



PLANNING COMMISSION

MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 28, 2026

ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

1. Consideration of the August 12, 2026 Planning Commission minutes



**Wilsonville Planning Commission
Regular Meeting Minutes
August 12, 2026**

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

CALL TO ORDER - ROLL CALL

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

Present: Yana Semenova, Matt Constantine, Nicole Hendrix, Andrew Karr, Rob Candrian, and Jeff Zundel

Excused: None

Staff Present: Miranda Bateschell, Amanda Guile-Hinman, Amy Maag, Zach Weigel, Chris Myers, and Mandi Simmons

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

CITIZEN INPUT

A handout received from Ryan Schera, Schnitzer Properties, LLC, related to the Wilsonville Industrial Land Readiness Project was distributed to the Planning Commission.

ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

1. Consideration of the July 8, 2026 Planning Commission Minutes
The July 8, 2026 Planning Commission minutes were accepted as presented.

PUBLIC HEARING

2. Town Center Building Height Waiver (Guile-Hinman)

Chair Semenova read the conduct of legislative hearing rules into the record and called the public hearing to order at 6:04 pm.

City Attorney Guile-Hinman presented the Town Center Building Height Waiver project via PowerPoint, providing background on the decades-long community effort to create a more vibrant downtown and reviewing the current Code provisions, prior input, and proposed revisions as follows:

- The Town Center Plan originated from a 2015–2017 Council goal, with pre-work beginning in 2016, the project starting in 2017, and adoption of the Town Center Plan in May 2019, which included the adoption of related Development Code amendments, particularly the updates to the Town Center Zone.

- In 2025, a new Council goal on Town Center communication and education led to a *Let's Talk, Wilsonville!* questionnaire and fall 2025 focus groups; feedback reconfirmed the community's desire for a vibrant Town Center as a place to meet, gather, and interact with each other, and raised concerns about building height and the feel within the Town Center. Staff subsequently presented Council with the option of examining the Town Center Building Height Waiver language.
- In March 2026, Council adopted Resolution No. 3244 to consider modifications to the Town Center building height waiver regulations.
- The Town Center subdistricts are generally covered in the Town Center Zone, but additional regulations govern each subdistrict, including the building heights allowed outright: C-MU (C-MU), 2 to 5 stories; Mixed-Use (MU) and Main Street District (MSD), 2 to 4 stories; N-MU (N-MU), 2 to 3 stories, reflecting the intent to scale development down from the I-5 corridor toward the residential neighborhood to the east. (Slide 4)
- Current Code provisions recommended for revision:
 - The Building Height Waiver provision in Wilsonville Code (WC) 4.132(.06) D currently applies only to the C-MU and Mixed-Use subdistricts and allows waivers to both floor plate size and number of stories. The proposed provision originated from Planning Commission discussion about accommodating anchor retail tenants that might require larger floor plates and allowing buildings, particularly one-story buildings, to come in below the outright-allowed building heights. The existing language was found to be imprecise, prompting this Code revision project. (Slide 5)
 - Bonus Floor for Affordable Housing provision (WC) 4.132(.06) C. Table 2. While not part of the Building Height waiver provision, the Bonus Floor provision exists within the Dimensional Standards table which establishes outright-allowed building heights and other dimensional development requirements within the Town Center subdistricts.
 - Based particularly on City Council feedback, Note 4 would be added next to each allowed building height in Table 2, stating that within the MSD, MU, and C-MU subdistricts, building stories could be increased by one story if a minimum of 25% of the units of the bonus floor area are affordable.
 - She explained that when discussing the community's understanding of what could be built under current regulations, the ability to obtain this bonus floor also needed to be considered to be transparent about what could occur.
- Prior Input: As part of Resolution No. 3244, City Council established the Building Height Waiver Task Force to provide recommendations and input to the Planning Commission and City Council. The Task Force, Planning Commission, and City Council were each presented with multiple options and revisions to those options for potentially revising the waiver language. At City Council's direction, each group was asked to identify a preferred alternative from among the options and then compare that preferred alternative against eliminating the waiver to increase building height.
 - The Task Force preferred Option 5, with an open question about whether to limit the waiver in the MU East area closest to N-MU, while continuing to allow a waiver in the MU area closest to C-MU. The Task Force preferred Option 5 over elimination of the waiver, 6 to 2. The Planning Commission was split between Options 5 and 6 as its

preferred alternative but was generally supportive of eliminating the waiver to increase building height over those options, 3 to 2, with the minority also commenting that they were not necessarily opposed to eliminating the waiver. City Council reached consensus to eliminate the waiver to increase the building heights in C-MU and MU and to remove Note 4, making Table 2's outright allowed heights the maximum height permitted under local regulations.

