

From: Paul Majkut
To: Rep.TinaKotek@state.or.us; [Rep Stark](#); [Rep Fahey](#); [Alissa Keny-Guyer](#); Rep.AndyOlson@state.or.us; brandon_spencer@portlandoregon.gov; [Peggy Moretti](#); [Dan Everhart](#); [Janet Baker](#); govrel@portlandoregon.gov; [Rep Sanchez](#); [JWMNR Exhibits](#)
Subject: providing affordable housing; comments on HB2007
Date: Wednesday, June 21, 2017 10:52:20 PM
Attachments: [HB 2007 comments 5-19-2017.docx](#)

I have attached my comments on HB2007. In addition, I am forwarding you a prior email with a real estate AD from Trulia.com selling a new \$1,095,000 home in Sabin. if you really want to provide affordable housing, do not rezone the inner city to allow developers to replace affordable housing with million dollar homes that none of us can afford. Rather, do 4 things that make affordable housing available to working class residents of Portland while preserving existing neighborhoods and their vegetation and wildlife.

- Allow one exterior ADU and one interior ADU per existing home to accommodate more residents.
- Allow internal changes to larger existing homes for up to 4 units under the residential code to accommodate more residents. This provides affordable housing and keeps the exterior of the building and the lot's vegetation and wildlife.
- Restrict the footprint of new homes on 5000 sq ft lots to 2500 sq ft to stop the current practice of clearing all vegetation and covering the vast majority of the lot with a new building and concrete. This would also allow existing vegetation to be retained.
- Most of the cost for small bungalows is in the land, not the house. Through public bonds finance a community land trust like Proud Ground that retains ownership of the land and allows sale only of the houses that the working class can then afford.

Paul Majkut

4130 NE 18th Avenue

Portland, OR 97211

4130 NE 18th Avenue

Portland, OR 97211

May 19, 2017

House Speaker Tina Kotek, Portland Rep.TinaKotek@state.or.us

Rep Duane Stark, Grants Pass, rep.duanestark@oregonlegislature.gov

Julie Fahey, Eugene, Rep.JulieFahey@oregonlegislature.gov

Rep Alissa Keny-Guyer Rep.AlissaKenyGuyer@state.or.us

Rep Andy Olson, Albany Rep.AndyOlson@state.or.us

Rep Tawna Sanchez, Portland Rep.TawnaSanchez@oregonlegislature.gov

cc:

Contact Portland Office of Government Relations: Elizabeth Edwards, Interim Director
govrel@portlandoregon.gov

Dan Eisenbeis, Interim State Government Relations Manager govrel@portlandoregon.gov

brandon.spencer@portlandoregon.gov

PeggyM@RestoreOregon.org

Dan@RestoreOregon.org

janbak@pacifier.com

HB 2007 Is a massive de-regulation bill that primarily benefits for-profit developers by encouraging construction of market rate housing as well as too generously defined “affordable housing. This bill will encourage the demolition of the smaller, affordable and habitable homes that already exist in Portland inner neighborhoods. It preempts city planning, ignoring Comprehensive Plans, neighborhood context and environments and makes no provision for building affordable housing where it is needed. Before rushing to judgement on HB 2007, the Legislature should consider the recent experience of the citizens of Portland.

The market rate infill occurring in Portland the last 5 years has resulted in the demolition of hundreds of typical houses that are smaller, affordable and habitable, @1300 sq ft in size. Just look at the good condition of the homes that are being destroyed on the portlandchronicle.com website. And with the demolition of nearly every home the lots are cleared of all mature

vegetation including trees. The footprint of the new infill (one or two homes) is so large that there is little room for yard, gardens or trees. There is also more shading on adjacent lots. These new structures are often not compatible in size, scale, design or quality with the houses of its neighbors. Each of the two townhomes typically built on these 5000 sq ft lots cost \$600 to \$800,000. This is not affordable housing.

