



PLANNING COMMISSION

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 10, 2025

ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

1. Consideration of the November 12, 2025 Planning Commission minutes



**Wilsonville Planning Commission
Regular Meeting Minutes
November 12, 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 6:30 pm.

Present: Nicole Hendrix, Ron Heberlein, Jennifer Willard, Yana Semenova, and Matt Constantine

Excused: Andrew Karr

Staff Present: Jeanna Troha, Cindy Luxhoj, Matt Lorenzen, and Mandi Simmons

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

CITIZEN INPUT

There was none.

ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

1. Consideration of the October 6 & 8, 2025, Planning Commission Minutes

The October 6, 2025, Joint Planning Commission/City Council minutes were accepted as presented.

The October 8, 2025, Planning Commission minutes were accepted as amended.

Commissioner Semenova moved to approve the October 6, 2025 meeting minutes as presented and approve the October 8, 2025 Planning Commission minutes, amending her comments on Page 6 to reflect that citizens, not PGE, have control by voting. Commissioner Heberlein seconded the motion. The motion passed by a 5 to 0 vote. (Ayes: Hendrix, Willard, Heberlein, Semenova, Constantine. Nays: None.)

WORK SESSION

2. Wilsonville Industrial Land Readiness (Citywide EOA & EDS) (Luxhoj/Lorenzen)

Nicole Underwood, EConorthwest, presented the Wilsonville Industrial Land Readiness (WILR) Citywide Economic Opportunities Analysis (EOA) and Economic Development Strategy (EDS) via PowerPoint, first explaining that WILR had both a Basalt Creek and citywide track and highlighting the project schedule and EOA conclusions, noting Wilsonville has enough industrial

land to support growth, but unlocking it would take focused effort and that while vacant commercial land is limited, substantial redevelopment potential exists. (Slides 2-5)
Commissioner comments regarding the EOA were as follows with the project team addressing questions as noted:

- Is there a percentage to identify how much of the city's approximately 2,000 acres of developed industrial land is underdeveloped? One discussion around the Basalt Creek and Coffee Creek areas was the lack of infrastructure and those associated costs. However, if underdeveloped industrial land was available within the city limits already, then that same cost constraint would not exist.
 - **Beth Goodman, ECONorthwest**, explained that some underdeveloped land could be considered as what the project team classified as partially vacant land, which was land parcels between two and five acres that had some development on it and could reasonably have more development. About 130 acres of the city's 308 acres of buildable industrial land was partially vacant. (Exhibit 36, Page 100 of the Agenda packet) Additionally, some industrial lands have more infill potential for higher and better uses but that amount was not quantified because that analysis would be on a site-by-site basis and depend on how the land was being used. Aside from the Buildable Lands Inventory (BLI), she understood some Basalt Creek land had been underutilized.
 - **Economic Development Manager Lorenzen** added he would not say there was a general trend of underdevelopment but select properties, such as the Peyton Building, which fronts I-5 and used to be the Hollywood Video headquarters and Payless, had a massive parking field that could likely accommodate another building, but for all intents and purposes, the project team considered the site fully developed.
- The Mentor Graphic campus was other property that the City would probably consider being fully developed but had space available that could be utilized in a different way.
 - **Ms. Goodman** noted the answer would be different for commercial land, where a lot of land was underutilized.

Ms. Underwood continued the PowerPoint, presenting the Economic Development Strategy (EDS), six desired outcomes over the next ten years, feedback from engagement, and six key focus areas with specific actions using existing and new resources so the City progressed toward the desired outcomes. She reviewed key questions the project team sought the Commission's feedback on (Slide 17) and highlighted next steps.

Comments and feedback from the Commission regarding the EDS and the questions provided by the project team (Slide 17) were as follows with responses to Commissioner questions as noted:

- **Ms. Underwood** explained the EDS was not a required strategy by the State, like the Housing Production Strategy. She confirmed the City wants to grow, clarifying that growth was driven by the State.
- **Economic Development Manager Lorenzen** clarified the City was required by State law to maintain a 20-year buildable land inventory for both employment and residential use. The purpose of an EOA was to look at that inventory within that 20-year horizon, but while there was a State mandated dimension to the EOA, the City initiated the EOA and EDS

development process at this time because it made sense, not because the City was up against a deadline that the State had mandated.

