



**Wilsonville Planning Commission
Regular Meeting Minutes
April 9, 2025**

Wilsonville City Hall & Remote Video Conferencing
<https://www.ci.wilsonville.or.us/meetings/pc>

CALL TO ORDER - ROLL CALL

Chair Hendrix called the meeting to order at 6:00 pm.

Present: Nicole Hendrix, Ron Heberlein, Matt Constantine, Sam Scull, Yana Semenova, Jennifer Willard, Andrew Karr

Staff Present: Daniel Pauly, Amanda Guile-Hinman, Miranda Bateschell, Kim Rybold, Mandi Simmons, and Beth Goodman

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

CITIZEN INPUT

There was none.

ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

1. Consideration of the March 12, 2025 Planning Commission Minutes
The March 12, 2025 Planning Commission minutes were accepted as presented.

WORK SESSION

2. Housing Our Future (Rybold)

Kim Rybold, Senior Planner, noted that since the Planning Commission's November 2024 work session, Housing our Future had continued to evolve as the Commission's comments and direction had been incorporated and following additional meetings with the Task Force and City Council, a set of seven actions were identified as being feasible to implement within the next six years. The meeting packet included the nearly final Housing Needs and Capacity Analysis (HNCA) and draft Housing Production Strategy (HPS). With public hearings beginning next month, the project team welcomed further questions or input from the Commission about any edits or additional consideration on the specific strategies.

Beth Goodman, ECO Northwest, presented the draft HPS via PowerPoint, highlighting the project and reviewing the HPS' key components, including the feedback received influencing its development and considerations for selecting the proposed actions. She described each of the

City's recommended housing strategy actions, as well as additional actions not yet recommended for inclusion and why and reviewed the proposed implementation schedule and next steps.

Senior Planner Rybold confirmed the City was looking at how any HPS actions might fit in the timing of the Comprehensive Plan update later in the work program. In particular, Item A, Evaluate redesignating or rezoning land for housing would fit, however Items B through D related more to the Development Code. (Slide 11) Staff was cognizant of potential conflicts with other actions, so staggering work program items was best, although more could be done if the timeline accelerated. Like the Equitable Housing Strategic Plan, the HPS was a framework for future actions with checkpoints, and the flexibility and fluidity to be able to pivot if needed. No decisions or recommendations were being made about adopting the HPS as everything was still being evaluated. The project team welcomed feedback on the actions and new suggestions to capture what might be important as the seven actions were not a binding list.

Commissioner feedback regarding the HPS and recommended actions was as follows with responses to Commissioner questions by the project team as noted:

- Senior Planner Rybold explained Action C. Administrative Review regarded the process to evaluate adopting a Class II Administrative Review process for residential project applications that meet the clear and objective development standards. State law requires the City to establish clear and objective standards for residential development, though waiver requests would still be reviewed by the Development Review Board (DRB). A Class II review would save applicants time and help decrease housing development costs, enabling housing to come online sooner. Class II reviews still have a public notice period and therefore, the appeal rights of those participating in the process can be preserved. The public can also provide comments.
- Ms. Goodman expected Wilsonville's forecast for housing growth would exceed Metro's forecast if based on the City's historical growth rate; however, State law required the City to use the official forecast, which was Metro's forecast. For the next HPS, the Oregon Housing Needs Analysis, a new forecasting system, would be used that makes allocations to cities by income level, etc.
 - Senior Planner Rybold added the historical growth rate depends in part, on the timeframe being used to calculate the rate. Over the past 5 years or so, the Portland State University data indicated a slowdown in the population growth rate. Wilsonville has not had any significant multi-family product in the last 10+ years. The last HNA highlighted the distinction and difference in Wilsonville's historical growth rate and Metro's rate, which was one reason the City started tracking housing each year with the Annual Housing Report. The City's historical growth rate has been coming into line with Metro's projections.
 - Ms. Goodman added that as cities grow, it is harder to achieve higher growth rates, and growth rates have slowed across the regions and the state in the last 5 to 10 years. Growth across in the state and across the country is not expected to increase given federal immigration policies. In six years, the City would do its next HNA and she

described the uncertainties, errors, and misplaced actions often involved with forecasting. She suggested aiming for reasonable growth rates.

