

Submitter: Matilda Novak

On Behalf Of:

Committee: House Committee On Housing and Homelessness

Measure, Appointment or Topic: HB2138

I am opposed to this expansion of HB2138 for a number of reasons:

- Middle Housing should only be allowed on existing lots or those created by new partitioning of land prior to June 30, 2021, the date that the Cities were responsible for having services available to support Middle Housing. This will help to minimize "greenfilling", which was not a goal of the Middle Housing rules, but rather an unforeseen consequence. By the Governor's own admission, we've vastly increased the amount of Middle Housing available -- and with Oregon's population Decreasing, this push for more makes no sense. Livability has been adversely impacted commensurate with this rush to create more Middle Housing while entirely bypassing time-honored and sensible rules for development.

- Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) prohibition should apply only to a single middle housing development on sites within areas of existing residential housing served by urban services on lots or partitions which were created prior to June 30, 2021. Any Middle Housing development that occurs on new lots or new partitions should be subject to TIA. I live in a part of Albany that has been tremendously negatively impacted by over-development. The lack of TIA has led to serious safety issues, which remain unaddressed in the face an inexplicable push for increased density.

- People who live in a neighborhood deserve to be informed of imminent changes in their adjacent area. I oppose the language in HB 2138 with amendments to SECTION 20. ORS 197.365 that states, in part, (the City) shall provide notice of the decision to the applicant but may not require that notice be given to any other person. I support SB 737 as submitted by Senator Sara Gelsler- Blouin, which expands the radius for giving neighbors notices of proposed middle housing land division. Prior to the push for Middle Housing, Notice was routinely given at 300 feet, but very few of my neighbors on Gibson Hill were notified of changes regarding "Riverwood Crossing". Even though I was serving on our City Council at that time, I was completely caught off guard by the realities of how Middle Housing played out, vs. what we were sold.

- To ensure dense developments (i.e., more than 10- plexes, townhouses or cottages in a single development) that are not located in walkable communities have adequate infrastructure, there must be an active bus service or mass transit stop

within ¼ mile of the development. If there is no active public transportation system in the area, such infrastructure must be implemented before the units are sold. System development fees should be used to address this lack of mass transit infrastructure. This is purely common sense. Using Riverwood Crossing as an example once again, there will be 80 townhomes in an area that is Not walkable, and where we have zero active public transit. Like many who live in Albany, I am Not opposed to Middle Housing outright -- but it ought to be sensibly implemented, with consideration for public safety and livability. "Growth" must "pay for itself" and not be an additional burden on the people. Thank you.