



PLANNING COMMISSION

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 8, 2025

ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

1. Consideration of the September 10, 2025 Planning Commission minutes



**Wilsonville Planning Commission
Regular Meeting Minutes
September 10, 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, Andrew Karr, Ron Heberlein, Sam Scull, Yana Semenova, and Matt Constantine

Excused: Jennifer Willard

Staff Present: Daniel Pauly, Miranda Bateschell, Amanda Guile-Hinman, Cindy Luxhoj, and Mandi Simmons

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

CITIZEN INPUT

There was none.

ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

1. Consideration of the August 13, 2025, Planning Commission Minutes
The August 13, 2025, Planning Commission minutes were accepted as presented.

WORK SESSION

2. Wilsonville Industrial Land Readiness (Code-Basalt Creek) (Luxhoj)

Associate Planner Luxhoj presented the Staff report via PowerPoint, providing a brief review of the Craft Industrial (CI) Zone and highlighting Development Code text proposed in response to prior Commissioner comments. (Attachment 1) She also introduced the new Northwest Industrial (NWI) Zone, reviewing its subdistricts (Slide 5) and the proposed new uses and why they were proposed. (Slides 7-12) The NWI Zone would implement the design elements of the Coffee Creek Industrial Design Overlay District, expand geographically to include Basalt Creek, and include an updated list of allowed uses and revised development standards drawn from both the Planned Development Industrial (PDI) and PDI-RSIA Zones, with the standards updated to reduce redundancy and reflect existing uses. The draft Code language for the NWI Zone was in Attachment 2 and Table NWI-1 Typically Permitted Uses was provided as Attachment 3 of the meeting packet. Staff sought Planning Commission input on the NWI Zone.

Commissioner input on the proposed Development Code amendments and Staff responses to Commissioner questions were as follows:

- Staff confirmed the Planning Commission had no additional input or comments regarding proposed CI Zone language.
- Including a legend with Figure NWI-2 to describe streets and street types would be helpful. (Attachment 2)
- The white area shown between the Light Industrial and High-Tech Subdistricts was the Craft Industrial area. (Slide 4)
- Light Industrial or Industrial uses should be located closer to the freeway so larger trucks would not need to travel through neighborhoods. Switching the locations was suggested to place office areas in the middle and heavier traffic uses along the freeway.
 - Staff explained that the High-Tech Employment and Light Industrial locations reflected the Basalt Creek Concept Plan, with larger freeway-adjacent parcels identified for High-Tech because they were flat, had good visibility, and freeway access.
 - Aside from some access issues with West Railroad, the entire area was relatively close to the I-5 Interchange. Many traffic and land use considerations were part of the concept planning process.
- In Section 4.134(.02)B.2, using “any exterior modifications” seemed too general. Would a minor change to a building’s exterior make the new standards applicable? (Attachment 2)
 - Staff explained that much of Section 4.134 came from the Design Overlay District and the exterior modifications language was changed from the Form-Based Code. It could be modified if necessary.
 - The phrase was carried over in a cut/paste scenario, and the proposed language should be considered to see about any redundancy with the General Zoning Standards for nonconforming uses. Even without any development, including exterior modifications, if the use was nonconforming, it would need to meet current standards. The language would be reviewed to confirm it still made sense in this context.
- Similarly, Section 4.134(.02)B.3, included “changing an existing sign” which seemed overly restrictive since even a name change could trigger the new standards to be in effect.
 - Staff noted the Code section language was originally for design standards so whether they were still applicable for General Zoning Standards was a good question.
- Figure NWI-3 Supporting Streets Standards showed no bike lanes planned for supporting streets. Figure NWI-4 showed bicycles sharing the through traffic lanes, but Figure NWI-3 did not. (Attachment 2)
 - Staff clarified the table identified Bike Facilities as shared streets, rather than having dedicated bike lanes. Supporting streets would generally be unmarked, more like residential streets without bike lane striping.
- Staff would confirm how the Addressing Street standards were defined, since they were not shown in the packet, and whether those streets defaulted to the City’s street requirements.