- Based on the prior input, Staff recommended the following proposed Code revisions as shown in the meeting packet (Slides 9 & 10):
 - Remove the waiver to increase the building height. Rather than the existing provision allowing waivers to the floor plate and/or number of stories, the proposed language would retain only the waiver to decrease the building height and also clarify that a building floor plate could be expanded only when the building height is being decreased, consistent with the intent of the original Planning Commission discussion. This would prevent a development from obtaining a larger floor plate while also building to the full height otherwise allowed in the applicable Town Center subdistrict.
 - Clarify that Wilsonville Code 4.119, the City's general waiver provision that allows waivers to building heights and other eligible provisions, is not available as an alternative pathway to increase building heights in the Town Center Zone. She explained that the recommendation reflected the intent of earlier discussions in the minutes and prior Planning Commission meetings.
 - Remove the "Bonus Floor" for Affordable Housing by deleting Note 4. Due to the costs associated with building affordable housing, the bonus floor provision was unlikely to be utilized without investment from government and other entities. With that level of investment, an entire building or the vast majority of a building would likely be affordable housing. City Council therefore questioned retaining a provision that created ambiguity about allowable building height when it was unlikely to be utilized. She noted that if Council determined in the future that the bonus floor should be reinstated, it could be added back through a similar Code amendment process.
- She noted Resolution No. LP26-0003 recommended City Council adoption of the proposed Development Code amendments.

Chair Semenova confirmed there were no questions of Staff and no public testimony from anyone in attendance in person or virtually.

Commissioner Karr moved to adopt Resolution No. LP26-0003, recommending adoption of Development Code amendments regarding building heights in the Town Center Zone. Commissioner Candrian seconded the motion.

Commissioner Candrian spoke in support of eliminating the waiver for increased building height, noting that starting without waivers preserves the greatest long-term flexibility for the City. If greater height were allowed from the outset, someone could build higher and, if the community did not like the result or other developers did not want to build that high, it could become problematic. If taller buildings become the norm in future years, the City retains the

ability to allow greater height, but scaling back would be difficult if increasing height was permitted from the outset.

Commissioner Karr thanked Staff, the Planning Commission, Task Force, and community members for their input, noting the process helped clarify community priorities and informed his decision to support eliminating the waiver provisions.

Commissioner Zundel echoed thanks to Staff, fellow Commissioners, and community members who had contributed to the drafts, discussions, and expression of opinions throughout the process. While he did not necessarily agree that eliminating the waiver provided greater flexibility, the proposed changes appeared to reflect what the dominant voice of the community wanted. He believed the changes were restrictive and would limit what builders could do, but in a deliberate manner that reflected the community's preferences. However, he did not believe the community's position was clear, expressing concern that louder voices could overpower or discourage other community discourse. He wished for more frank community conversations without devolving into mischaracterizations and mudslinging sometimes seen online or in Council Chambers.

- He clarified his prior vote did not reflect a personal preference for having building waivers or taller buildings in Town Center but was intended to reflect what the community expressed in the survey results and Task Force findings which was to allow building height waivers; though proceeding in the opposite direction was not necessarily wrong since other inputs were also being considered.
- He did not oppose the proposed amendments and supported the outcome, which he believed appeared to reflect the will of the community, but emphasized that the community's actual position on the issue was unclear.

Chair Semenova expressed support for the proposed changes, noting that, after listening to the many deliberations and vision expressed by the Planning Commission over the years, the changes were more reflective of that vision and of what the city center should look like.

Chair Semenova declared the public hearing closed at 6:25 pm.

The motion passed 6 to 0. (Ayes: Constantine, Hendrix, Karr, Candrian, Zundel, Semenova. Nays: None.)

