

From: [Brooke Best](#)
To: [JWMTR Exhibits](#); [Sen Manning](#); [Rep Gomberg](#); [Sen Golden](#); [Sen Hansell](#); [Rep Evans](#); [Rep Leif](#); [Rep Post](#); [Rep Prusak](#)
Subject: I OPPOSE HB2001
Date: Wednesday, June 5, 2019 1:33:33 PM

My name is Brooke Best and I live at 2100 SE Larch Avenue, Portland, OR. I have submitted previous testimony regarding HB 2001 and submit the following comments expressing my opposition on what's proposed:

HB 2001 removes the right of local governments and communities to determine what zoning and development is appropriate in each local area. One bill, written by Portland-area legislators and developers, will silence the voice of every resident and every neighborhood everywhere in Oregon. This violates Oregon's [Planning Goal 1](#): "To develop a citizen involvement program that insures the opportunity for citizens to be involved in all phases of the planning process."

HB 2001 allows developers to build multiplex apartment buildings, up to quadplex, or dense developments of more than four houses per lot, with no off-street parking, *everywhere*.

The bill will lead to demolition of existing houses and neighborhoods to build multiplex apartments. Studies of this sort of "upzoning" in Portland and elsewhere show it [drives up housing prices](#), as lower-price housing is replaced with new luxury housing. Vulnerable communities are displaced as they are "priced out" by redevelopment.

The demolition of buildings amounts to a staggering amount of embodied energy that is thrown away. Every time we raze an older house and replace it with a new one – even an efficient new building – it takes [an average of 50 years to recover](#) the climate change impacts related to the demolition. That doesn't even include the trees cut down and the [toxic dust](#) from demolitions.

HB2001 will result in significant transportation impacts. Should quadplex apartments with no parking and other dense development be allowed in *some* areas? Of course, and local voters, communities, and their local elected representatives should decide where more density is desirable, based on a thoughtful planning process which takes into consideration traffic and transit, along with affordability, infrastructure, environmental consequences, and more. The legislature in Salem shouldn't dictate density for every neighborhood lot, street, block, city, town and county in Oregon.

If this isn't compelling enough, other possible negative outcomes of this well-intentioned proposition include:

- <!--[if !supportLists]-->• <!--[endif]-->More displacement of vulnerable communities by pricing out lower-income families
- <!--[if !supportLists]-->• <!--[endif]-->Encourages developers to outbid family home buyers
- <!--[if !supportLists]-->• <!--[endif]-->Overburdening of local services and infrastructure including schools, sewers, parking and roads
- <!--[if !supportLists]-->• <!--[endif]-->Does NOT mandate any affordability in the new infill redevelopment, and will NOT result in affordable housing because new construction is more expensive than the less expensive houses it will replace
- <!--[if !supportLists]-->• <!--[endif]-->Does NOT fund anti-displacement or affordable housing programs

SB 2001 is opposed by the League of Oregon Cities, many individual cities and towns, planning organizations, and the great majority of Oregonians whose neighborhoods will be rezoned.

This bill as proposed is a *bad* idea. I strongly urge you to look beyond the rhetoric and look at what this really will achieve for our cities.

Thank you for this opportunity to provide public comments.

Brooke Best

