

Submitter: Ted Coopman

On Behalf Of:

Committee: House Committee On Housing and Homelessness

Measure, Appointment or Topic: HB2138

Oregon has over 138 National Register Historic Districts and thousands of designated homes across our state. So this section of the bill, if retained, would greatly impact these historic places, potentially leading to unrestricted demolition. This new rule would eliminate the minimal protection of a process that is designed to review and balance the needs of local communities and their historic homes and places.

Demolition review does NOT equal automatic demolition denial. It is a weighing of the public benefit of retention vs replacement.

Demolition review is the only protection we offer in Oregon - to remove it will nullify Oregon's Land Use Goal 5 for historic resources.

Removing demolition review denies the public a voice (counter to Land Use Goal 1). The community or stakeholder group should have an opportunity to weigh in on places that matter to them and reflect their heritage. Should the developer be the only voice?

Demolition is forever and more demolition works against our climate goals

The demolition review process has been shown to balance the public benefit and often has helped create more housing, not hindering it.

As written, Section 22(1)(f) has no requirement that middle housing or affordable housing replace the demolished historic structure. It has NO connection to the bill's goal.

Historic designation requires rigorous research and vetting to prove cultural significance. They should not be erased without careful consideration.

No protection + no restoration & reuse incentives = Oregon dead last in the U.S. for stewardship of its heritage places

How can we move the needle for increased housing in heritage areas? Create a better inclusive "both-and" strategy that would add more units within designated historic areas through an incentive package for adapting existing residential, add ADUs, add triplexes on non-contributing properties, etc.

The state should not impose its will on land use for Oregon cities. This one size-fits-

no-one approach is anti-democratic and disenfranchises residents, especially low income and marginalized communities, from providing input by taking debates out of cities and transporting it hundreds of miles away. This empowers special interests, the wealthy, and powerful corporations at the expense of regular Oregonians. Offer incentives and help, not unpopular draconian mandates.