- Program Actions A through E made sense and it would be interesting to see if the City could get momentum on Actions F and G, where the benefits seem to be.
- Concern was expressed about Town Center being able to accommodate the bulk of the multi-housing need in the next 20 years as indicated in the HNCA, although the midpoint check-ins, every six-year HPS updates, are intended to address that.
 - Senior Planner Rybold noted the nature of redevelopment would be different and less predictable than greenfield development in the HNCA, which was why Actions A and B, for example, become important; not only looking at land with different uses, but also existing undeveloped residential land to be able to meet affordable multi-housing needs.
 - Ms. Goodman added the ability to get a lot of multifamily housing in a small space, so not a lot of space would necessarily be needed.
- When doing the analysis and evaluation, review current City positions to see about any potential to repurpose any work or position to fill the Action F Housing Specialist role.
- Senior Planner Rybold confirmed that even though things change quickly, the HPS' 6-year review cycle is adequate as far as keeping up with what has to be built and informs being cautious on the number of actions to implement in order to balance being ambitious and realistic about what can be accomplished.
- Ms. Goodman noted that the HPS has cut sheets for each recommended action to inform the public, and then some actions might involve a 20- or 30-page report to cover all the details.
- Senior Planner Rybold explained each action was essentially a project and potentially some Code work could be combined in a single process. For example, Action B Housing Variety would involve a Development Code update for which Staff would create a more detailed scope of work, timeline, how to involve the public, Planning Commission work sessions, etc. Such details had not been discussed for the Actions because things could change over time, such as new State requirements. The goal was to create enough of a framework to begin creating that scope. The public process for these actions would have more information and an assessment and details of each action.
 - Ms. Goodman added the HPS must provide enough information for the City to assess what the result was of each action, such as the rezoning of 20 acres of land and whether housing was built there.
 - Senior Planner Rybold noted these results are incorporated into the Annual Housing Report, the City's existing monitoring system, and she anticipated seeing the results reflected in subsequent versions of that report going forward.
- Senior Planner Rybold noted the required planning work and program actions was envisioned to be done by current Staff, potentially with consultant assistance on some. Whether the action made it on the planning work program list was influenced, not necessarily by Staff capacity, but by the expertise required.
 - Ms. Goodman noted the Mental Housing Inspection Program was one example where an expert would be needed.

- Housing Variety and Administrative Review (Actions B & C) processes should start earlier. The Frog Pond discussions proved the need to make Administrative Review more available, reducing building expenses or at least the paper work expense.
- This work should piggy back onto the work the Commission did on Housing Variety for Frog Pond, perhaps accelerating or starting the process earlier in the implementation schedule.
 - Ms. Goodman read the description of Housing Variety, which perhaps modeled the Commission's work in Frog Pond East and South.
 - Senior Planner Rybold added implementing Actions B and C could follow along with the Comprehensive Plan work, and while Staff capacity would be a factor, the work could be done sooner and having a later deadline would not compromise the City's position with the State.
- Having the Actions in place citywide before next Frog Pond was important to avoid having to make exceptions to City policies.
- Adding the Housing Specialist position was supported, though concern was expressed about how to protect the position's scope of work on future actions when future changes are unknown, such as having unexpected, unplanned State mandates in the future.
- Ms. Goodman explained the Clackamas County Point-in-Time (PiT) Counts for homeless data are done at a higher level than the City, noting those experiencing homelessness move from place to place within a region.
 - Planning Manager Pauly added that generally when the City has done housing reports and in gathering other data, Staff has an idea of the regular usage of Wilsonville's parking areas and have called to local hotels and motels to get information about the number of long-term residents.
- Senior Planner Rybold confirmed funding sources were a future conversation, noting the Action listing the General Fund as a funding source was initially focused on CET funding. Intuitively, the CET was the best funding option, however, the Task Force wanted to do its due diligence in considering other options, however the default was the General Fund if none of the options are pursued, aside from doing nothing. The feedback to Staff was there was still a lot of interest in CET, which was most likely the most beneficial for housing at this time, but the General Fund would be considered in the evaluation.
 - Part of the Action was to evaluate where the Housing Specialist would be in the budget as the tasks would inform the position's place in the organization as well as how the position is funded. A CET could fund help fund the Housing Specialist, which was why those implementation timelines tracked similarly. (Slide 11)
- Ms. Goodman added additional funding sources were being discussed at the State level, so more options might be available.
- Ms. Goodman added many accessible units are not occupied by people with disabilities; some options...becoming clearer as other cities have implemented different policies which the City may want to address a bit later. Additionally, there was continued outreach to these groups.
- Senior Planner Rybold noted with Actions B and D, which regarded requirements trying to achieve an outcome related to some functional housing aspects, perhaps the City

needed to examine what was possible to ensure the population's needs identified in the HNCA are met and aligned with requirements or incentives being implemented.

The Commissioners supported the draft HNCA and HPS as presented.

Chair Hendrix confirmed there was no public comment on the Housing Our Future project.

Senior Planner Rybold confirmed the upcoming Planning Commission public hearing would be for both the HCNA and HPS documents.

