

From: Karl Keener
To: [JWMNR Exhibits](#)
Cc: [Rep KenyGuyer](#); [John Liu](#); [Brad Mckenzie](#); [Constance Beaumont](#); [Scott Pratt](#); [Keith Comess](#); [Jeanne Schapp](#)
Subject: In Opposition to HB 2007
Date: Tuesday, June 20, 2017 8:35:06 PM

Honorable Members of the Joint Ways and Means Committee:

Much has been said about those of us who oppose HB 2007. We have been called racists and NIMBY's, amongst other things by people whom we worked hard to elect. We can only imagine what our more typical opponents might have to say about us.

My wife and I are proud homeowners in the Laurelhurst neighborhood of NE Portland, and are fully engaged in the ongoing efforts to have Laurelhurst registered as a National Historic District. We love our home and neighborhood and look at HB 2007 in its current form as a threat to both.

While HR 2007 started out as an "affordable housing" bill it is now nothing more than a give away to big money home builders and developers. If you want Portland and other cities throughout Oregon to look like San Jose, CA then you should by all means support HB 2007. Eliminating design review is not a bad thing if mediocracy is your goal. HB 2007 is a great idea if you feel compelled to have Salem dictate control over local communities in which your constituents live and vote.

Most modern countries in the world respect and cherish their architectural heritage. Some in Salem call it NIMBYism.

The supporters of a National Historic District for Laurelhurst are actually YIMBY's (Yes In My Back Yard). Yes, we want to save our historic homes and neighborhood, and Yes we want infill that is in character with this neighborhood. There is no reason that infill cannot be affordable and also meet basic design review. Many large historic homes could be easily converted to duplexes or triplexes without changing the exterior character of the structure or the neighborhood,

The idea that tearing down historic homes in historic districts will result in any appreciable increase in affordable housing is a fallacy. What happens when our smaller affordable houses are torn down in neighborhoods like Eastmoreland, Irvington and/or Laurelhurst is huge non-affordable houses are built in their stead. That is very simply a "lose/lose" proposition. We lose an affordable house and a big non-affordable house is built in its place.

Across the street from us in the 3400 block of NE Davis is a lovely three generational family. The grandparents who have lived in the house for nearly 40 years are now living in a recently converted small unit that was once their garage. Their daughter (who was born in that house), son-in law and grandchildren are now living in the main house, and it is working just fine for them and their neighbors.

A block and a half from us a small historic bungalow was demolished two years ago and replaced by two tall skinny houses that sold for more than \$900,00 each. So one affordable house was replaced with two unaffordable houses. That was a lose/double lose situation.

National historic districts are not bad. Affordable housing is not bad. HR 2007 in its current form is bad.

Please protect both present and future National Historic Districts. Promote affordable housing. Delete everything else from HB 2007.

Respectfully yours,

Carol and Karl Keener
3457 NE Dava Street
Portland, OR 97232

