Community Development
CODE ASSESSMENT
EVALUACIÓN DEL CÓDIGO DE
desarrollo comunitario

Washington County CDC Assessment
Summary - TAC Meeting #4
April 14, 2026

Meeting Attendees

- Cascadia Partners: Jamin Kimmell, Lydia Ness, Mary Phillips
- Washington County: Suzanne Savin, Theresa Cherniak, Anne Kelly, Casi Brown
- TAC Members
    - Homebuilders 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 - Glen Hamburg
    - Department of Land Conservation and Development - Laura Kelly
- Members of the public: None

Project Updates and Timeline

County staff provided a brief project update and reviewed the agenda. TAC #4 is the final TAC meeting for the CDC Assessment Project. The CDC Assessment Summary Report was completed in February and posted to the project webpage. The project has moved into the CDC Priorities Report phase, with upcoming Board and Planning Commission briefings in late April and May.

Community Open House Summary

County staff summarized feedback from the March open houses (in-person on March 17; online March 13–April 5). Participants were asked to select the two most important issues from five identified in the CDC Assessment. The top responses across both events were simplifying the CDC and neighborhood meeting requirements. Written comments also included support for higher density, housing affordability, and rural housing allowances, along with concerns about high-density development, data centers, transitional housing, and reduced parking.

TAC discussion:

Community Representative

- Asked whether open house respondents appeared to favor retaining neighborhood meeting requirements or eliminating them. Noted that respondents' selection of neighborhood meeting requirements as a top issue did not indicate their position on these requirements.
- Emphasized that neighborhood meetings are often the only mechanism for community members to learn about proposed development before formal public notices are issued, and

DRAFT

that the 500-foot notice radius is insufficient. Noted that the absence of neighborhood meeting requirements for middle housing has already generated community frustration.

Fair Housing Council of Oregon representative

- Cautioned against over-weighting open house input, as participants may largely be current residents with an interest in maintaining the status quo, which may conflict with goals of affirmatively furthering fair housing.

Metro representative

- Echoed concerns about the representativeness of open house participants. Noted that participants may not have fully understood the trade-offs of neighborhood meeting requirements (e.g., cost and time burdens), and questioned what participants thought was meant by "simplifying the CDC."

County Staff

- Confirmed that open house input is one of several sources being weighed alongside TAC input, focus groups, and Planning Commission and Board discussions. Any potential future changes to neighborhood meeting requirements will go through a full public planning process.

Draft Approach to CDC Priorities Report

Consultants presented the draft framework for the CDC Priorities Report, which organizes the CDC assessment's recommended changes into 13 amendment packages and establishes a prioritization and phasing approach. The report uses three criteria - urgency, impact, and feasibility - to inform the sequencing of work.

TAC Discussion:

Community Representative

- Questioned the value of retaining legacy housing types alongside state-mandated middle housing, citing added complexity, and recommended removing the duplication rather than managing two parallel systems.
- Recommended delaying land use district consolidation (proposed Package 9) until middle housing implementation has stabilized, and delaying any changes to neighborhood meeting requirements (proposed Package 11) until the ongoing CPO program restructuring is resolved.
- Flagged that many community plans have not been updated since the early 1980s and may not reliably support access-to-opportunity assessments. Also raised concern that Washington County's unique approval process (no design review board; planning commission does not approve land use applications) should be reflected in how proposed Package 5 is structured.

Washington County Staff

- Clarified that legacy housing forms have been permitted in higher-density districts since the 1970s-80s, in zones that do not allow single-family homes. Removing them could reduce the range of unit sizes available and limit the county's ability to require street and circulation improvements.

Consultant Representative

- Clarified that proposed Package 9 can reorganize how district information is presented in the code without consolidating districts on the zoning map. Agreed to note the connection between proposed Package 11 and the CPO restructuring.
- Noted that access-to-opportunity ratings currently use land use districts as a proxy and acknowledged that more detailed transit mapping could be incorporated. Agreed to update usability language to clearly reflect benefits for all CDC users, including community members.

Phasing Approach

Consultants presented three phasing scenarios as tools for discussion. All scenarios are subject to fixed constraints: statutory deadlines, external dependencies, and staff capacity. Scenario A prioritizes housing production, affordability, and access-to-opportunity packages. Scenario B weights all five impact areas equally. Scenario C prioritizes CDC usability and compliance packages first, with the rationale that a well-organized code makes all subsequent amendments easier to implement.

Metro Representative

- Supported Scenario A, citing the urgency of the housing need and suggesting that anything the county can do to facilitate housing production should be prioritized.

Washington County Current Planning Representative

- Strongly supported Scenario C, noting that the code's organizational and structural issues have been a longstanding problem. Argued that cleaning up the structure first would make all subsequent amendments more effective.

Developer Representative

- Noted that the preferred approach depends on the overall timeline. If the process spans many years, early structural work is reasonable; if shorter, housing impact packages should come first.

Washington County Engineering Representative

- Supported a balance of Scenarios B and C, leaning toward C.

Washington County Staff

- Confirmed that the Housing Facilitation Ordinance is already underway and will move forward independent of this phasing framework. Noted that funding for future implementation is being actively pursued.

Consultant Staff

- Noted that the final phasing approach will likely blend scenarios and include identifying low-effort, high-impact changes that can advance early alongside longer-term modernization work.

Public Comment

No members of the public were present at this meeting.

Next steps

- Board of Commissioners and Planning Commission consideration.

- CDC Priorities Report to be completed by end of May, incorporating feedback from the TAC, community, Planning Commission, Board, and staff.
- Beginning in July 2026, the county will begin work on top priority amendment packages and explore funding for ongoing implementation.
- TAC members will be notified when summary notes are posted and when the final Priorities Report is complete. Additional comments can be submitted by email.