3. Climate Friendly and Equitable Communities Parking (Pauly)

Daniel Pauly, Planning Manager, presented the Climate Friendly and Equitable Communities (CFEC) Parking Compliance via PowerPoint, noting the Planning Commission's input was being sought on the Development Code updates and additional details regarding Parking B, Compliance Option 2 for which City Council sought additional Planning Commission feedback on the menu options.

Brian Davis, Consultant, Studio Davis, added that pursuing Option 1 was recommended because it required no parking minimums and would apply to the vast majority of the city. The project team welcomed any additional discussion with the Commission regarding Option 2 and its menu items.

The Planning Commission confirmed it still recommended Parking B Option 1 to City Council, noting it had the lowest implementation cost, and that Option 2 seemed to involve a lot of work and enforcement without any significant difference in parking.

Mr. Davis continued the presentation, reviewing the key Development Code amendments required to implement CFEC Parking Compliance (Slides 9-10) with additional comments from Planning Manager Pauly. Feedback from the Commission was sought on the parking lot design standard options (Slides 11-13) as well as the draft Development Code updates overall.

Commissioner questions and input were as follows with responses to Commissioner questions as noted:

- Mr. Davis confirmed if a developer chose solar for climate mitigation, a 30% tree canopy would still be required.
- Is solar included as an option for developers in their designs or is solar just part of parking lot configuration? Who benefits from the electricity generated from the solar?
- Are there other components of the Full Enhanced Standards that would be expensive if applied to a half-acre parking lot?
- What is the difference between applying and not applying the Full or Partial Enhanced Standards and how expensive would it be to apply those standards to a half-acre lot?

- Planning Manager Pauly displayed and highlighted Municipal Code Sections 4.155.(03), noting that for the Full or Partial Enhanced Standards, the ½- to 2½-acres, Code Sections 4.155.(03).b and (03).c would still be required, as well as the ratio of trees per parking spaces, street-like features along the principal drive aisles, and enhanced landscaping.
 - A ½- to 1-acre parking lot would have some substantial additional requirements that would consume land, leading to the question of whether to make the Code a bit more complicated or streamline it by adding the additional requirements.
 - The current regular design standards for ½- to 2½-acre lots had lower standards; for instance, not as many pedestrian pathways are required. (Slide 12)
 - He confirmed not all the standards were new. Code Sections 4.155.(03).a, (03).d and (03).e would be additional requirements for the ½- to 2½-acres, while (03).f and (03).g were more like notes.
 - Code Section 4.155.(03).a—shifts from having an island or equivalent for every 8 parking spaces to every 6 parking spaces.
 - Code Section 4.155.(03).d—still requires access drives, for example, but street-like features would not be required.
- The requirements essentially shrink the parking available in a 1/2-acre parking lot, especially with (03).e.
- The key difference between the Code options is the amount of landscaping that will be required.
 - Mr. Pauly believed the low screen standard was still the minimum; some buffer would still be required, but not a 12-ft buffer.
- It was surprising that the State had not gone after the landscape buffers, which were large land areas that did not serve the climate.
- Mr. Pauly noted areas within the city where the new parking lot standards may apply, stating that in areas like Coffee Creek, parking areas may not reach a ½-acre, so the regular design standards would apply, though some could get up to 1 acre. In Wilsonville, 200-space parking lots were rare, so the Full or Partial Enhanced Standards would apply to potential development and many more properties.
- Mr. Davis confirmed street trees counted into the tree canopy calculation and cited the following, “Development shall either provide trees along driveways or a minimum of 30% tree canopy coverage over new parking areas.”
- If a new developer or business in Coffee Creek completely solarized its parking lot, providing EV charging stations, how could it meet the 30% canopy requirement?

Given the detailed level of the questions and in the interest of time, continuing the discussion to another work session was suggested.

Key Commissioner comments and responses to further questions by the project team continued as follows:

- Providing visual examples, perhaps satellite views showing how the different parking area standard options would impact existing parking lots was suggested.