In a January 28, 2014 article entitled “The Impact of Oregon’s Increasing Demolition Trend” By: [Brandon Spencer-Hartle](#) on the [restoreoregon.org](#) website, Mr. Hartle documents the negative impact of Oregon's increasing demolition trend on our neighborhoods. “Because design review isn’t required in most established neighborhoods, much of the new construction that follows the demolitions is not compatible with the character of the neighborhood around it. . . The average residential building demolished in Portland in recent years was built in 1927.”

“Retaining the integrity and continuity of traditional neighborhoods is a significant concern for Restore Oregon,” says Executive Director Peggy Moretti. “We need to be careful that in the name of density, we aren’t sacrificing quality, character, and our unique sense of place. Without thoughtful urban planning and community involvement, some of Oregon’s most livable neighborhoods could be lost in the next ten years.”

Moreover, the most energy efficient way to provide housing is to retain, and only when necessary, to upgrade the existing structures.

“The current tear-down trend across Oregon should cause pause for any environmentally-conscious Oregonian because the demolition of buildings amounts to a staggering amount of [embodied energy](#) that is literally being thrown away. Every time we raze an older house and replace it with a new, more energy efficient one, it takes an average of 50 years to recover the climate change impacts related to its demolition.”

“According to a recent [national study](#), “If the city of Portland were to retrofit and reuse the single-family homes and commercial office buildings that it is otherwise likely to demolish over the next 10 years, the potential impact reduction would total approximately 231,000 metric tons of CO₂ – approximately 15% of [Multnomah County’s] total CO₂ reduction targets over the next decade.”

In an Oct 7, 2015, article entitled “The State of Demolition in Portland” By: [Brandon Spencer-Hartle](#) on the [restoreoregon.org](#) website, Mr. Hartle updated his January 28, 2014 letter.

“Using data compiled from the demolition applications, PortlandMaps, and the Bureau of Planning and Sustainability, the 172 demolitions that occurred from April 27 to October 5 had the following average characteristics:

- Built in 1930
- 1,340 square feet in size
- Generated 58,558 pounds of landfill waste upon demolition (not including recycled materials)

Assuming that 400 houses are indeed demolished in Portland this year, it will mean that 23 million pounds of waste will end up in Oregon's landfills. That's the equivalent of sending 2.5 billion pieces of paper to the landfill!"

This Bill should be amended to prohibit demolition of sound smaller homes in pursuit of its goals, to remove prohibitions of design review, to leave protections for historic districts in place. The State Building Code should also be amended to ease internal conversions of historic houses, including for ADU's within existing houses.

The State's first priority should be to reduce the avoidable climate change impacts of development and preserve our existing neighborhoods, homes and vegetation. Encourage cities to use back yard habitat certification of existing homes. Encourage cities to update their historic resource inventories, begin public review of demolitions, and require deconstruction when a home cannot be saved (not just pre-1917 homes as the City of Portland requires). Encourage cities to tax landfill waste, remove hurdles to home relocation and provide financial incentives for preserving existing homes. See Mr. Hartles January 28, 2014 article cited above.

If the State is serious about providing low income families housing in the inner ring neighborhoods, it will do so by supporting and funding Proud Ground and equivalent housing subsidy programs. The primary cost of smaller inner ring homes (@1300 sq ft) is the lot they sit upon. Lower income buyers should be encouraged to purchase these homes, not the lots they sit upon.

The State should also encourage cities to adopt their own rules that allow two ADUs per house existing in 2016 only (one internal and one detached). This would reduce the pressure to demolish existing sound, smaller, affordable homes. Portland has also waived ADU fees for several years. Encourage cities to tax landfill waste, remove hurdles to home relocation and provide financial incentives for preserving existing homes. See Mr. Hartle's January 28, 2014 article cited above.

Finally, the State should require inclusionary zoning in current multi dwelling zones to subsidize housing in buildings of 5 or more units.

Citizen of Portland, Oregon

Paul Majkut