WORK SESSION

3. Transportation Performance Measures (Maag)(30 Minutes)

Planning Director Bateschell explained that recurring Commission questions about the city's transportation system, how facilities are designed, and how they interrelate with land uses and different master planned areas in the community prompted tonight's presentation from the City's Engineering team to orient the Commission on the goals and guidelines in the City's Transportation System Plan (TSP) and how the City measures its performance in executing the TSP and reviews the TSP's performance. The information is foundational to Community

Development work and would provide useful context for the Commission's feedback on future items.

Development Engineering Manager Maag introduced the DKS consultants, noting DKS works with the City every three years to produce a performance monitoring report, assessing the City's progress toward the TSP's goals and policies. The current review was underway and would be completed this fall. Tonight's presentation would provide a higher-level discussion of the TSP's goals and policies and establish the framework for how the City viewed its transportation system.

Jenna Bogert, Transportation Engineer, DKS Associates, presented Wilsonville Transportation Goals via PowerPoint, reviewing the seven transportation system goals established in the Transportation System Plan (TSP), which guide transportation design and funding priorities and support the City's overall transportation vision. The TSP is a sub-element of the Comprehensive Plan and is consistent with State and regional transportation goals. Bogert reviewed how the goals are implemented through City policies, standards, and planning documents and how progress is evaluated and monitored through transportation studies and the City's three-year Performance Monitoring Report. The City's standards would continue to apply to new streets in the Basalt Creek area, including bicycle and pedestrian facilities supporting multimodal connectivity goals.

The project team addressed questions and key Commissioner comments were as follows:

- **Ms. Bogert** explained that performance measurements draw from multiple data sources, including annual crash data, traffic counts collected during TSP updates, development traffic impact studies, and other City transportation analyses, which are compiled to track changes in traffic volumes over time.
- **Scott Mansur, DKS Associates**, noted camera and AI technology can be used to evaluate near misses and was frequently used at high-crash locations. The technology was expensive and typically used where more fatal and serious injury crashes occur. Wilsonville has a very safe network with one five-year period with no fatal crashes, and only one or two in the last five years but they did not occur at intersections.
- **Mr. Mansur** confirmed the increased tracking mentioned in the Staff report was part of the new Climate-Friendly and Equitable Communities (CFEC) requirements, which the City would be required to monitor. He commended the City, noting Wilsonville was one of the only cities monitoring its progress.
- **Mr. Mansur** explained that bicycle and pedestrian data collection had expanded significantly, especially since previous data had to be collected in person, and now pedestrian data was also being collected. However, e-bike trips were currently included within the bicycle and pedestrian data but could not be differentiated from regular bicycle trips, which could skew bicycle-trip data. He acknowledged the different safety issues associated with regular bicycles and e-bikes were a challenge being discussed with City Engineering and police Staff.

- **Ms. Bogert** confirmed that the National Community Survey results, collected roughly every two years, comprise a sizable portion of the Performance Monitoring Report and were cross-referenced with what is actually being implemented and with the public's perception of the transportation system.
- **Mr. Mansur** explained that rather than comparing individual TSP goals to determine which should take priority, projects were evaluated against all seven goals. The TSP had a 20-year horizon. When TSP projects were identified, financial constraints were also part of the process because there were always more projects than funding available. The TSP goals were used to develop evaluation criteria through the public process, and projects were scored against those criteria. A project might be really expensive and not cost effective but would improve safety and be an amazing connection for the city, which was why all the goals are considered when scoring or evaluating projects. Project scoring was reviewed through the public process, allowing the community to determine whether priorities such as safety should receive greater weight. The overall evaluation helped Staff recommend which projects should advance as most consistent with the City's transportation goals.
- **Ms. Bogert** explained that trips not taken because people lacked facilities or did not feel comfortable walking or biking were considered through the Bicycle Level of Traffic Stress scale, which ranged from Level 1 corridors comfortable enough for children to ride independently to Level 4 corridors generally comfortable only for experienced cyclists riding next to high-speed traffic. The City aimed for more Level 1 and 2 corridors and considered latent demand, trips foregone due to unsafe or uncomfortable conditions, for bicycle and pedestrian trips when facilities were not present as part of corridor design and future development planning, such as Frog Pond East.
- **Mr. Mansur** added that accounting for trips not taken also involved providing a well-connected multimodal system which was a core goal of the TSP. A road might have few cyclists because it did not yet connect anywhere; bicycle use could change once a bridge, or other connection provided a route from one destination to another. Transportation planning considers land use, job centers, residential locations, and transit access to ensure safe routes exist for every transportation mode between destinations.
 - **Commissioner Zundel** acknowledged that the discussion about last-mile connections and providing multimodal ways for people to get to work reinforced Staff's response to his question during a prior Basalt Creek discussion about providing bicycle lanes on roads carrying heavy vehicle traffic. He was interested in further exploring how the data supported providing alternatives to driving as a way to address vehicle traffic, which was a significant community concern.
- **Mr. Mansur** responded that interagency coordination occurs through the TSP Technical Advisory Committee which included representatives from neighboring counties and jurisdictions affected by Wilsonville transportation decisions or that owned connecting facilities. Similar coordination occurred when neighboring jurisdictions prepared their TSPs, providing opportunities to discuss desired connections, such as safe bicycle facilities between Wilsonville and West Linn. Metro's regional trail plans provided another means of planning connections between cities and through the counties. While gaps remained in Wilsonville's system, the TSP identified planned facilities that would be built as