- When considering criteria, consider what would make someone want to develop and bring jobs to Wilsonville, and what could Staff manage, how would the Code be enforced?
- Mr. Pauly clarified that while the term, underutilized parking, was used in the rules, from a functional standpoint as the Code was currently drafted, it removed barriers to redevelopment of any parking in general, not just underutilized parking.
 - Mr. Davis added the Implementation Guide included language about the property owner being able to decide what is or is not underutilized; however, Wilsonville could adopt a specific definition in its Code.
 - He noted Wilsonville's Code already met the CFEC standards by allowing underutilized parking to be redeveloped. While "encouraged" is used, it pointed to allowing it in certain circumstances.
 - Mr. Pauly added that the use of encourage in the Code often translates to removing Code barriers.
- Having three different parking design standards seemed best to prevent developers from having to do more than was necessary.
- The Commissioners agreed that where there was little impact one way or another, it was best to keep it simple; however, adding some complexity when there was impact on the ground made sense.
- Mr. Davis believed the amendments would have a relatively small impact on a relatively large number of parking lots.
 - He wanted to do some geometry on the difference the requirements would have on the 12-ft buffer and the percentage of the potential parking area.
 - Mr. Pauly added the Development Code did not define the width of the landscape buffer, which was generally 8-ft for trees; however, the queuing distance for the drive aisle at the access was the driving factor in the depth of the buffer.
- Mr. Davis said he would create a graphic to show 30% tree canopy on a ½-acre verses 200 space lot. This was the first time the Code met all the CFEC requirements, but not for right size of parking lot.
- While a simple, streamlined Code was desired, including if/then options was suggested to make it as efficient and simple as possible.
- Which is more climate friendly, trees or solar?
 - Mr. Davis hoped DLCDD had done some research to know why the numbers work, whether to stop heat islands, generate energy in the most efficient way, or have an aesthetically pleasing parking lot.
- As a tree-friendly city, how would Wilsonville accommodate solar without eliminating its Tree City USA designation? It would be nice to have some guidance from the State.
- The fee-in-lieu option, throwing money at the problem, is not a solution.
- Mr. Pauly noted examples of when the landscaping standards might not be unfeasible, such as the odd geometry of a lot impacting the project layout, preventing the applicant from meeting the 40% canopy requirement, so a solar panel might be added. The intent of the City's waiver process is to enable the City to entertain better designs.
- Mr. Pauly confirmed that fee-in-lieu of generally equates to in lieu of trees.

- Addressing what is more climate friendly and how climate friendly is defined is key to answering whether solar panels should be allowed in lieu of landscaping. Solar panels 12 ft in the air provide more shade than a tree of a similar size, so climate friendly benefits come from both options, each simply generates different things, carbon capture verses electricity generation, etc.
- Mr. Davis acknowledged the confusion of having the two different requirements. The 30% tree canopy requirement had to be met regardless, and then the climate requirement, which was higher tree canopy requirement that could instead be met with solar. Some landscaping would be done either way, but now more rigidly defined landscaping would be required as well as 10% more tree canopy in aggregate for climate mitigation. Fee-in-lieu could be used for solar or the additional 10% canopy and was calculated on a per space basis.
- Commissioners expressed interest in allowing solar in lieu of landscaping/trees.
 - Some wanted more details about whether paying in lieu of solar was at the expense of planting trees, or if trees would still be planted.
 - Requiring the solar panels to be in the parking lot was also mentioned, as solar panels on rooftops, for example, would not count.
- Mr. Davis noted that currently, solar panels were allowed anywhere on the property. Developers could choose to meet the 30% tree canopy and find somewhere on the site for the solar, in the parking lot or on the building; or they could meet the 40% tree canopy and not have to worry about meeting the solar requirement.
- One company in Colorado had solar panels that provided energy for the EV parking spaces below. Because the solar panels ran the entire length of the parking lane, there were no trees. charging stations.
- Mr. Pauly noted the conversation was helpful to Staff as the rules were not straight forward. He agreed to share thoughts from Staff's perspective next time.
- Mr. Davis noted there may not be much difference between allowing a solar option via a waiver process verses allowing solar at the developer's discretion. A reasonably good planning consultant would be able to get that waiver approved most of the time.
- Mr. Pauly stated he leaned against having a waiver if solar was allowed, but would talk further with Staff.
- Mr. Pauly explained the redevelopment of existing parking areas to other uses could mean redeveloping to a park or building. The intent was to allow redevelopment to whatever it could be if it was a greenfield site.

Chair Hendrix called for public comment.

Jeffrey Zundel commended Staff for hosting and responding to questions at the open house on the parking minimums, which helped answer some critical questions. He appreciated the questions asked by the Planning Commission to ensure the right codes were being put in place and to address parking holistically. As the topic was shared with the public, addressing confusing items would be important. For example, did removing parking minimums mean people's parking was being taken away? Staff had responded that market forces were still at

play and underwriters would not fund development that did not have adequate parking, which was very helpful to hear. It was also helpful to hear the amendments were part of a much bigger set of Code standards and grander holistic plan citywide.

Mr. Pauly appreciated the Commission's feedback, noting the project team had the direction needed to return with some crystal recommendations next time. He agreed to talk with Staff about include the PowerPoints and perhaps questions for the Commission in the meeting packet to provide further clarity when preparing for agenda items.

INFORMATIONAL

4. City Council Action Minutes (March 3 & 17, 2025) (No staff presentation)
5. 2025 PC Work Program (No staff presentation)

There were no questions or comments.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:09 p.m.