



Housing Beaverton Project: Public Engagement Summary

Public Engagement Purpose

The public had an opportunity to provide ideas and feedback at every stage of the project. Public engagement is split into three phases, each with a different engagement goal:

- **Phase 1 (June-October 2022):** Introduce the project and seek feedback on housing needs in Beaverton; used to inform the development of housing strategies (collaborate/involve)
- **Phase 2 (January – May 2023):** Share draft housing strategies with stakeholders and get feedback on the preferred approach(es) and make modifications; used to inform prioritization (involve/consult)
- **Adoption and Post-Adoption (Summer-Fall 2023):** Make modifications as needed, share, and adopt housing strategies. After, communicate results with stakeholders, especially those interested in implementation or other city efforts (inform)

Background and Approach

The Housing Beaverton Project is designed to identify people's housing needs and determine what actions the city can take to promote the creation of housing that meets community members' needs. The project includes a Housing Needs Analysis to understand current and future housing needs in Beaverton over the next 20 years. In addition, a Housing Production Strategy identifies priority city actions and specific tools (policies, programs, development rules, financial incentives, etc.) that the city will implement to help make that housing happen.

What We Have Already Heard from the Community

The Housing Beaverton Project is guided by existing community and city policy direction and builds on previous city engagement efforts. The community has long identified the need for housing, as described in the following community-led and Council-adopted documents:

- [Past Engagement Plan](#)
- [Beaverton's Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Plan](#)
 - Priority Area 3: Housing and Livability
- [Beaverton Community Vision Plan](#),
 - Enhance Livability
- [Beaverton Housing Five-Year Action Plan](#)
 - Goals under Affordable Homes and Housing Supply Areas of Focus

Building on the community's longtime support for housing in Beaverton, staff has tailored the Phase 1 engagement approach to ask the community what housing needs exist in Beaverton and other factors that should be taken into consideration.

Summary of Engagement Activities for Phase 1

Phase 1: June-October 2022

The first phase of engagement focused on learning and understanding housing needs, prioritizing underserved communities such as low-income households, people of color, seniors, and people with disabilities. Given the ongoing popularity of hybrid meetings, staff used a variety of engagement methods that included in-person interaction and virtual engagement opportunities.

Interviews with Community Members

City staff conducted interviews with community members (e.g., youth, seniors, people with disabilities, and veterans) to understand their housing needs. To connect with these specific populations, staff received support from community partners to conduct outreach. The list includes:

- Boys and Girls Aid
- HomePlate Youth Services
- Second Home
- Salvation Army
- Housing Supportive Services Network (HSSN)
- Boards and Commissions
- Unite Oregon

Meetings with City Advisory Boards, Committees, and Groups

Staff attended group meetings, held via Zoom video conference, to introduce the project and collect feedback on the project engagement strategy, equity considerations, and housing needs in Beaverton. Groups included:

- Beaverton Committee for Community Involvement (BCCI)
- Housing Technical Advisory Group (HTAG)
- Beaverton Committee on Aging (BCOA)
- Urban Renewal Advisory Committee (URAC)

Meetings with Other Priority Groups

Outside of city advisory boards, groups, and committees, staff also discussed the project with the following city partners and community members:

- **Unite Oregon:** Unite Oregon is a community organization led by people of color, immigrants and refugees, rural communities, and people experiencing poverty to build an intercultural movement for justice in Oregon. The city has a contract with Unite Oregon to conduct multicultural engagement. City staff meets weekly with Unite Oregon staff to discuss local housing issues and potential topics to bring to the Inclusive Housing Cohort or share with others in the broader community.
- **Multicultural Engagement** With the support of community partners and organizations, further engagement was completed to include community members consisting of people of color, immigrants, refugees, English language learners, non-

binary people, renters, low-income persons, people with disabilities, and people who have experienced homelessness. A community event was held on October 19, 2022, and used Poll Everywhere, an online engagement tool, to get feedback in real-time, to supplement the discussion. Live interpretation in Spanish and translated presentation materials was provided.

