

From: Stephanie
To: Sen.LewFrederick@state.or.us; Rep.BradWitt@state.or.us; Sen.FredGirod@state.or.us; [Sen.Taylor](mailto:Sen.Taylor@state.or.us); Rep.SalEsquivel@state.or.us; rep.kenhelm@state.or.us; [Rep.Lewis](mailto:Rep.Lewis@state.or.us); [Rep.Power](mailto:Rep.Power@state.or.us); [JWMNR Exhibits](#)
Subject: HB 2007 Testimony
Date: Wednesday, June 21, 2017 11:21:42 AM

Good morning,

It is my understanding that there will be a hearing on HB 2007 on June 22, 2017 and although I have written on this bill before (for the May 25, 2017 hearing), I wanted to again urge you to either fix this bill or VOTE NO.

Please, the actions that could result from this bill will be permanent and could have undesired and unintended effects on Oregon's unique character and livability. While I recognize and understand the need for affordable housing, this bill is not the answer and I ask you, as our elected representatives, to give careful thought and consideration to this matter.

I sincerely want to see thoughtful and intelligent growth for this state, and I hope we will not be misled by parties who would capitalize on people's good intentions with regard to affordable housing.

I ask you adopt Restore Oregon's amendments to HB 2007:

1. Focus incentives on the creation of affordable housing, not market-rate housing.
2. Stop tear downs of good modest-priced homes, unless they're being replaced with multiple affordable units.
3. Enable the internal conversion of existing houses into as many as four units without triggering the cost-prohibitive commercial building code. This adds density while retaining character.
4. Leave in place baseline protections for new historic districts, while providing incentives for ADUs, internal conversions, and compatible infill.

As it stands, HB 2007 is based on FALSE PREMISES:

That simply building more housing – even if it's at high market rates – will have the trickle-down effect of creating more affordability. That we have a shortage of market rate housing in Portland and other major metro areas.

There is no evidence this has worked in other cities. One need only look at San Francisco and Vancouver.

That we have a shortage of market rate housing in Portland and other major metro areas.

Market rate housing is doing fine – there's even an over-supply at the higher end.

We do not have enough AFFORDABLE housing. Building more high-end homes will not help that

That there is insufficient buildable land inside the UGB.

Nope. The central city is already dense, but outer neighborhoods have lots of opportunities for development and deserve investment.

That designation of historic districts is being used as a mechanism for blocking density and affordable housing.

Historic designation does NOT prohibit accessory dwelling units (ADUs) or infill development. Some historic districts require design review for compatibility.

Recently revised Goal 5 rules provide that the only automatic protection for new historic districts is demolition review.

Historic districts comprise just 1% - 3% of residential zoning. They are not the problem and provide significant community benefits worthy of good stewardship.

There are positive aspects to HB 2007 such as streamlining review, establishing clear and objective standards for affordable housing design, and allowing religious institutions to create affordable housing on their property.

But to avoid doing more harm than good, I urge you to either **adopt Restore Oregon's proposed amendments as a package, or VOTE NO on this bill.**

Thank you for giving this your full consideration.

Sincerely,
Stephanie Davis
Portland, OR

Sent from [Outlook](#)