Community Development
CODE ASSESSMENT
EVALUACIÓN DEL CÓDIGO DE
desarrollo comunitario

Washington County CDC Assessment
Summary - Meeting #3
January 21, 2026

Meeting Attendees

Project Staff:
Cascadia Partners: Jamin Kimmell, Rachel Cotton, Lydia Ness
Washington County: Suzanne Savin, Theresa Cherniak, Anne Kelly, Casi Brown

TAC Members:
Home Builders Association – Matt Wellner
Fair Housing Council of Oregon – John Miller
Clean Water Services – Elle Worrlein
Washington County Current Planning – Anne Elvers
Washington County Engineering – Stacy Shetler
Community representative – Mary Manseau
City of Beaverton Current Planning – Jana Fox
Metro representative - Glen Hamburg

Members of the public:
Nancy Fletcher
Ayla Hofler

Project Updates and Timeline
County staff and the consultant team provided a brief project update and reviewed the purpose of the meeting. The focus of TAC #3 was to share draft findings from the CDC assessment, with an emphasis on barriers to housing production, access, and opportunity, and to gather TAC input on key issues, potential priorities, and upcoming community engagement.

Barriers to Housing Production, Access and Opportunity
Consultants presented a summary of barriers identified through the CDC assessment, including regulatory constraints on housing supply, code complexity, infrastructure alignment, and affordability incentives. The discussion focused on how zoning, density standards, and process requirements may affect housing production, access, and opportunity outcomes.

TAC discussion:

Metro representative

- Expressed strong support for the assessment recommendations and highlighted interest in increasing maximum density.
- Noted Metro Title 1 requirements linking minimum density to 80% of maximum density and questioned implications on minimum densities that might be tied to increasing maximums.

DRAFT

Community representative

- Raised concerns about retaining legacy attached housing types that are similar to Middle Housing types, suggesting their removal could reduce complexity.
- Emphasized that density increases should be thoughtfully located and aligned with existing services, transit, and infrastructure.
- Described recent missed opportunities for residential development in mixed-use zones.

Washington County staff

- Noted that certain legacy attached housing types are allowed in land use districts that don't allow Middle Housing and if those legacy housing types were treated as Middle Housing, the County would have to forgo pedestrian and vehicular connectivity standards for them.
- Noted ongoing efforts to increase flexibility in mixed-use zones and streamline legacy housing provisions.
- Noted the community representative's written comments had raised a good point about maintenance for Middle Housing common areas.

Homebuilders Association representative

- Praised the assessment for identifying both known and previously unrecognized barriers.
- Observed that targeted code fixes could address many single-family barriers, while changes to multifamily development standards may have greater short-term impacts.

Fair Housing Council representative

- Identified increasing density as a key priority.
- Suggested alternatives to current affordability incentives, such as increased Floor Area Ratio (FAR) while maintaining affordability at 80% AMI.
- Framed challenges regarding affordable vs. market rents as a supply-and-demand issue.

Beaverton Current Planning representative

- Shared an example of consolidating residential zones to reduce complexity and improve implementation.

Fair Housing Council representative (follow-up)

- Cautioned that restricting where middle housing is allowed could raise fair housing concerns.

Detailed Findings

Consultants reviewed Appendix A, which provides a comprehensive inventory of issues identified in the CDC by Cascadia Partners, County staff, and stakeholder engagement. The Findings & Recommendations column of Appendix A explains each issue in detail and, where feasible, identifies a recommended course of action. These findings informed the policy direction for the CDC amendment recommendations included in the CDC Assessment Report. The discussion on this appendix focused on where simplification, consolidation, or clarification could reduce barriers while maintaining policy intent.

TAC Discussion:

Community representative

- Expressed concern about proposed changes to neighborhood meeting requirements for Type II applications and supported more detailed discussion of this topic in the main body of the CDC Assessment Summary Report.
- Questioned characterization of community plans as "inaccessible" and was interested in hearing more about how they could be made clear and objective.
- Supported eliminating legacy attached housing types that are similar to Middle Housing types and consolidating Middle Housing standards into a single section.
- Suggested delaying FAR changes until the impacts of recent middle housing reforms are better understood.
- Raised concerns about inconsistent review requirements for single-family development in areas containing natural resources and wetlands.
- Highlighted unclear frontage improvement requirements and expressed concerns about sidewalk gaps.
- Raised concerns about long-term affordability considerations for middle housing developments that contain private streets.

Metro representative

- Encouraged clearer explanations of how proposed code changes align with original policy intent.
- Questioned whether certain requirements (e.g., bike parking) remain necessary or unintentionally constrain development.

Cascadia Partners staff

- Agreed on the importance of aligning regulatory changes with policy goals.

March Open House

Consultants and County staff previewed plans for a March community open house, intended to share key findings from the CDC assessment and gather public input. Discussion focused on what information should be highlighted, how to frame proposed changes, and how to structure the engagement to set clear expectations for participants.

- Key priorities to highlight:
    - Community representative
        - Noted that community members are likely to come with many unresolved questions.
        - Community priorities would include any proposed changes to neighborhood meeting requirements and Type II application requirements, clarity on Middle Housing allowances, and any proposed changes to community plans.
    - Fair Housing Council representative
        - Anticipated concerns related to property impacts and values.
        - Emphasized the need to clarify which proposed changes are state-mandated.

    - Homebuilder Association representative
        - Stressed the importance of clearly distinguishing between requirements and recommendations.
        - Cautioned against overstating potential outcomes where implementation is uncertain.
    - Metro representative
        - Recommended clearly communicating whether feedback sought is for new ideas, and/or reactions to proposals from County staff and consultants.

- Prioritization Criteria
    - Emphasis on adopting clear and objective standards to reduce compliance risk and future conflicts, recognizing that prolonged noncompliance increases risk for both the County and developers.
    - Housing affordability was identified as a top priority, encompassing production, cost reduction, timelines, and access.
    - If CDC streamlining and usability necessitates a lower priority due to limited staff resources, perhaps less formal "cheat sheets" could be developed as interim tools to summarize CDC requirements and improve usability until more comprehensive changes can be adopted.

- Open House Format
    - Support for offering both online and in-person engagement options.
    - Food and childcare were identified as important components for in-person events.
    - Clear framing of the purpose and expectations of the open house was emphasized.

Public Comment

- A community member raised questions about how sufficient vehicle parking, emergency preparedness and emergency vehicle access for services such as fire and police would be addressed in areas planned for higher densities.

Next steps

- Planning Commission work session briefing is scheduled for February 18.
- March open house date will be finalized and shared with the TAC.
- The draft CDC Assessment Summary Report will be shared with stakeholders interviewed at the start of the project.
- TAC meeting #4 is planned for April to review open house feedback, revisions to materials, and the next phase focused on prioritizing proposed CDC updates.