development occurred and projects were funded. The City also reevaluated planned facilities as standards evolved, such as considering protected bicycle lanes where the 2013 TSP identified on-street bicycle lanes, to determine the safest option when streets were built.

- **Commissioner Candrian** noted that North Marion County had a designated scenic cycling area with shoulders providing space for cyclists even on busy roads and suggested the Stafford area had similar potential for bicycle tourism, including routes between West Linn and Wilsonville with stops at Town Center.
- **Development Engineering Manager Maag** added that Wilsonville Staff reviewed and commented on neighboring jurisdictions' TSP processes and draft plans. Staff also coordinated on capital projects, including working with Clackamas County on the 65th Avenue/Stafford Road roundabout, although Wilsonville did not determine how neighboring jurisdictions prioritized their capital projects.
- **City Engineer Weigel** explained that smaller gaps in the transportation system identified by community members were tracked through the City's CRM portal and addressed over time as funding became available. Funding, however, was limited and typically provided for three or four crosswalks or similar improvements every couple of years. Larger connections were also identified in County and Metro plans, including a Stafford Road shoulder-widening project and regional trail plans. The City planned to extend the Boeckman Creek Regional Trail in Frog Pond to Memorial Park, but the County had plans to extend the regional trail along Boeckman Creek through the county up Stafford Road all the way to I-205, extending the 205 Trail clear to Gladstone; plans existed for all the work, but funding was needed.
- **Mr. Mansur** explained that lower-cost, temporary solutions, such as striping or cones, could be used to test an improvement before making a larger capital investment. The first step was to confirm an issue existed, recognizing there could be competing needs, such as demand for the parking spaces being considered for removal. In Town Center, traffic analysis showed volumes were well below what was needed for the existing four or five travel lanes. Despite initial pushback, the City was able to restripe the roadway to add bicycle lanes with the understanding the striping could be reversed if it did not work. The change worked well, demonstrating how lower-cost, reversible improvements could be implemented and evaluated; however, such options were more limited where existing road width did not provide sufficient space for additional facilities.
- **Ms. Bogert** explained that following spikes in crashes or fatalities, DKS analyzed detailed crash data for patterns involving locations, causes, time of day, speeding, impairment, and other contributing factors that could be addressed through a project or improvement. Some spikes could be anomalous, such as the ten serious-injury crashes in 2008 compared to substantially fewer crashes in surrounding years, but Staff reviewed the data for an underlying cause.
 - **City Engineer Weigel** cited the Canyon Creek/Boeckman intersection, formerly one of the City's highest crash-rate intersections, as an example. Crash data showed drivers frequently failed to stop at the four-way stop, which had an unusual configuration with through and left-turn lanes. The analysis contributed to the decision to install a roundabout at the intersection.

- **Ms. Bogert** explained that the updated report would probably include crash data through 2024 because statewide crash data typically lagged approximately two years due to the reporting and public-release process. Notable, more recent crashes known through news reports or City knowledge could be documented and discussed unofficially despite not yet being included in the statewide data.
- **Mr. Mansur** explained that the approximately 24-month lag resulted from Oregon's paper-based crash-reporting process, which required information from police crash reports to be manually entered and could result in information being lost. ODOT had received a grant to transition the process to electronic reporting, which was intended to improve the process.

