



PLANNING COMMISSION

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 11, 2024

ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

2. Consideration of the November 13, 2024 PC Meeting Minutes

Draft PC Minutes are to be reviewed and approved at the December 11, 2024 PC Meeting.



**Wilsonville Planning Commission
Regular Meeting Minutes
November 13, 2024**

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

CALL TO ORDER - ROLL CALL

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

Present: Ron Heberlein, Yana Semenova, Jennifer Willard, Sam Scull, and Nicole Hendrix

Excused: Andrew Karr and Matt Constantine

Staff Present: Daniel Pauly, Amanda Guile-Hinman, Kimberly Rybold, Kerry Rappold, Miranda Bateschell, and Mandi Simmons

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

CITIZEN INPUT

There was none.

ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

1. Consideration of the October 9, 2024 Planning Commission Minutes
The October 9, 2024 Planning Commission minutes were accepted as presented.

WORK SESSION

2. Housing Our Future (Rybold)

Comments received from Chair Andrew Karr via email dated November 12, 2024, are attached.

Daniel Pauly, Planning Manager, noted the importance of the conversation on housing solutions, which would continue over the next few months.

Kimberly Rybold, Senior Planner, Housing Our Future Project Manager, reminded about the Planning Commission's joint work session held in July 2024 with City Council on the Housing Needs and Capacity Analysis (HNCA), which would be finalized in early 2025. Since July, the Housing Our Future Task Force had also been meeting to discuss strategies to meet the city's housing needs identified over the next 20 years, which was the Housing Production Strategy (HPS) part of the Housing Our Future Project.

- This work session’s primary focus was to consider the Task Force’s potential actions to meet future housing needs and discuss contextualized housing needs based on interviews and public outreach to provide a more nuanced understanding of future housing needs.
- The Commission’s feedback would prioritize potential actions to help focus and direct the City’s resources to best address future housing needs.

Beth Goodman and **Nicole Underwood, ECONorthwest**, presented the Wilsonville HPS via PowerPoint, reviewing the HPS project schedule and six-year action plan process, as well as the completed and planned public engagement plans. Also presented were statistics related to understanding the city’s unmet housing needs (Slides 6-10), a city’s role in influencing housing development, existing strategies in Wilsonville, and feedback from the Task Force on actions recommended for further consideration (Slide 14) and those not recommended for inclusion in the HPS (Slide 15).

- Questions for discussion centered on receiving feedback from the Commission about land use related actions and how they relate to needed housing, as well as what information the Commission would like to learn more about. (Slides 16-18)

Senior Planner Rybold noted next steps included a City Council work session in December 2024, reminding the project team sought the Commission’s feedback given its expertise in Development Code and the Comprehensive Plan to inform City Council in determining which actions to include in the HPS. Additional ideas to add to the discussion were also welcome.

- She noted the actions recommended for further discussion (Slide 15) regarded funding and Staff resources, which may or may not be critical to implementing the HPS actions.

Ms. Goodman noted the City already had a tax exemption for low-income affordable housing, and described how Action J would explore potential property tax exemptions for multi-family rental housing and new residential development to make rental and home ownership more affordable for lower income households. (Slide 15)

Feedback from the Commission regarding the actions on Slides 15 and 14 was as follows with responses to Commissioner questions as noted:

Actions not recommended for inclusion in the HPS. (Slide 15)

- Differentiating between actions not truly recommended and actions the City would want to pursue if the capacity was available was difficult. For example, Action C regarding live-work and business accessory units would not cost the City extra to support.
 - **Senior Planner Rybold** explained the Task Force’s reasoning for recommending and not recommending certain actions, noting in some cases, having the County be the lead resource for an action seemed more appropriate and some actions were not particularly discussed, while other actions, like Action D, the Task Force did not seem to know much about, so it was recommended for further discussion by the Planning Commission.

