

Submitter: Denice Searcy
On Behalf Of: Precursor to 15 Minute Cities
Committee: House Committee On Housing and Homelessness
Measure, Appointment or Topic: SB49
NO on SB 49-A

This is a “gut and stuff” bill, in that a city with a population of 10,000 or more must remove minimum densities for all developed residential lands, except that a city may enforce a density to prevent the reduction of existing housing units.

This bill sets the basis for 15-minute cities. Portland is a 15-minute city project, and while that MAY work for Portland, it DOES NOT work for the rest of Oregon, especially in the rural areas. Other bills are pushing rural areas into denser core cities as the UN One World Order is pushing for population control. We here have a different identity as the “Pioneer State” founded for farmers and generational families.

The -1 amendment to SB 49 will make it harder to build and maintain housing in Oregon. The 10-unit cap is too restrictive, the 99-year affordability requirement is excessive, and the proposed tax abatement falls short. Without meaningful cost reductions and stronger incentives, this bill will limit housing supply at a time when we urgently need more. Stripping cities of their ability to make density-related decisions will not speed up housing production; it will instead lead to inefficient development, infrastructure strain, and unintended economic consequences.

SB 49 would have a disruptive impact on land use planning, housing development, and LOCAL decision-making across Oregon. In spite of the intention to increase housing supply, this bill takes a one-size-fits-all approach that undermines decades of thoughtful planning at the local level. Also, SB 49’s sweeping preemptions on local land use authority ignore the realities cities face in providing essential infrastructure, such as roads, water, and wastewater services. Housing development cannot happen in isolation—it requires coordinated planning to ensure communities remain livable and functional.

Protect Oregon citizens and vote NO on SB 49-A.