

For the following reasons, I strongly oppose HB 2001:

**Local control:**

Increased density can be achieved, but a 'one model fits all' approach is irresponsible and inappropriate.

Characteristics of cities, and neighborhoods within each city, differ.

*Local governments should retain authority and responsibility to plan for population growth in a manner that preserves livability and optimizes access to services.*

**Decimates responsible planning in the State of Oregon:**

This bill clearly violates Statewide Goal 1: requirement for public involvement (in local planning), as well as undermining Statewide Goal 2 requiring comprehensive and coordinated planning.

No wonder the development community is promoting it.

**"Middle Housing" red herring:**

There is no guarantee that middle housing will be more affordable: I believe the conflation of the two ideas

to be a development industry strategy to increase profit potential and erode planning constraints upon its activities.

The first property conversions will likely be in areas which already house lower income residents

(because property prices are generally lower). This will result in a **net loss of affordable housing**,

as market demand will drive prices, and new, market rate units are generally not within reach of those displaced.

**Untested solution:**

This 'no zoning' approach to the problem is a new one, and a bit of an urban planning fad.

Better to await evidence from cities which have adopted it before jumping on the wagon; especially statewide!!

Will it, in fact, solve the affordable housing problem?

What are the unintended consequences of such a drastic measure?

Can these consequences, once understood, be avoided by carefully crafted policies?

An alternative: Incremental, **planned** approach to densification:

Grow density in ways that are compatible with access to transportation and other public and commercial services.

For example, begin with transit corridors and commercial/service clusters; this also concentrates/localizes

the public infrastructure investments (sewer, water, roads, public transit, bike and pedestrian improvements)

necessary to support increased density. Such an approach should also remain under local control.

Plan out from there, as the need develops.

But please, ***as you value the livability and affordability of Oregon cities, do not advance HB 2001!!***

Pamela Miller

1959 Harris Street

Eugene Oregon