- The Planning Commission was encouraged to leave items on the list that deserved further consideration, share any compelling reasons to pull an action off the list, and ask questions as needed.
- **Ms. Goodman** provided examples and briefly described why the actions were not recommended for inclusion in the HPC.
- **Senior Planner Rybold** highlighted the current review process, noting State legislation over the years has pushed for more clear and objective standards. Conversations at the State level supported approving applications based on meeting clear and objective standards, which could speed up the review process, save money, lower the cost of housing, and create additional certainty.
 - The conversation around Action D was if the City's current clear and objective standards were met, an application should be approved, so why require a public hearing process when nothing discretionary had to be considered?
 - While uncertain about future legislation around approving applications based on meeting criteria, the matter would continue to be raised. Action D would evaluate what the City could do from a procedural standpoint to help reduce housing development costs.
- During Development Review Board (DRB) hearings, allowing public comment seemed to give people a false sense of hope that they could deny an application when it would be approved if the clear and objective standards were met.
 - It was challenging when the public felt like there was an opportunity to make a change when that was not the case and approval was solely based on whether the standards were met.
 - Action D seemed like low-hanging fruit and addressing it with existing Staff seemed feasible. While not a high priority, it could be done quickly, saving Staff time in the long run, and perhaps allowing other actions on the list to be addressed.
- There was consensus that Action D be considered for further discussion and inclusion in the HPS.
- **Ms. Goodman** confirmed that other agencies provide rental assistance (Action M), and some cities have considered providing rental assistance on their own. There was a nearly infinite need for rental assistance.
 - The City's ability to implement Action M would be highly dependent on the City having enough money to offer rental assistance.
 - She did not know about any limits on the amount or length of time rental assistance could be received as long as funds were available. She believed there was a standardized amount of rental assistance a household could apply for based on income, so lower-income households would likely be eligible.
- Given the two sides to the housing issue: building new housing and addressing rental housing, it may be helpful to create separate plans to address both sides of the equation.
 - **Ms. Goodman** replied the HPS actions could be organized based on whether the action addressed developing new housing or existing housing issues, such as housing stability. The HPS would address both sides of the issue.

- While no one action was a silver bullet, the actions would build on each other as they were implemented, such land banking, working with community land trusts, scaling system development charges (SDCs) to different unit sizes (Slide 14) and having a different administrative review process for residential development.
- The HPS actions would also build on the City's existing policies.
- Support was expressed for considering Action C as it provided opportunities for small businesses and for being able to defray costs, while not costing the City much to implement Code changes to support live-work and business accessory units.
- **Senior Planner Rybold** confirmed the feedback received via email from Chair Karr would be included with the Commission's comments, noting his top actions were reflected in the actions proposed for further consideration. Chair Karr's email would also be attached to the meeting minutes. (See attachment)
- **Ms. Goodman** noted City Council would receive a brief memorandum summarizing the feedback from the Task Force and Planning Commission regarding each action and would include Chair Karr's comments.

Actions recommended for further consideration (Slide 14)

- Support was expressed for Action E as many apartments in the city were around 20 years old, and a majority were a mess due to structural issues, housekeeping, fire and safety issues, mold, etc. Having a City-based program that could partner with HOAs or other organizations to keep homes safe and in order for the renters would be valuable.
 - **Ms. Goodman** explained Action E mainly regarded the physical condition of the structures, while Action U regarding a tenant protection program (Slide 15) considered more people-based actions, enabling people to get help from the City with compliance testing for fair housing, working with landlords to help resolve issues, etc.
 - Implementing a rental inspection program or tenant protection program would require additional Staff capacity.
- **Ms. Goodman** explained how a community land trust (CLT) worked to promote development of affordable housing, long-term affordability (Action H) and how the City could partner with a CLT to help households get into home ownership. The purpose of a CLT was to ensure housing stayed affordable over a 50- to 100-year period.
 - The CLTs only applied to home ownership units. The City was taking similar actions to support affordable renting at the Transit Center property.
 - **Senior Planner Rybold** clarified the CLT worked to create affordable home ownership opportunities whether through new construction or purchasing existing units. Some partner CLTs operate in the area, and the goal was to further establish those partnerships and look for opportunities to promote affordable homeownership in Wilsonville.
- **Ms. Goodman** clarified variety of housing types in Action B was different from what already existed in the City as it looked at ~~more~~ possibly establishing a mix of housing requirements, like those in Frog Pond East and South, and applying them over a larger area, possibly the entire city. Development of prefabricated or modular homes could also be incentivized.

