

December 18, 2017

Planning Commission City of Amity

## **Re:** File Number 1710-01: Change Parcel R5420CD 00201 back to previous zone classification of General Commercial

Dear Commissioners:

This letter is submitted jointly by Housing Land Advocates (HLA) and the Fair Housing Council of Oregon (FHCO). Both HLA and FHCO are non-profit organizations that advocate for land use policies and practices that ensure an adequate and appropriate supply of affordable housing for all Oregonians. FHCO's interests relate to a jurisdiction's obligation to affirmatively further fair housing. Please include these comments in the record for the above-referenced proposed Development Plan.

We understand that this action involves a comprehensive plan map designation change from residential to commercial, zone change from R-3 to general commercial, and site design review for a 7,489 square foot retail building (Dollar Store) with landscaping and parking; and a minor variance to allow 23 parking spaces when 27 are required. As you may know, all amendments to the Municipal Code regarding land use must comply with the Statewide Planning Goals. ORS 197.175(2)(a). However, our concern is over the adequacy of Goal 10 findings in the staff report for the proposed amendment.

When a decision is made affecting the residential land supply, the City must refer to its Housing Needs Analysis and Buildable Land Inventory (BLI) to show that an adequate number of needed housing units (both housing type and affordability level) will be supported by the residential land supply after enactment of the proposed change.

The City's actions to increase housing supply are commendable. However, even when a proposal increases the residential land supply, the City must show that it is adding needed residential



zones. The City must demonstrate that its actions do not leave it with less than adequate residential land supplies in the types, locations, and affordability ranges affected. *See Mulford v. Town of Lakeview*, 36 Or LUBA 715, 731 (1999) (rezoning residential land for industrial uses); *Gresham v. Fairview*, 3 Or LUBA 219 (same); see also, *Home Builders Assn. of Lane County v. City of Eugene*, 41 Or LUBA 370, 422 (2002) (subjecting Goal 10 inventories to tree and waterway protection zones of indefinite quantities and locations). Only with a complete analysis showing any gain in needed housing as compared to the BLI can housing advocates and planners understand whether the City is achieving its goals through code amendments.

HLA and FHCO support the end result of the proposed amendment, but recommend the Commission defer adoption of the proposed amendment until Goal 10 findings can be made. Thank you for your consideration. Please provide written notice of your decision to, FHCO, c/o Louise Dix, at 1221 SW Yamhill Street, #305, Portland, OR 97205 and HLA, c/o Jennifer Bragar, at 121 SW Morrison Street, Suite 1850, Portland, OR 97204. Please feel free to email Louise Dix at ldix@fhco.org or reach her by phone at (541) 951-0667.

Thank you for your consideration.

Jouise Dije

Louise Dix AFFH Specialist Fair Housing Council of Oregon

Mary Kyle Mcandy

Mary Kyle McCurdy Board Member Housing Land Advocates

cc: Gordon Howard (gordon.howard@state.or.us)