

From: stephanie brown
To: [JWMNR Exhibits](#)
Subject: Please either fix or reject HB 2007
Date: Wednesday, June 21, 2017 1:50:02 PM

I implore you to either vote no on HB 2007 or work to fix its grievous flaws.

HB 2007 claims to support the creation and maintenance of affordable housing but instead:

- incentivizes demolition of existing modestly-priced housing,
- fails to provide incentives to build additional affordable housing
- obliterates local control over zoning
- prevents public participation in the creation of regulations
- strips protections from future historic districts.

[Amendments to HB 2007](#) which would address these issues have been proposed by a coalition of preservation advocates. These proposed amendments would support construction of affordable housing, curb further demolition of existing homes, increase density, and retain critical protections for historic districts.

HB 2007 is based on faulty logic. It assumes that building high-end housing will have a trickle-down effect and spur the creation of additional affordable housing. The housing situation in San Francisco, Seattle, Vancouver and other West Coast cities shows that this is simply not true.

HB 2007 posits that we have a shortage of MARKET RATE housing, which is untrue. The actual problem is that 'market rate' is unaffordable for many folks. What we lack is AFFORDABLE housing options, and allowing developers to demolish small "starter homes" to make way for \$900,000 infill destroys affordable housing options and floods the high end of the market with overpriced units which raise the cost of adjacent properties.

HB 2007 also suggests that we have an insufficient amount of buildable land inside the urban growth boundary. Again, this is untrue. Many close-in neighborhoods are already dense (although even in tightly packed neighborhoods basement granny flats and free-standing ADUs are possible on many lots) but many outer neighborhoods have plenty of developable land and deserve investment in their growth.

Finally, supporters of HB 2007 have suggested that historic district designation blocks density and prevents the creation of affordable housing. Yet, historic district designation does NOT prohibit accessory dwelling units (ADUs) or infill development. Some historic districts do require design

review for compatibility but that is not the same as prohibiting construction. Furthermore, historic districts comprise less than 3 percent of residential zoning. Clearly, other factors are to blame for the shortage of affordable housing in the other 97 percent of our residential areas.

If you agree that creating more affordable housing, increasing density without demolition and protecting our region's architectural history are important, please work to develop incentives which will create affordable housing rather than market-rate house; end demolition of modestly priced homes unless they are being replaced with AFFORDABLE multi-family housing units, support the conversion of existing single family homes into multifamily units without triggering commercial building codes, and PLEASE leave baseline protections in place for new historic districts while providing incentives for the creation of ADUs and compatible infill.

HB 2007 does have some positive goals. I support streamlining review, establishing clear and objective standards for affordable housing design, and allowing religious institutions to create affordable housing on their property and hope that you do as well. But to avoid doing more harm than good to our region, please either **adopt the proposed amendments listed above, or VOTE NO on this bill.**

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Stephanie Brown

SE Yamhill Street

Portland, OR 97214