- **Ms. Goodman** confirmed Action A was about vacant land and not about repurposing existing Industrial or Commercial vacant structures.
- **Senior Planner Rybold** added that as written, Action A was about looking at land-use and straddled both the Comprehensive Plan designations as well as applicable Development Code regulations to address the underlying zoning of buildings, and the uses allowed in them.
 - Action A essentially addressed where certain uses exist or would be allowed and whether opportunities exist potentially for additional housing.
 - Questions about the need for employment space balancing and interrelating with housing needs could be considered together during the Comprehensive Plan process required to implement Action A, whether specific to the policy or as part of a Comprehensive Plan update.
 - Staff was open to amending verbiage like “redesignating” for added specificity as using various words had been discussed.
 - If the Commission believed both buildings and raw vacant land should be evaluated in Action A, Staff wanted to reflect that point and would consider how that would fit, since the action was so policy and land-use heavy.
- Adding buildings to Action A seemed important as a lot of questions were being asked about why the City was not using some of the vacant commercial or retail buildings to solve some of the housing problems.
 - **Senior Planner Rybold** explained that when scoping out whether the reuse of an existing building was feasible, elements such as design standards, Building Code, and livability, etc. had to be considered. Approving the actions did not involve actually scoping out the projects. The HPS would provide a list of steps for how to approach solutions, and key questions were a helpful part of the current process. Hearing feedback on considering structures rather than being limited to land in Action A for housing solutions was helpful.
- Support was expressed for adding buildings to Action A.
- A fundamental assessment was suggested to determine if the land mix within Wilsonville was appropriate to support businesses and housing or if the percentage of commercial land was higher than would be needed based on expected population growth. The analysis could help drive redesignating the land and/or buildings to support additional housing growth.
 - **Ms. Goodman** replied the City would be engaging in a study looking at Wilsonville’s commercial and industrial land needs.
 - **Senior Planner Rybold** added the second phase of the Wilsonville Industrial Land Readiness (WILR) Project included an Economic Opportunity Analysis (EOA), which was the commercial/industrial side of this housing work. Actions in the HPS were not intended to operate in a bubble, but would acknowledge and consider other work related to land and building. After receiving the output of the HPS project and EOA, the City would be positioned to consider a Comprehensive Plan update more thoroughly.
 - If included in the HPS, the City would likely implement Action A through a more holistic look at the Comprehensive Plan rather than as its own project without other land use factors.

- Considering the historical projected growth of commercial or residential needs, and which outpaced the other, could be helpful. The city was founded with goals to be an attractive location for industry given its proximity to the interstate.
 - **Ms. Goodman** noted decision makers in other cities hoped for an ideal distribution of land between housing and commercial development, but every city was unique and looking at the City's projected future needs was better than trying to come to some ideal mix, which may not exist.
- While Action F seemed logical, the Commission received a lot of mixed feedback regarding SDCs, with developers saying the SDCs were high, and Staff being able to justify why a particular development had higher SDCs. Understanding more about SDCs, whether it was useful in developing additional housing would be beneficial.
 - **Ms. Goodman** stated much of the need was for smaller and less expensive units and scaling the SDCs to unit size would incentivize building smaller units.
- Support was expressed for the Task Force's recommended actions list.
- Public land disposition seemed easier to accomplish than the other two items in Action G, so why were they grouped together?
 - **Ms. Goodman** explained public land disposition was using land already acquired by the City rather than land the City purposefully purchased and assembled for a specific use. She gave the example of having an urban renewal district where Planning would use some of the funding for parcel assembly, which provided a funding source and expectations regarding the type of housing that would be created. In this case, land banking and parcel assembly made sense.
 - Land banking did not imply buying land and then waiting for 30 years to develop it. Land banking was owning land, deciding what the City wanted to happen on the land, and issuing a request for proposals (RFP) to do the work, which put the City in a powerful position.
- With SDCs and urban renewal as options, what was the benefit of Action Q?
 - **Ms. Goodman** explained some areas did not have the infrastructure needed and could receive funding through lobbying for state or federal funds, and then if more funding was needed, a local improvement district (LID) could be created. Action Q would look for opportunities or solutions to develop vacant land that needed infrastructure to be developable. Basically, how could the City support infrastructure in the area using the amount of money the City had available.
 - **Senior Planner Rybold** noted Action Q was about being broad and more strategic. Infrastructure continued to increase in price, and often in developing new urban areas, cost became the consideration for the feasibility of the housing and/or the ultimate end product.
 - SDCs could be collected when new projects are added, but when reevaluating the SDC formula, SDCs could increase, resulting in increases in housing costs.
 - Action Q was about flexibility in continuing to see what funding sources were available. The State tried to address this through revolving loan programs, and there may be other sources the City was aware of yet. This action was rooted in being open-minded and creative. While SDCs and urban renewals have worked historically,

there was no guarantee that the City could rely on those two funding sources alone going forward.