Planning Director Bateschell offered to check with Staff working with the Tourism Committee about bicycle tourism and designated scenic cycling area and share the information with the Commission by email.

4. Wilsonville Industrial Land Readiness (Basalt Creek Master Plan) (Myers)

Senior Planner Myers introduced the Commission's third and final work session on the draft Basalt Creek Master Plan before the September 9 public hearing. The Commission had reviewed most major plan elements and supporting analysis during the June and July work sessions, so the presentation would focus on revisions made in response to Commission comments and elements not previously presented.

Lauren Scott, MIG, reviewed the draft Master Plan via PowerPoint. The five-chapter structure remained unchanged, with the stormwater evaluation and funding analysis remaining outstanding. The stormwater evaluation was nearly complete, and its major recommended facilities had been incorporated into the draft plan. Revisions since June included expanded treatment of natural resources, including Tapman Creek and Coffee Lake Creek; adjusted Chapter 5 implementation timing to better reflect Staff capacity; and refinements addressing transportation planning, wildlife crossings, planning history, infrastructure, and master planning. Sanitary sewer and stormwater planning were incorporated at a high level, and most placeholder text and figures had been resolved.

Senior Planner Myers continued, reviewing changes following the prior work session. Data centers were changed to a restricted use in all four subdistricts, required to be accessory rather than primary uses, and remained limited to 25,000 sq ft. An industrial services definition was added, and the Northwest Industrial Pattern Book was clarified regarding streets and the multimodal design framework.

- A recent meeting with Ryan Schera and Schnitzer Properties clarified the Track 1 administrative and Track 2 Development Review Board (DRB) pathways available to the property. The City would retain the design standard limiting parking between an addressing street and building frontage to 16 spaces per structure, reflecting the longstanding principle

of avoiding large expanses of parking in front of buildings. Staff continued working with Schnitzer Properties on other concerns, including connectivity, with additional information provided in Attachment 4.

Development Engineering Manager Maag continued the PowerPoint, reviewing the infrastructure planning for future development. Planned water extensions would generally follow the transportation network, with the system looped for reliability and fire service and line sizing coordinated with development needs. Sanitary sewer would primarily use gravity service following road alignments and terrain, with a lift station anticipated near Grahams Ferry Road to serve the West Railroad area.

Commissioner comments were as follows with questions addressed by Staff as noted:

- **Senior Planner Myers** explained that the regulating Master Plan and Pattern Book identify addressing streets within the Basalt Creek Master Plan area, generally corresponding to the higher-volume or larger street fronting a site.
- The memo summarizing the Schnitzer Properties discussions and Staff's work navigating those meetings were appreciated.
- The Commission's prior comments, including those regarding data centers, had been well addressed.
- **Development Engineering Manager Maag** explained that the master plan includes a funding plan for infrastructure, with much of the infrastructure expected to be funded and installed through private development. Much of the stormwater system would also be privately owned and maintained. The City would own and maintain the water and sewer systems to meet State law and public health requirements, with new development paying its proportional share through rates. Although development would initially construct new infrastructure, its ongoing monthly fees would also help offset the cost of aging infrastructure throughout the city.
- **Commissioner Candrian** raised concerns about allowing data centers. Exhibit 31 showed data centers' electricity demand of 5 to 100 megawatts (MW) far exceeding the maximum 6 MW of other potential uses listed. The proposed accessory-use definition could contain a loophole that would allow a company to structure its operations to effectively make the data center a primary use. Having data centers as a permitted or acceptable use was dangerous, especially with regard to water and electricity consumption. Data centers also employed relatively few people compared to the employment envisioned for Basalt Creek. He preferred prohibiting data centers altogether, but if he was in the minority, accessory uses should be more strictly defined; perhaps even with regard to the amount of power that could be used in specific locations to ensure loopholes could not be exploited if data centers are allowed.
 - **Planning Director Bateschell** read the existing Accessory Use definition (Slide 15) and noted additional restrictions could be considered if the Commission did not want to prohibit data centers entirely. Rather than relying only on the existing square-footage limit, the City could limit an accessory data center to a percentage of the primary building or use, such as a maximum of 10 percent of the main use on site. Data centers

could also be changed from a restricted use to a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) only, requiring review by the DRB even if the proposal otherwise met the Track 1 process criteria.

