



February 26, 2026

Senate Committee On Housing and Development
900 Court St., NE
Salem, Oregon 97301

Chair Pham, Vice Chair Anderson and Members of the Committee:

As Mayor of the City of Tigard, I respectfully submit the following testimony on HB 4037. This testimony supersedes my testimony of February 10, 2026.

Tigard has long been a housing leader in Oregon. We were the first city in the state to legalize middle housing in all zones, the first to adopt an Affordable Housing Plan as a precursor to the required Housing Production Strategy, and we have produced more Metro Affordable Bond-supported units per capita than any other city in Washington County. We are also moving forward with plans to urbanize a 500-acre UGB addition at a target density of 18 units per acre, with an emphasis on middle housing.

Tigard is not opposed to housing reform. We stand ready to partner with the Legislature to continue addressing Oregon's housing shortage. At the same time, we ask for partnership and flexibility for cities that are already meeting production goals, rather than additional preemptions that may limit local tools without meaningfully improving affordability or access. Cities like ours are being penalized for the actions of others who do not share our commitment to housing production.

For these reasons, we oppose HB 4037 with the current Section 17. If this section were removed or substantially amended as shared below, our position would be support.

Section 17

Noticing requirements

Tigard generally supports reducing or eliminating noticing requirements for simple housing applications where clear and objective requirements mean the public has no meaningful opportunity to comment. However, we oppose reduced notice for large subdivisions and planned developments for neighborhoods. These are applications that involve significant public investment and should allow for public comment. **A more targeted approach would be to reduce noticing requirements for simple applications like partitions, property line adjustments, and development and design review for housing. Noticing should be preserved for subdivisions and planned developments.**

Public hearings

We also oppose the language in (5) that removes the ability for a city to require a public hearing related to a planned development. The planned development process is fundamentally a Comprehensive Planning process. We recognize that some cities use

the Planned Development process to complicate individual developments. In Tigard, planned developments are used for large greenfield developments that involve infrastructure and parks. These are initiated at the developer's discretion and may allow development that would otherwise not be permitted under locally adopted codes, public review and engagement are essential. Such significant deviations from publicly adopted local Comprehensive Plans and codes should not occur without public comment. **A more targeted approach would be to prohibit public hearings for housing developments on a single lot.**

Appeals

Likewise, we cannot support the language in (6) that removes the ability to appeal these types of decisions. The requirements that an unsuccessful appellant pay the respondent's attorney fees, adopted in previous sessions, already serves as a meaningful deterrent to frivolous appeals. Eliminating all appeal rights would raise concerns related to Goal 1 and due process protections. **We request removal of Section (6).**

Thank you for your consideration and for your continued partnership with cities working to increase housing supply while preserving the thoughtful planning principles that have long defined Oregon communities. We welcome continued dialogue on how we can move this work forward together.

Sincerely,



Yi-Kang Hu, Mayor
City of Tigard