From:	Alice Duff
To:	sen.lewfrederick@state.or.us; rep.bradwitt@state.or.us; sen.fredgirod@state.or.us; Sen Taylor; rep.salesquivel@state.or.us; Rep Lewis; rep.karinpower@oregonlegislature.com; rep.kenhelm@state.or.us; JWMNR Exhibits
Subject:	HB 2007: Fix it or vote NO
Date:	Wednesday, June 21, 2017 8:29:43 PM

Dear Senators and Representatives:

If you share our goal of creating **more affordable housing**, increasing **density without demolition**, and **conserving the historic character** of our older neighborhoods, you must adopt Restore Oregon's amendments to FIX HB 2007:

1. Focus incentives on the creation of **affordable** housing, not market-rate housing. How about mandating that a city or county must require a certain proportion of affordable units in any apartments or condos or housing subdivision? Depending on the location, that might be one in 20, or one in two.
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 conversations, and compatible infill.

As it stands, HB 2007 is based on the following FALSE PREMISES:
1. That simply building more housing – even if it's at high market rates – will have the trickle-down effect of creating more affordability.

- There is NO EVIDENCE this has worked in other cities. One need only look at San Francisco and Vancouver.

2. 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.

3. 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.

4. 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 they 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, we urge you either to **adopt Restore Oregon's proposed amendments as a package, or VOTE NO on this bill.**

Thank you for giving this your full consideration.

Alice Duff, Chair

Gresham Historic Resources Subcommittee
and historic property owner