



March 6, 2025

**Clackamas County Board of Commissioners  
Policy Position  
Relating to Land Use Zoning Statutes for Housing**

**Clackamas County opposes SB 49-1:** Though well intended, this bill will functionally reduce local authority in the development process and introduce new barriers to housing production. While we understand that refinements are being considered to the -1 amendments, successful legislation must:

- Preserve local authority to guide development. Clackamas County is urban, suburban, rural, and wild. Land use planning must remain flexible and adaptive to address the unique challenges and opportunities within these contexts. Minimum density requirements and zoning codes tailored to local conditions are important tools to balance the goal of increasing housing production and choice with what is feasible on a particular property.
- Contemplate housing-supportive infrastructure. As proposed, SB 49-1 would allow cities or counties to delay Goal 10 (housing), Goal 11 (public facilities and services), and Goal 12 (transportation) analysis when increasing density. This approach will not work in Clackamas County where the county sometimes acts as the sewer or transportation provider to some cities. Adding density where there is insufficient sewer capacity or failing intersections may produce life safety hazards and more expensive infrastructure requirements later.

Additionally, Clackamas County is very concerned by the frequency with which the state is modifying land use and community development requirements. It is very expensive for the county to repeatedly amend codes, particularly when new requirements override what was done in prior legislative sessions. Clackamas County recently completed code amendments to implement state requirements regarding middle housing, and it is important that the county has time to implement and evaluate the effectiveness of code changes in accelerating housing production before revising rules that were so recently adopted. Please allow time for previous adjustments to prove outcomes before making more changes.

**We urge a “NO” vote on SB 49-1.**

Please contact Trent Wilson ([twilson2@clackamas.us](mailto:twilson2@clackamas.us)) for more information.