- **Community Events:** To engage with a broader community, during the housing needs phase of this project, the project team participated in the following outreach events:
 - City of Beaverton library tabling
 - Beaverton Night Market
 - Tualatin Hills Parks and Recreation District: Concert in the Park at Cedar Hills Park
 - Tualatin Hills Parks and Recreation District: Tianquiztli Anahuaca Cultural Market at Schiffler Park
 - Central Beaverton business and community partner flyering

Other Engagement Methods

In addition to group meetings and one-on-one interviews, staff used other methods to engage members of the community, such as:

- Project website
- Notify Me and emails to various stakeholder groups and organizations
- Your City article
- Neighborhood Association Committee (NAC) newsletter
- Cultural Inclusion Newsletter
- Community Survey

What We Heard During Phase 1

This includes feedback from conversations with BCCI, BCOA, HTAG, the Inclusive Housing Cohort, and other community members through interviews and focus groups.

Youth Focus Group

Neighborhood Needs

- Accessible transit (bus route to train)
- Transit centers (bathrooms need to be cleaned, charging stations on the train, bus stops (to stay dry) and have lights
- More sidewalks
- Need for more supportive housing (wraparound), consider mandatory reporting as a need when considering cases of abuse and neglect

Interior and Exterior Needs

- Home must allow pets (emotional support animal, companion)
- Natural light
- Outdoor area
- Privacy
- Indoor relaxation area

- Bedroom and kitchen
- Washer and dryer available

People with Disabilities

- People with disabilities are not a monolith; housing needs and accommodations will depend on what kind of disability someone has
- Housing should be flexible/customizable e.g., pocket doors, accessible laundry, open floor plans
- Housing should be accommodated/retrofitted that accommodates the most people possible e.g., lever handles rather than turning knobs, wide hallways, accessible showers, no landings
- Parking close to the dwelling is important
- Consider climate change for all homes e.g., heat pumps and/or air conditioners
- Requesting reasonable accommodations can be a burdensome process e.g., long delays in requests, yearly renewals of requests
- Financial assistance is needed to retrofit homes for accessibility
- Affordability is a huge constraint
 - To find a home that meets their needs is to purchase one and renovate it to accommodate accessibility
 - Accessible units are difficult to find
 - Renters are also often faced with large losses to security deposits e.g., scuffs and dings on walls, cabinets, and appliances

Veterans and Seniors

Challenges

- Rent controls needed to anticipate increases in bills and cap increase amount
- Rentals are not affordable
- Changes in landlords or ownership cause disruptions to living situations due to raising rents or selling buildings
- Live somewhere without fear of changes in price or eviction

Characteristics of Needed Housing

- Housing with free parking
- Safety and security
- Proximity to medical care (VA), shopping, and services
- Interior needed characteristics included a washer/dryer (free or low-cost), an elevator, and space for families.
- Ground-floor ADA-compliant units for low-income people and families.

Other

- VASH (Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing) assistance is inadequate and there are challenges in finding landlords who will accept VASH vouchers.
- Developers should be required to build a certain percentage of units for low-income people.

Survey Respondents

Location Needs

- Walkable
- Close to transit
- Close to work, grocery, schools, shopping, and green spaces/parks
- Safe neighborhood
- Bike infrastructure

Interior Needs

- Space e.g., for larger families, storage, open floor plan, more than one bathroom
- Single-level homes
- ADA accessible e.g., open spaces for navigating mobility devices and equipment, ground floor, grab bars, lower cabinets, turn-around space
- AC and in-unit washer and dryer
- Natural light/windows

Exterior Needs

- Outdoor space and access to parks/green spaces
- Safety
- Quiet
- Privacy e.g., separation from neighbors
- Off-street parking
- Accessibility
 - Paved walkways
 - Flat sidewalks
 - Bikeable
 - Walkable
 - Shaded areas
- Long lasting
 - Concrete shake-proof
 - Good condition
 - Materials/finishes

Challenges

- Affordability
 - Cost of living/high rent
 - Price of homes
 - High down payment
 - HOA (Homeowner Association) fees/restrictions
 - APR (Annual Percentage Rate) for housing loans is high
- Accessibility
 - ADA ground floor units
 - Handicap parking spaces
 - Older homes need to be ADA
- Landlords

- Hard to get a hold of
- Not following up on applications
- Fail to provide adequate notification of unit availability
- Screening process and full waitlist
- Adequate outdoor space
- Unaffordable larger homes

Further Takeaways

- Incentivize affordable housing development
- Village and town square-type atmosphere
- Multigenerational and mixed-age housing
- Homeownership education and assistance
- Affordability for single parents

Staff plans to use this early feedback to develop housing strategies to address the needs and challenges mentioned. Staff will then share and seek feedback on housing strategies with community members and other stakeholders during the Phase 2 Engagement period.