- Was any funding coming from the State as both the Housing Production Strategy (HPS) and EDS projects run parallel, or was that on the City to figure out?
 - **Ms. Underwood** said for industrial lands, the Regionally Significant Industrial Sites (RSIS) Program through Business Oregon had funding available.
 - **Ms. Goodman** stated that sometimes infrastructure was more likely to be State funded. The recommended actions in the EDS were geared toward what Wilsonville wanted to do, not on how to meet some State mandate. Some of the bigger pieces regarded infrastructure costs, but other pieces were more local, addressing local desires, such as a wider bank of commercial uses to have more restaurants and commercial businesses local to Wilsonville. Some of that funding might come regionally, but probably not much from the State unless there was a special program.
 - **Economic Development Manager Lorenzen** added there was a remote possibility that City Council would commit General Fund dollars to some of these efforts, but because those dollars were in high demand, that was not something to count on. The other piece mentioned a couple of times in the context of Town Center and Basalt Creek was urban renewal. Tax Increment Finance (TIF) did not require the City's General Fund. TIF was a reallocation of existing and future tax revenues to take a slice of existing tax revenues to grow the overall pie. He confirmed that essentially, capital investments would be financed with the hope that more tax income would be generated in the future to cover the investment.
 - Generally, system development charges (SDCs) were collected for infrastructure construction. At the time of new development, redevelopment, or a change of use greater in intensity than the previous use within a property or building, the City charges SDCs for water, sewer, parks, transportation, and streets which are put into special SDC funds to build new roads, water lines, sewer lines, etc. SDCs were an expense to development at the time of development application and not an expense to Wilsonville taxpayers.
- Rather than being concerned whether a business was a major regional employer, it was important that they were a size appropriate for the development in the area to make a meaningful difference. Did major regional employer really mean anything? If the City has 10 small employers that net the same result as a major regional employer, should the City care?
 - **Economic Development Manager Lorenzen** agreed that 10 employers employing 20 people could be equivalent to a 200-employee establishment, noting the only critical difference was that larger employers generally tend to offer better wages and benefits. The language could be wordsmithed to provide an equal look at all business sizes.
- **Ms. Underwood** confirmed that the order of the words, placing business before residents, was not intentional but simply reflected this being an economic development strategy. She was amenable to prioritizing residents in the desired outcome language. (Slide 8)
 - She confirmed that the actions were not ordered by importance, but rather by how quickly they could be started with actions using existing resources listed first, followed

- by those requiring new resources. The project team sought to understand the priorities of both the Commission and City Council in ordering the actions. (Slide 12-16)
- There was a sequenced proposal for how the actions are implemented in the plan. Currently, the Focus Areas show “Existing Resources” and “New Resources” which aligns with the sequencing. For example, the exploration and starting of Actions 4.1, 4.2, and 4.3 could start immediately. How far along the City gets in the implementation may require additional resources, so that piece would come later. Some actions were a bit less discreet, while others were much more. (Slide 15)
 - **Ms. Goodman** noted Actions 4.2 and 4.3 could also be said to be supplements to 4.1.
 - **Ms. Underwood** agreed, adding that she went back and forth on that; however, it seemed Action 4.1 could be a broader action that applied to more businesses, whereas 4.2 was really more targeted towards the food cart program and the affordable commercial space.
 - How has Action 3.1 been implemented so far since the city already has commercial uses in select industrial areas. How did developers get approval to put a cross-fit gym in an industrial area or were they all in commercial areas? (Slide 14)
 - **Associate Planner Luxhoj** explained that current restrictions limit non-industrial uses in industrial areas to 5,000 square feet within a building or 20,000 square feet within multiple buildings on a site, which generally includes all the indoor/outdoor retail functions of a particular business.
 - Action 3.1 was the most concerning because the industrial areas were meant to be industrial areas and given that the city already had a lot of underutilized commercial land, caution should be taken about allowing more commercial use in an industrial area because it might be easier to partition a big building for commercial use. Expanding commercial use might lead to the permanent loss of industrial land.
 - **Ms. Goodman** agreed that was a valid concern, having watched some cities turn all their industrial land to commercial uses. It was important to note the discussion regarded non-retail uses, such as flex uses because sometimes, the line between light industrial and heavy commercial was pretty blurry. For example, architects often like to locate in old industrial spaces, not Class A office space; businesses that were not necessarily manufacturing and not quite a traditional office use; not a grocery store or even a hair salon, but other employment uses that were happy enough to locate in an industrial area where space was less expensive.
 - The Action 3.1 section states, “commercial recreation, gyms, climbing facilities, entertainment venues, and offices or co-working spaces that are not directly tied to an industrial operation.”
 - **Ms. Goodman** suggested limiting the uses more to the type of employment the Commission believed would be more helpful to see in industrial areas or less threatening to industrial areas.
 - The benefits of the commercial recreation side were understood, but the uses were not large employers or provide high wage jobs. The City would not be getting many of the benefits the Commission was looking for from industrial land by allowing those uses, so was it really something to focus on?