- If Action Q was more focused on identifying and utilizing state and federal funding to help support infrastructure that would be supported.
- More information on how LIDs worked could be useful, as it seemed SDCs took a wider distribution of cost and spread it out, where a LID concentrated the costs into one area, which would not appear to make housing more affordable.
 - **Senior Planner Rybold** explained that LIDs could be used in a more targeted manner for very specific and localized improvements. For example, a LID could be used for a frontage improvement that affected only three properties but was a critical improvement despite not having a systemwide impact. The improvement would be supported by the development occurring on properties on which the improvement was happening as opposed to being dispersed across the city.
 - In certain circumstances, a LID was a better approach than adding another project to the SDC project list. When a lot of projects were on the list, there was a time component to SDCs where the City did not always have the funding immediately available when needed.
 - **Ms. Goodman** suggested this action could lead with federal and state funds, and then the other funding options could also be explored.
- **Vice Chair Heberlein** stated the actions on his priority list were Actions E, A, O, F, H, and G, noting Actions H and G seemed to go together.
- **Senior Planner Rybold** noted the Commission's next work session on the HPS would be when the HPS documents were drafted. She welcomed the Commission's input to help shape the conversation with City Council, especially regarding land-use items. Knowing why Commissioners felt strongly about including certain actions was helpful, so Staff could convey that reasoning to the City Council and Task Force.
- **Ms. Goodman** clarified that Action T referred to things like the Universal Design Standard or Lifelong Housing Certification which went beyond the Americans with Disabilities Act ADA, and were specific to a unit or housing structure, such as visitability, for instance, not having steps to go into a unit.
 - Accessible design was not about public access, only access to housing for people with disabilities.
- Action I, support preservation of affordable rental housing, was very important.
- In regard to Action K, had the City or County considered a sliding scale for property taxes to encourage/incentivize homeownership, as property taxes were often a significant part of the monthly payment.
 - **Senior Planner Rybold** explained the City had never pursued homebuyer assistance, but research could be done on other homebuyer assistance programs and whether a sliding scale was allowed, and such a program could be implemented in Wilsonville.
 - **Ms. Goodman** noted other cities, like Salem and John Day, used urban renewal to provide property tax relief in certain cases and it was very specific to the unit.

- **Commissioner Hendrix** noted that having the ability to access and stay in accessible housing and ensuring rentals were safe was her highest priority. (Action E) Housing safety included being climate ready with access to air conditioning, heat pumps, etc.
 - **Ms. Goodman** noted that fed into the idea of weatherization and weatherization programs.

INFORMATIONAL

3. Climate Action Plan (Rappold)

Kerry Rappold, Natural Resources Program Manager, presented the Climate Action Plan via PowerPoint, noting the project had started in August and that he would return with a consultant for further discussion with the Planning Commission when more specific strategies and actions were in place. His overview included the background and key steps in developing the Climate Action Plan; how climate change was addressed; the planning paradigm for the Plan's strategies and actions; the required analysis, technical modeling, and public engagement involved; and the anticipated project schedule. Information about the Climate Action Plan was on the Let's Talk Wilsonville website, along with a FAQ section and a community survey open to the public through the end of November.

Comments and feedback from the Commission were as follows:

- Starting to implement climate action changes internally first within the City and practicing what is preached to the community would be a good starting point.
- Middle school and high school students have a lot of passion around the climate, reaching out to schools and teachers to get input from students during public engagement might be worth it.
 - **Natural Resource Manager Rappold** responded the City currently already implemented some things through the Energy Education Squad working with the Energy Trust of Oregon. The City also recently developed a draft energy policy and was trying to model what should be done moving forward in addressing climate change.
- A future version of the Climate Action Plan should include water usage, and that water was not an unlimited resource, even when located along the Willamette River. The new pipeline going into Washington County should be a reminder of how blessed the City was to be next to the river.
 - Water usage would be an interesting goal for the City Council to consider.
 - **Natural Resource Manager Rappold** agreed water usage was important, especially considering the cost of supplying water to the community as well as the associated energy consumption.
- A lot of non-functional grass around the city requires a lot of maintenance with fuel to mow and water to keep the lawns green. Considering Code changes to help discourage non-functional grass would have positive benefits for a Climate Action Plan.
- The outreach plan should include getting middle school and high school students involved in the process of developing the Climate Action Plan, working through the issues, and coming

up with suggestions. Getting kids involved who were already passionate provided an opportunity to get their feet wet in civic service.

