

**From:** Constance Beaumont  
**To:** [JWMNR Exhibits](mailto:JWMNR_Exhibits); [Sen.LewFrederick@state.or.us](mailto:Sen.LewFrederick@state.or.us); [Representative Alissa Keny-Guyer](mailto:Representative Alissa Keny-Guyer); [Senator Michael Dembrow](mailto:Senator Michael Dembrow); [Rep.BradWitt@state.or.us](mailto:Rep.BradWitt@state.or.us)  
**Subject:** Opposition to HB 2007  
**Date:** Wednesday, June 21, 2017 10:32:11 AM

---

## TESTIMONY IN OPPOSITION TO HB 2007

To: Ways & Means Committee (and Subcommittee on Natural Resources) -- [jwmnr.exhibits@oregonlegislature.gov](mailto:jwmnr.exhibits@oregonlegislature.gov)  
From: Constance E. Beaumont (4125 S.E. Pine St., Portland, OR 97214; [constancebeau@msn.com](mailto:constancebeau@msn.com))  
Subject: Opposition to HB 2007  
Date: June 21, 2017

I support the affordable housing goals of HB 2007 but oppose the bill as written because it is likely to *worsen* our housing problems while doing irreparable damage to valuable community assets.

Builders and developers are already targeting smaller, more affordable houses for demolition and replacing them with significantly more expensive McMansions. HB 2007 would do nothing to discourage this practice. The bill provides no guarantee that new housing units replacing demolished structures would be affordable. It thus offers false hope, not a real solution to the housing problem it purports to address.

Meanwhile, HB 2007 would gut Oregon's long-standing Goal 5, which was intended to protect historic resources, insofar as it relates to residential historic structures. If approved, this hastily considered, poorly drafted bill would replace recently revised, carefully vetted Goal 5 rules finalized earlier this year.

Most of the great cities of the world treasure their historic and architectural heritage and take steps to preserve it. They do so not only because this heritage engenders civic pride but also because it also often helps to stabilize their economies. HB 2007 threatens to squander this heritage – again, with no guarantee that the affordable housing problems would be abated.

I recognize the value of higher density to cities. Among other things, such

density can make public transit more economically feasible and shorten travel distances – which in turn can help to reduce carbon emissions by enabling more people to walk more places. But density can be handled well or ineptly. HB 2007’s removal of design review options is likely to foster the kind of poorly-designed density that engenders backlash from the public – something that can lead to the types of construction delays that HB 2007 seeks to reduce.

To be clear: In the case of historic structures, I am not opposed to *internal* conversions of existing homes (or to compatibly designed Accessory Dwelling Units) to create additional housing units. In other words, I support *density without demolition*.

The rush to enact HB 2007 without thinking through its possible unintended consequences reminds me of urban renewal, another well-intentioned effort that resulted in permanent damage to countless American cities.

In short, I urge you to oppose HB 2007. I support the position (and recommended amendments) offered by Restore Oregon. Thank you for your consideration of these views and for your efforts to make Oregon a better place.