- **Chair Semenova** questioned if data centers were allowed, whether a study or other review should determine whether a proposed data center could constrain other development by consuming available electricity or water system resources. While existing infrastructure might have capacity for the data center, subsequent development could become substantially more expensive if additional transmission or water-system capacity was then required. She also asked whether the sewer and water infrastructure presented for Basalt Creek could support the resource demands of a data center.
- **Development Engineering Manager Maag** explained that data centers varied widely in their power and water usage, largely depending on how the facility was cooled; some used more power while others used more water. The Governor had convened a task force that spring to examine data centers, including their power and water usage, and Maag offered to provide links to the task force discussions for additional information. If a large water user impacted the City's water system, the developer would be responsible for contributing to the necessary system upgrades. Power infrastructure was under Portland General Electric's (PGE) control, and existing standards limited PGE's ability to extend new transmission routes through the city. A data center requiring significant power might be possible along Grahams Ferry Road near existing transmission routes, while other areas, such as Clay Street, might not be able to accommodate one. PGE understood the amount of power available for Wilsonville and continued to track that capacity. Given the wide variation in water and power consumption, she recommended limiting data centers by square footage rather than attempting to limit resource consumption. She confirmed that square footage would be the more effective approach for restricting data centers and preventing a loophole.
- **City Attorney Guile-Hinman** explained that regulating data centers based on usage could be challenging if usage increased over time. From a Code enforcement perspective, square footage was much easier to regulate than resource usage, particularly because the City would not have access to power-usage data. She supported considering both size limitations and the review process, noting that a CUP provided more than a simple discretionary review path.
- **Planning Director Bateschell** explained that data centers were currently proposed as a restricted use in all four subdistricts, meaning they could not exceed 25,000 sq ft and had to be an accessory use. A standalone 25,000-sq-ft data center would not qualify; an applicant would have to demonstrate a primary building and primary use, with the data center incidental and in addition to that use. However, as a restricted use, a qualifying data center would be allowed by right. Whether reviewed through the DRB or the Track 1 administrative process, the clear and objective standards could be reviewed and approved by Staff. If the Commission wanted to further limit data centers, they could instead be designated as a CUP, while retaining a size limitation based on square footage or a percentage of the primary use. A CUP would require DRB review through a discretionary process, providing an opportunity to determine whether the use was appropriate in the

particular circumstances and consistent with surrounding development, and to condition the use accordingly. The Commission could determine the appropriate level of oversight by subdistrict, including retaining data centers as a restricted use in the High-Tech subdistrict with a CUP in the other subdistricts, requiring a CUP in all subdistricts, or prohibiting data centers outside the High-Tech subdistrict and requiring a CUP within High-Tech.

- **Planning Director Bateschell** believed 15 percent or less seemed reasonable as an accessory use when the primary use occupied the remaining 85 percent. Staff could also assess the existing data center in Wilsonville to determine what percentage of the total square footage of the use on the entire site was occupied by the data center. Because the existing data center was clearly permitted as an accessory use, that percentage could provide a reference point and, if consistent with the percentage range identified by the Commission, could be incorporated into the use table.
- **Commissioner Candrian** favored allowing data centers only in the High-Tech subdistrict, questioning the need for data centers in the other subdistricts, such as Craft Industrial. Within High-Tech, he supported requiring data centers to be an accessory use limited to a percentage of the primary building square footage and also requiring a CUP. He questioned whether the regulations could prevent one company from purchasing multiple lots and using the allowable percentage on each property to create a much larger data center. He also questioned how relevant the existing Siemens data center should be as a precedent because it was already approved in a separate area, while acknowledging that it could provide a basis for determining a reasonable percentage for an accessory use.
- **Planning Director Bateschell** confirmed that the existing Siemens data center solely met Siemens' business needs and was not leased to another company. Staff could determine the data center's percentage based on the square footage of Siemens' uses rather than the square footage of the property. The resulting percentage could provide an informative data point for the Commission when considering an appropriate accessory-use limitation, although the Commission would not be required to use it.
- **Commissioner Zundel** questioned what would happen to an accessory data center over time if the circumstances under which it was originally approved changed. Siemens, for example, built a data center as a genuine accessory to its primary business, but what if it later contracted, sold portions of its property, or eventually left Wilsonville, potentially leaving the data center without the primary use upon which its accessory status was based? Perhaps the Commission was focusing on the wrong mechanism. If the underlying concerns were water and power usage, could those impacts be restricted, more meaningfully outside the land-use process, such as through a City license to operate a data center that would be renewed regularly and tied to resource usage.
 - **Planning Director Bateschell** stated she could not identify a clear path for restricting a data center's water or power consumption once the use had been entitled and allowed, noting the Code enforcement challenges associated with obtaining and monitoring resource-usage data or regulating the use through a business-license process. The Commission could combine restrictions, such as limiting a data center to 10 percent of the primary use while also retaining the maximum 25,000-sq-ft cap. The purpose of the square-footage limitation was, to some degree, to limit power consumption because