Questions Asked During Phase 1 Engagement

Questions varied depending on the audience and their experience with housing. Below is a general list of questions we asked during this project's first phase.

Accessibility

1. What are the challenges to finding accessible units?
2. What are your non-negotiable exterior and interior needs?
3. What has been your experience visiting other people's homes?
4. What programs/facilities/services support you or others with disabilities?

Location

1. What are the most important things that should be in your neighborhood to meet your needs?
2. For a home to meet your needs, what is the most important thing(s) about where it is located?

Needs

1. Does your current living situation meet your housing needs? If so, why, or why not?
2. What is the most important interior characteristic(s) about a home that would meet your needs?
3. What is the most important exterior characteristic(s) about a home that would meet your needs?

Challenges/Other

1. What other barriers or challenges do you have, or have you faced that prevent or hinder meeting your housing needs?
2. Is there more information you would like to provide to help us better understand your housing needs?

Summary of Engagement Activities for Phase 2

Phase 2: January-May 2023

The second phase of engagement focused on drafting housing strategies to address the housing needs shared from the community during Phase 1 and receive input and feedback on the strategies shared. Due to the increasing popularity of virtual/hybrid meetings, staff focused on engagement methods that included both in-person interaction as well as virtual engagement opportunities to provide options for people who prefer to participate remotely.

Meetings with City Advisory Committees and Groups

Staff attended group meetings, held via Zoom video conference, to give an update about the project and gather feedback on the potential housing strategies to meet people's housing needs in Beaverton. Groups included:

- Beaverton Committee for Community Involvement (BCCI)
- Housing Technical Advisory Group (HTAG)
- Beaverton Committee on Aging (BCOA)
- Urban Renewal Advisory Committee (URAC)

Meetings with Other Priority Groups

Outside of city advisory boards, groups, and committees, staff also discussed the project with the following city partners and community members:

- **Unite Oregon:** Unite Oregon is a community organization led by people of color, immigrants and refugees, rural communities, and people experiencing poverty to build an intercultural movement for justice in Oregon. The city has a contract with Unite Oregon to conduct multicultural engagement. City staff meets weekly with Unite Oregon staff to discuss local housing issues and potential topics to bring to the Inclusive Housing Cohort or share with others in the broader community.
- **Multicultural Engagement:** With the support of community partners and organizations, further engagement was completed to include community members consisting of people of color, immigrants, refugees, English language learners, non-binary people, renters, low-income persons, people with disabilities, and people who have experienced homelessness. An Inclusive Housing Cohort meeting was held on January 11, 2023, and used Jam Board, an online engagement tool, to get feedback in real-time, to supplement the discussion. Live interpretation in Spanish and translated presentation materials were provided. In addition, the team connected with all previous community members (e.g., survey and stakeholder interview participants, youth and veteran community partners) who were engaged during phase 1 of the project, to have an opportunity to provide input.
- **Stakeholder Interviews:** To engage with a broader community, during the housing strategies phase of this project, the project team, including both city staff and consultants, connected with housing producers and developers, which include:
 - Rachael Duke, CPAH – Affordable housing provider
 - Dan Grimberg, West Hills Development – Market-rate housing developer

- Roy Kim, Central Bethany Development – Market-rate multi-dwelling housing and commercial developer
- Todd Kimball – Realtor and disability advocate
- Mike Mitchoff, Portland Houseworks – Middle housing developer
- Brendan Sanchez, Access Architecture – Designer of multi-dwelling and other types of housing (including affordable housing)
- Erica Calderon, Bienestar- Non-profit housing provider
- Roy Kim, Central Bethany Development- Real estate development
- Preston Korst, Home Building Association of Greater Portland

