

From: [Laura Illig](#)
To: [Rep KenyGuyer](#); [Rep Noble](#); [Rep Sanchez](#); [Rep Helt](#); [Rep Meek](#); [Rep Mitchell](#); [Rep Schouten](#); [Rep Williams](#); [Rep Zika](#); [FenderSosa Amie](#); [Buell Adam](#); [HHS Exhibits](#)
Subject: I OPPOSE HB 2001
Date: Sunday, February 10, 2019 9:44:42 PM

Dear Sir or Madam,

We all understand that there is a need for more affordable housing in Oregon. However, I am writing to OPPOSE HB 2001. I believe it is a flawed bill that will not ameliorate the housing situation - and may even make it worse- and is also undemocratic and unfair.

In particular:

1. HB 2001 mandates increased density without any planning or funding for the additional facilities and services necessary to support that density (road improvements, sewers, parks, etc.), nor does it provide any expectations that the developers who will make money making Oregon denser pay for or contribute to any of these critical support services.
2. The housing being promoted in this bill, “missing middle” housing, will do nothing to improve the desperate need, in Eugene, at least, for TRUE affordable housing (that costs under \$625/month) which is where we are short by more than 13,000 units. Instead, it is likely to result in higher-end rental units that are generally expensive, often become second homes or AirB-and-B units, and are not desirable for anyone needing personal space, storage space, or vehicle parking.
3. The bill has the potential to destroy the livability of existing close-in neighborhoods, those that are already dense, where people already use public transportation, walk or bike (supporting Oregon’s climate goals) while leaving intact further-out, less climate-conscious neighborhoods.
 - A four-plex housing unit with no onsite parking will generate a need for 4 to 10 vehicle parking spaces. If there is space for one or two vehicles on the street in front of the unit, then where do the other 2 to 9 vehicles go? How many quadplexes can go on one block before there is no parking anywhere nearby? What sort of parking permit systems will be required to fix this mess? Who will want to live there?
 - By exempting (further out) neighborhoods governed by CC&Rs, this bill exacerbates and reinforces income inequality and pushes anyone who wants a livable neighborhood further out into the suburbs where those CC&R neighborhoods exist. It is deeply unfair, bad for the climate, and bad for the cohesiveness of communities.
 - Finally, there is nothing in the bill to stop proposed units from being horribly ugly, oversized, too tall, or generally incompatible with existing residential neighborhoods.
4. This bill is completely undemocratic.
 - It undermines cities’ abilities to determine how best to proceed with developing housing, and does not necessarily meet the needs of individual cities (Eugene, for

example, is in desperate need of true affordable housing (13,000 units below need), but only needs a slight bump in “middle housing” (1700 units below need).

- This process is happening WAY too fast, with far too few opportunities for impacted communities to provide feedback, participate in the conversation, or be engaged in productive conversations about how to simultaneously achieve multiple goals.
- It violates the Legislature’s own Statewide Goal 1 requirement for public involvement in local planning.

This is not Nimby-ism. It is a desire to build the housing each community *actually* needs - based on evidence - that will *actually* solve the problems we face - again, based on evidence - while utilizing smart planning that ensures livability and the appropriate parking, services and infrastructure to make such density successful.

PLEASE go back to work and develop a better, more inclusive path forward toward tackling Oregon’s housing affordability challenges. HB 2001 is NOT the answer.

Thank you for your attention and for your service.

Robert and Laura Illig,
Eugene, Oregon