4. City Council Action Minutes (October 7 & 21, 2024) (No staff presentation)
5. 2024 & 2025 PC Work Program (No staff presentation)

Daniel Pauly, Planning Manager, stated details about the Rent Burden meeting tentatively scheduled prior to the Planning Commission's December meeting would be sent soon. He also reminded that the Frog Pond East and South Master Plan would go before City Council for adoption on Monday.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 7:40 p.m.

From: Drew Down 69 <drewdown69@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, November 12, 2024 11:20 PM

To: Mandi Simmons <msimmons@ci.wilsonville.or.us>; Miranda Bateschell <bateschell@ci.wilsonville.or.us>; Daniel Pauly <pauly@ci.wilsonville.or.us>

Cc: Ron Heberlein <ronheberlein@gmail.com>

Subject: Re: November 13 2024 PC Packets now available!

Mandi, Miranda and Daniel,

Unfortunately, I just found out that I will be unable to attend tomorrow night's Planning Commission meeting as I am required to attend a work event from 6-9 pm here in Las Vegas.

Here are my thoughts:

Housing Our Future

- Nice write-up on the Executive Summary.
- EcoNorthwest was also a good write-up.
- My prioritization of Actions
 - A=4; B=2; C=5; D=1; E=14; F=3; G=6; H=15; I=13; J=12; K=11; L=18; M=17; N=16; O=20; P=19; Q=7; R=9; S=8; T=10; and U=21
- Comments on Action item A
 - How many lots would this impact?
 - As a city-wide change, can we standardize to streamline the process?
 - Cost by lot of impact of change
- Comments on Action Item B
 - For infill or new construction?
 - If infill, might have considerable pushback from surrounding residents
- Comments on Action Item C
 - Same concern as during Frog Pond discussion
 - If live-work takes away from ground floor commercial in mixed-use areas
- Comments on Action Item D
 - I agree (meet clear & objective standards)
 - Maybe beef up notices of impacted areas to reduce potential pushback
- Comments on Action Item S
 - Need more details or sample language for "Fair Housing as a Housing Policy"
- Comments on Action Item T
 - Define universal design and lifelong housing certification
 - What is the process?
 - Who defined this process?
 - What is the cost to developers?
- Other Action Items
- Comments on Action Items E, F, and G
 - Agree in concept

- Comments on Action Item H
 - How prevalent is this in the Portland Metro area?
- Comments on Action Item I
 - What is the overall potential impact to Build/Maintain ARH units?
 - How much is the current Federal subsidy?
- Comments on Action Item J
 - In essence a city subsidy for a specific time-period.
- Comments on Action Item K
 - Will need substantial funding pool sources
- Comments on Action Item L
 - Partnering with organizations like Rebuilding Together and others
 - What is the funding source
- Comments on Action Item M
 - This is a subsidy
 - What is the cost vs. Public Housing (HUD)?
- Comments on Action Item N
 - What is the total number of unhoused in Wilsonville?
 - What is the cost of this program per unhoused individual
- Comments on Action Item O
 - Not sure this is an appropriate use of URAs unless the area is "Blight" or needs redevelopment
- Comments on Action Item P
 - Only apply tax if not building affordable housing, what % of affordable housing gets this exclusion for the project?
- Comments on Action Item Q
 - Curious, need more details
- Comments on Action Item R
 - Acknowledge this need in concept
- Comments on Action Item U
 - Any existing public programs (state level) or non-profit that provide this?

Climate Action Plan

- Nice Executive Summary
- Questions
 - Do we consider funding during action plan creation or does that follow later.
- Inputs
 - It would be interesting to involve Wilsonville High School science classes into this engagement

Thank you very much for your work on these items.

Andrew Karr