Other Engagement Methods

In addition to group meetings and interviews with stakeholders, staff used other methods to engage members of the community, such as:

- Project website with a comment box allowing people to submit feedback
- Notify Me and emails to various stakeholder groups and organizations
- Your City article
- Neighborhood Association Committee (NAC) newsletter
- Cultural Inclusion Newsletter
- Housing Supportive Services Network newsletter

What We Heard During Phase 2

This includes feedback from community members and groups such as the Housing Technical Advisory Group, the Beaverton Committee for Community Involvement, and the Inclusive Housing Cohort. The consultant team also engaged with developers and housing producers to get their thoughts on the strategies. Below are major takeaways:

Key housing priorities from community groups and the general public:

- Micro-shelters/sleeping pods
- Renter protections/rent control
- More education around housing
- Homes for large or multigenerational households
- More homeownership opportunities
- Preserving existing low-cost housing, such as manufactured dwelling parks
- Accessible/senior housing
- Partnering with builders, especially in the non-profit sector
- More housing concentrated near transit and services

Developers and housing producers

- Developers are in favor of increasing development flexibility and capacity in multi-dwelling and mixed-use districts, which can make multi-dwelling development more feasible to build.
- Single Room Occupancy (SRO) housing is seen as a good option for permanent supportive housing, but SROs and micro-housing can be controversial if they're market-rate.

- Permit-ready plan sets for Middle Housing types (including single-family dwelling units) can help deliver more housing by dramatically cutting down on costs.
- Accessible design incentives or mandates: Accessible features in units can add significant costs and reduce the number of units that could be provided. A requirement to add elevators could be a project killer, both for affordable and market-rate development, but incentives could work to encourage accessible housing.
- Incentives (such as density and floor area ratio (FAR) bonuses) could also work to encourage developers to build more family units with multiple bedrooms and can make affordable housing and mixed-income projects more feasible.
- Onerous bike parking requirements can be a challenge for middle housing infill development.
- Expedite or streamline permitting: Anything the City can do to speed up the permitting process will benefit developers and lead to more housing production.
- Construction Excise Tax (CET) may deter some developers, but per affordable housing providers, any and all funding sources should be considered.
- Middle housing and multi-dwelling developers advocate for the Multiple Unit Property Tax Exemption (MUPTTE) program and think it could be very effective in spurring development (including single unit housing).
- Consider an interim rule for public right of way requirements for Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs).
- System Development Charge (SDC) deferral option that defers payment of SDCs until timing of impact, sale of unit, etc. to help builders save on carrying costs which could help affordability for buyers/renters.
- Think of more creative ways to fund infrastructure beyond SDCs, including reimbursement districts, urban renewal, grants, general budget etc.

Staff plans to use this feedback to finalize housing strategies to then share with the City Council for prioritization and implementation.

Questions Asked During Phase 2 Engagement

Questions varied depending on the audience and their experience with housing. Below is a general list of questions we asked during this project's first phase.

Community Members:

Which housing strategies are the most important/highest priority in Beaverton?

- a) Preserve existing low-cost housing
- b) Homeownership
- c) Affordable rental housing
- d) Home for big families
- e) Accessible housing
- f) Micro-shelters/pods
- g) Housing near transit/services

Other Stakeholders:

- What types of projects or programs does your organization offer to address housing needs in Beaverton? If you are developing or providing housing, what type of housing do you focus on and who are the intended residents?
- What tools or strategies do you think would be effective in creating more desired housing in Beaverton? Which of these tools or strategies, if any, has the city used previously to support your projects in Beaverton? [Some overlap with Q3 below; will ask in whatever sequence makes sense.]
- Which tools or strategies are a poor fit for this community?
- How could the city strengthen their relationships with your organization and best assist you in the housing related work you are doing?

Questions for Affordable Housing Developers/Designers:

- Are there particular development code or process barriers that you think should be addressed to make multi-dwelling housing easier to build in Beaverton?
- What types of incentives are most beneficial to your organization? Density/height/FAR bonuses, tax abatements, fee reductions, etc.?
- What are other ways that local governments have supported your work?
- Does your organization include accessibility features beyond the minimum federal requirements? What are the barriers to providing accessible units? What are the costs?
- Do you think financial, or code incentives (such as reduced fees or density/height/FAR bonuses) would be effective in delivering more accessible units? What about requirements for accessibility beyond federal standards?
- One of the needs identified in Beaverton is more housing for multi-generational families. Does your organization provide units that meet these types of needs? What are the barriers? Would bonuses (density/height/FAR) be an effective way to encourage multiple bedrooms?
- Do you see opportunities for SRO development in Beaverton?

