3919 takes a crucial step in addressing this issue by allowing the construction of smaller, more affordable homes, fostering economic growth, and strengthening communities.

By restoring property rights and enabling the development of diverse housing options, HB 3919 supports Texas' tradition of private property ownership and free-market principles. Ensuring that developers and builders have the flexibility to meet market demands will help alleviate housing shortages and create more opportunities for Texans to achieve the dream of homeownership.

I respectfully urge the committee to support HB 3919 and move this important legislation forward. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Cody Whittle

Billy McCurley
Self
Austin, TX

Either it was always disingenuous or y'all are now being disingenuous that impermeable coverage is necessary to help prevent flooding in Austin. Which is it? Either way what is being voted on now is not ok!

oppose the section of HB3919 that requires only 30% permeable cover on small lots, raising the impervious cover from 45% to 70%, which greatly increases flood risk in our community.

Kristi Daugherty
Self
Austin, TX

I oppose the section of HB3919 that requires only 30% permeable cover on small lots, raising the impervious cover from 45% to 70%, which greatly increases flood risk in our community.

Wendy McCurley
Self / Accounting
Austin, TX

I am writing today to oppose the section of HB3919 that requires only 30% permeable cover on small lots, raising the impervious cover from 45% to 70%, which greatly increases flood risk in our community.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Audrea Moyers, Mrs.

self, teacher

Austin, TX

I live in a home I've owned since 2000, that has flooded several times due to localized urban flooding. My neighborhood cannot handle higher increases in impervious cover without flooding homes. I oppose the section of HB3919 that requires only 30% permeable cover on small lots, raising the impervious cover from 45% to 70%, which greatly increases flood risk in our community.

Susan Rodenko

Self

Austin, TX

Hi, my name is Susan Rodenko. I am a supporter of flood-free family-friendly neighborhoods. I oppose the increased impervious cover on small lots allowed in HB3919, which would increase significantly the risk of flooding in our community. I urge the representative to remove the section of the bill that requires only 30% permeable cover." "I oppose the section of HB3919 that requires only 30% permeable cover on small lots, raising the impervious cover from 45% to 70%, which greatly increases flood risk in our community."

Stephanie Taparauskas

Self, university development

AUSTIN, TX

I oppose the section of HB3919 that requires only 30% permeable cover on small lots, raising the impervious cover from 45% to 70%, which greatly increases flood risk in our area. Please do not support this section of this bill. It will only hurt our communities in the long run.

Sharon Gillespie

SELF

AUSTIN, TX

I oppose the section of HB3919 that requires only 30% permeable cover on small lots, raising the impervious cover from 45% to 70%, which greatly increases flood risk in our community.

Jesse Palacios

Mi/My Montopolis

AUSTIN, TX

"I oppose the section of HB3919 that requires only 30% permeable cover on small lots, raising the impervious cover from 45% to 70%, which greatly increases flood risk in our community."

"I oppose the section of HB3919 that requires only 30% permeable cover on small lots, raising the impervious cover from 45% to 70%, which greatly increases flood risk in our community."

"I oppose the section of HB3919 that requires only 30% permeable cover on small lots, raising the impervious cover from 45% to 70%, which greatly increases flood risk in our community."

Ashley Brundage
Dallas Area Habitat for Humanity
Coppell, TX

According to buildingcommunityWORKSHOP, the city of Dallas has a shortage of over 16,000 affordable single-family homes. Through the passage of HB 3919, Dallas Area Habitat for Humanity could more efficiently use its land to better meet the increasing demand for neighborhoods with a variety of housing types, from detached townhomes on smaller lots to traditional single-family homes, and price points. In addition, we have waiting lists of first-time homebuyers may prefer smaller, lower maintenance housing options – if they were given the option. Under current lot size requirements, Dallas could build only 26,000 homes on undeveloped land, but, with smaller lot sizes, Dallas could build more than four times that amount, up to 120,000 starter homes for first-time homebuyers, according to the American Enterprise Institute. For these reasons, Dallas Area Habitat for Humanity supports HB 3919 by Chairman Gary Gates and looks forward to monitoring the bill's progress from here.

mag franzoni
self
the woodlands, TX

Builders and advocates for affordable housing support this bill because it would allow for easier construction of smaller, more affordable homes. An identical bill, SB 15, has received bipartisan support from legislators and community organizations such as Texans for Housing, AURA, and several affiliates of Habitat for Humanity.

John Jenkins
Self
Ovilla, TX

I do NOT support this bill.