

Submitter: Robin Lee
On Behalf Of: myself
Committee: Senate Committee On Natural Resources and
Wildfire
Measure, Appointment or Topic: SB78

I strongly oppose SD 78. Our state is too varied for a one-size-fits-all ultimatum. Local jurisdictions should make the decisions and regulations that most benefit their communities. A larger home may be needed for a family than has grown since the home was built/purchased. Or a family may wish to care for aging relatives. Or adopt children. Or perhaps add tiny homes for folks needing a hand-up in recovery from job-loss, drugs, illness, etc. The State is wrong to categorically decide against our choices. Keep private property PRIVATE!

If a "rebuild" is bigger, the appraisal will be adjusted, and the tax-base will grow. No harm in that, eh?

Maybe a property was so damaged after fire or storm or other loss that it was no longer suitable for original use(s). Maybe the enterprising owner envisioned recouping his losses by building a B&B. Or an entertainment venue like "The Britt" in my neighboring city of Jacksonville, thereby drawing visitors and economic growth for the area as well as the family. More jobs ensue. More taxes paid. Again, What's the harm? If the Planning Commission approves, the State can 'butt-out'.

There were more submissions in support of this abuse than I expected. Out of curiosity, I read almost all of them. Surprisingly, most cited "wealthy landowners and speculators are abusing this lack of review criteria to tear down modest homes and build large, expensive country estates" and "every year, Oregon loses nearly 300 tracts of agricultural and forest land to high end residential development in the form of replacement dwellings." None of these submissions documented the source of that statistic. Are we supposed to believe Planning Commissions are that derelict?

I urge this committee to VOTE NO on SB 78 and focus on issues that really belong to state-wide overview. Rebuilding after disaster is a local purview. Thank you.