Questions for Middle Housing Developers:

- Have you developed or explored developing middle housing in Beaverton? What challenges have you faced (here or elsewhere).
- Are there particular development code or process barriers that you think should be addressed to make middle housing easier to build in Beaverton? Have bicycle parking requirements for middle housing been a challenge?
- The city is considering the strategy of developing pre-approved plan sets to facilitate middle housing development. Would you consider using them? Do you think it would help reduce costs? Lead to lower home prices? Any other potential benefits or drawbacks?

Questions for Multi-Dwelling Developer:

- Are there particular development code or process barriers that you think should be addressed to make multi-dwelling housing easier to build in Beaverton?

- Beaverton is considering increasing or removing density maximums in mixed-use zones. Do you think higher allowed densities would make housing units more affordable? What density range would you target if there were no limits (except height)?
- Does your organization include accessibility features beyond the minimum federal requirements? What are the barriers to providing accessible units? What are the costs?
- Do you think financial, or code incentives would be effective in delivering more accessible units? What about requirements for accessibility beyond federal standards?
- Some officials in Beaverton are curious about inclusionary zoning (IZ)—like what Portland has done. What do you think would be the impact to your developments—or other multi-dwelling developers? What kind of incentives do you think the city would need to consider offsetting the impact of IZ on development?

Questions for West Hills / Larger Land developer:

- What do you think of the strategy to require a mix of middle housing in new planned areas, such as Cooper Mountain?
- Does your organization incorporate accessible features into its homes? If not, what are the barriers? Would local incentives increase the likelihood that you would include those features?
- Beaverton is considering a Construction Excise Tax for affordable housing. The tax rate could be up to 1% for residential development. Have you worked in communities that have a CET? To what degree would this impact what you build—or whether you build—in Beaverton? Would it affect home prices, and if so, to what degree?
- What could the City do (in terms of regulatory changes, incentive, etc.) to support more development of lower-cost market-rate homes in Beaverton?

Questions for Realtor/Accessibility advocate:

- What is your involvement with housing in Beaverton or in the area?
- What types of homes do you find people with mobility or other impairments are looking for?
- Do you see many homes with accessibility features? Are you aware of the costs of building those features into homes?
- The city is considering strategies to encourage more accessible housing in Beaverton. What do you think about the requirements to make certain new housing visitable for people with disabilities (versus full accessibility)?

Stakeholder Impact

The feedback received from stakeholders greatly influenced the strategies included in the Housing Production Strategy. For example, multigenerational housing, accessible housing, and affordability were broadly supported and advocated by community members and have been integrated as part of the housing strategies. In addition, Multiple Unit Property Tax Exemption (MUPTE), increasing development flexibility, and exploration of funding sources were favored by developers and housing producers and have been integrated into the

housing strategies. Housing producers also advocated for strategies that would make the permitting process more efficient, which is reflected in strategies like 2.1 and 2.2 which involve creating permit-ready plan sets for middle housing types and facilitating development of ADUs to make the permitting process quicker and more cost-effective.

Engagement Evaluation

Even though this project implemented a robust engagement effort, there are opportunities for improvement in future engagement practices. The city lacks tools and platforms that make virtual/hybrid participation accessible and engaging for everyone. The project incorporated several tools (e.g., Google JamBoard and Poll Everywhere) to engage community members virtually. However, tools for hybrid opportunities were scarce. In the future, a virtual engagement platform like Bang the Table could make virtual engagement more accessible to those who cannot attend or commit to an event/meeting/focus group at a set date and time. Lastly, inviting community members to lead or co-lead some engagement work, while being monetarily compensated, could be a future strategy that provides a broader reach to a diverse range of community members. The city intends to increase engagement with diverse community members and organizations, as described in Strategy 5.2.