- **Ms. Underwood** replied the project team would consider that feedback and bring it to Council as well.
- The EDS was helpful. Having the focus areas were appreciated, including how the actions were tethered directly toward the focus areas, which seemed to make logical sense. Action 3.1 regarding the expansion of allowable non-retail uses did say “consider” which was a broad term. (Slide 14)
- Adding language was suggested to support minority-owned businesses or put an emphasis on how to bring in people with different identities that could bring unique opportunities to the city. Maybe an action could be added to Focus Area #4 Lack of unique retail and dining experiences or perhaps the topic was just something to be mindful of. (Slide 15)
 - **Ms. Underwood** believed it could live within some of the actions as an area for the City to focus. It could be also an action or part of the implementation.
 - Perhaps language could be added in Action 4.4 to be more explicit around diverse restaurants and shops. The goal was to identify a couple areas that would be unique.
 - The project team was asked to consider opportunities to include more of the suggested language.
 - **Economic Development Manager Lorenzen** suggested Staff consult with the City’s Legal Department about how to execute the concept without being preferential or discriminatory.
 - **Ms. Underwood** clarified that Action 4.4 called out Town Center because it was from the Town Center Plan, which was where the City was most likely to have additional funding if an urban renewal area (URA) were to function.
- Does the City have data on the kind of unique retail or dining experiences people were leaving Wilsonville for?
 - **Ms. Underwood** noted that interviews and the Town Center Plan indicated a desire for more non-chain restaurants and specialty items like food carts.
 - **Economic Development Manager Lorenzen** confirmed food carts was definitely a recurring theme, which was reflected in the EDS. As far as what people were leaving for, whatever reasons the Commissioners would leave for was probably aligned with the general population.
- Having more concrete goals for Focus Area #4 about what specific things the City wants to develop in the future Town Center would be helpful to make sure the public is aligned on the goals or provide feedback otherwise.
 - **Economic Development Manager Lorenzen** agreed Action 4.4 was stated in pretty broad terms but it would be fine-tuned if the City implemented a program to accomplish the goal with input from the Planning Commission, City Council, and other committees to tailor the program to the community's desires.
 - Hearing what the community wants might spark somebody to start that unique opportunity.
- There was a lot of talk about recruiting or attracting, but some beloved local businesses have gone out of business. Does the EDS include support for retaining existing restaurants, retail and other local businesses that were struggling?

- **Ms. Underwood** clarified that Actions 4.1, 4.2, and 4.3 (Slide 15) could support local businesses. The project team heard that high rents were the major cause of local businesses closing. Exploring commercial space models (Action 4.3) could be for local residents who have a business idea and want to grow or are already established in Wilsonville. If that was not clear in the EDS, she would be sure to clarify the language.
- Could the City act as a resource connector to outside programs, such as the County's vocational rehab program, for businesses struggling to find qualified workers?
 - **Ms. Underwood** stated Actions 5.1 and 6.1 were intended for the City to act as a connector/convener role or one stop shop to existing resources and programs. (Slide 16)
- Some nearby communities have new restaurants and grocery stores. Has the City benchmarked with other metro cities' policies regarding successful economic development plans and incentives?
 - **Ms. Underwood** confirmed the project team generated ideas from other cities, including Hillsboro for workforce connections, Gresham for business communication elements, and Tigard for food cart launch programs, but did not do specific benchmarking. Some ideas could live under these Actions to refer back to what other cities are doing successfully.
 - **Economic Development Manager Lorenzen** added Hillsboro and Portland had executed land aggregation in their industrial areas successfully.
- Retail, industrial, and dining came to mind when thinking of Sherwood, which had a lot of industrial development and fresh new restaurants that did not seem to be struggling.
 - **Economic Development Manager Lorenzen** noted a big factor in Wilsonville was the lack of affordable space, which the City had little control over. A good piece of Town Center and almost all of Old Town Square was owned by one real estate investment trust, which changes how market dynamics work as one major player was setting the bar. The City was not powerless to do anything, but some complicating factors exist. The fact that Wilsonville was on I-5 is both a blessing and a curse. Landowners in the city could wait for a credit tenant, which was not usually a mom-and-pop establishment, but a national brand that will pay reliably month after month. It was great that the city's commercial property was in high demand, but that did cause a degree of turnover and more national brands than the small unique businesses everyone wanted.
- Perhaps some language could be added around business retention to be very clear about that intent.
- The desired outcomes included discussion around employment opportunities and increasing wages but perhaps the desired outcomes or some of the strategies could emphasize the importance of maintaining and growing existing Wilsonville businesses, which was a gap in the EDS, as well as recruiting additional businesses.
- Priority actions should include anything related to helping land get ready to be developed, as well as any dedicated funding sources for making things happen. The Commission had multiple conversations about not being in a place to bring on opportunities.

Chair Hendrix confirmed there was no public comment.

INFORMATIONAL

3. City Council Action Minutes (October 6, 9, & 20, 2025) (No staff presentation)
4. 2025 PC Work Program (No staff presentation)

Chair Hendrix congratulated former Commissioner Sam Scull, who was now on City Council, and shared her experience applying for City Council, encouraging other capable Commissioners to consider applying in the future.

ADJOURN

The meeting was adjourned at 6:55 p.m.