- Staff would work with the engineering team and others to clarify the description in Table NWI-2 Street Design and Connectivity regarding the Connection Spacing, the exceptions for some Addressing Streets, and Day Road being separate. (Attachment 2)
- Table NWI-5 Building Design requiring a primary building entrance to be visible from, and accessible to, an Addressing Street might result in long walks from parking areas, which may not be near the Addressing Street. (Attachment 2)
 - Staff clarified some parking was allowed on Addressing Streets in front of buildings, though the number of spaces was limited. ADA spaces would still be located at the primary entrance.
- The use of “safe, direct, and convenient” in the Accessibility section of Table NWI-5 could be a bit subjective; perhaps other language should be used.
 - Staff explained subjectivity was allowed, since this was not for residential development, and mirrored similar language in Code Section 4.154.
- The 30-foot minimum building height requirement in Table NWI-5 was an urban design element carried forward from the Day Road Design Overlay, which became the Coffee Creek Overlay, to create a consistent street presence with buildings that help frame the street. Being form-based design regulations played into it to create an employment district look with clear delineation of the public space edges within the employment area. High facades along Addressing Streets were wanted to create that look and feel. (Attachment 2)
 - Staff confirmed even one-story buildings would need a 30-foot façade as the intent was to provide the desired visual design. The minimum height requirement had an allowed adjustment of 10%, so the facades could be no lower than 27-feet high.
- In Section 4.134(.11) Waysides, and especially Table NWI-6, understanding how waysides would look and how they would connect together was difficult to visualize.
 - Staff described three existing wayside examples at Coffee Creek Logistics, Black Creek, and Precision Countertops, noting a wayside was also planned for Delta Logistics. Waysides were generally concrete areas directly off main sidewalks with benches, trash receptacles, and perhaps artwork, surrounded by trees and landscaping to provide shade.
- Staff clarified that Enhanced Transit Plazas could only be developed as part of a wayside if SMART served the parcel. (Footnote, Table NWI-6) The City and SMART would have to approve the project as SMART would be part of the development review team.
- Data centers and contractor establishments had no size restrictions in the Light Industrial Subdistrict to maintain flexibility and to reflect what is currently allowed in the PDI Zone. Staff received no additional direction about the need to restrict the size. Parcel geometry in the subdistrict would limit both the size and likelihood of such uses. (Table NWI-1, Attachment 3)
 - Including prohibitions and restrictions are only considered if there was a reasonable probability of an issue; however, Staff welcomed Commissioner input, particularly if there was a risk that contractor establishments would become too big and unduly consume land in the Light Industrial Subdistrict.

- Staff suggested an acreage limitation be explored after a comment that contractor establishments may consume significant land in the future if other land became unavailable.
- Staff clarified that the Connectivity Master Plan requirement for development within the NWI Zone was a direct carry over from the Overlay District.
- To accommodate business uses not listed in the permitted use table, the Code included “similar use” provisions and broader categories to allow flexibility for emerging uses. The business would apply, and Staff determine the applicable use category.
- Staff confirmed no building to acreage ratio was required but recognized that contractor establishments consume land that would probably be better suited for other uses.
- However, the use was an economic cluster in Wilsonville that provided payroll, attracted jobs, and supported other public and private projects. Some contractor establishments had been built within the city limits under urban standards and seemed to function and fit well in industrial areas. Those precedent developments could inform standards such as floor-to-area ratio or square footage-to-yard area distinctions.
- “Hospital/medical building” might be a better term, since medical buildings were more likely than a hospital, which was difficult to imagine being built in the area.
 - Staff clarified the Code’s definition of “hospital” was distinct from “medical center”, which would not be a permitted use. Though not built, an in-patient mental health hospital was approved in Coffee Creek that would have functioned more like an industrial use in terms of job density, high-wage jobs, and traffic, which was the basis for including the use. Larger medical centers would involve vacant commercial land, rezoning or master planning, while urgent care or medical office uses would be classified as commercial uses. A physical therapy office would be considered a medical office, not a hospital.
- The concept of allowing in-patient facilities was supported, given the challenges of siting such uses, but the term “hospital” might not be the most accurate as it conjured up larger facilities like Meridian Park, Emmanuel, or Dammasch.
 - Staff welcomed wording ideas, noting earlier drafts titled the use as in-patient medical office, medical research and development, laboratories, which was long. The intent was to capture facilities not serving out-patient consumer uses.
- Overall, the permitted use definitions were broad enough to allow flexibility for future developments and were well done.
- Small-scale versions of commercial food preparation uses, such as centralized school kitchens, were permitted in the CI Zone,. Larger scale operations for commercial food preparation would be categorized under Manufacturing, Processing, Assembly, and Packaging of Products; some warehousing might be associated with the use as well.

Chair Hendrix called for public comment.

Ryan Schera, Schnitzer Properties, a stakeholder and property owner, expressed support for the consolidation of the NWI Zone, noting Staff had identified appropriate uses for the Light Industrial Subdistrict, but raised concerns that several design standards were not appropriate

for the functional needs of industrial sites. His primary concern was the 600-foot connection spacing in Table NWI-2, which could eliminate 12 acres of developable land on Schnitzer's 44-acre property and limit building size below what was typical for large industrial users. He noted additional concerns with parking standards limiting spaces at the front of buildings, building height requirements that were too low for modern industrial facilities, driveway width standards that were too narrow for trucks, and retaining wall standards that would consume significant portions of developable land on Schnitzer's sloped property. Mr. Schera would like to meet with Staff to review the standards and address the realities of light industrial development.

Planning Manager Pauly replied Staff would be happy to meet to discuss Mr. Schera's concerns.

Chair Hendrix confirmed there was no further public testimony.

INFORMATIONAL

3. City Council Action Minutes (August 4, 2025) (No staff presentation)
4. 2025 PC Work Program (No staff presentation)

Commissioner Karr inquired about comments in the minutes about the Civics Academy's interest in rebooting Boones Ferry Days event. **City Attorney Guile-Hinman** clarified that the Civics Academy had been informed that Staff had no resources to assist with the Boones Ferry Days event, but the Academy was welcome to take the event on.

Planning Manager Pauly clarified a joint work session would be held with City Council on October 6th in addition to the Commission's regular meeting. Packet materials would be provided in advance.

ADJOURN

The meeting was adjourned at 7:02 p.m.