smaller data centers supporting the business conducted on site generally did not have the water or power demands associated with massive data-center facilities. Data centers could also be prohibited across all subdistricts and reconsidered in 5 to 10 years as conditions evolved. She summarized the Commission's remaining policy choices: whether to allow data centers in all or only some subdistricts, what limitations to impose, and what level of review to require. Based on the discussion and Commissioners' responses, she heard interest in limiting or potentially prohibiting data centers, along with considerable support for requiring a CUP and public review.

- **Commissioner Karr** believed the Commission generally wanted to discourage large data centers and identified a percentage of building square footage combined with an overall square-footage limit and CUP process as potential mechanisms. He questioned whether data centers should be allowed only in the High-Tech subdistrict and prohibited in others, such as Craft Industrial. He distinguished between discouraging large data centers and allowing a high-tech company to have a data center that fit its own business needs.
- **Commissioner Candrian** suggested the City might need to better define a data center, distinguishing between a company hosting servers internally for its own business needs and an external-facing data center providing services to outside users. He reiterated that based on what he had read about other jurisdictions, companies had identified loopholes that resulted in uses that were not originally intended. If that trend could not be prevented, he preferred prohibiting data centers altogether. Rather than having a blanket data-center category, he suggested defining what a company could have to host servers internally solely for its own benefit and not for external-facing operations.
- **Commissioner Karr** agreed with distinguishing internal from external data centers, noting Siemens was likely using its data center for internal proprietary storage rather than e-commerce or providing server capacity to external users. Drawing from his experience working for a large high-tech company, he noted that such companies could have sizable internal servers behind their firewalls that were proprietary and solely for the company's own use. He suggested the definition could potentially distinguish between an internal and an external data center.
 - **Senior Planner Myers** reported that the State was currently working on an official data center definition, which could provide additional guidance for the City. He noted regulating data centers was more complicated than initially anticipated, with the discussion raising numerous issues that would require substantial research to answer accurately because the topic was new and evolving quickly. He suggested the Master Plan might need some type of interim or "stopgap" approach, with the regulations revisited in the future with City Council direction as more information became available.
- Discussion followed about establishing interim data center restrictions that could be revisited as technology and development conditions changed. For example, data centers could initially be prohibited and reconsidered in approximately 10 years if technological advances reduced impacts on the power grid or if Basalt Creek had not fully developed and additional tenants were needed.
 - **Senior Planner Myers** confirmed this was an available approach that Staff could present to City Council as the Planning Commission's current position, recognizing Council could

provide different direction. A Commissioner asked whether the initial regulations should instead include a percentage limitation, square-footage limit, and CUP.

- **Commissioner Zundel** asked how robust the CUP process was and how well it positioned the City to make a defensible decision to deny a data center application, including what could occur if the decision was challenged.
 - **Planning Director Bateschell** explained that the CUP process was fairly discretionary and allowed the City to determine whether a proposed use was suitable for a particular area. An allowed use would be very difficult for the City to deny, and a data center designated as a restricted use would likewise be difficult to further limit if it met the accessory-use definition and applicable size limitation. A CUP, however, would allow the City to determine whether a data center could or could not be suitable for a particular parcel or area and provided the ability to deny the use when supported by evidence. For example, evidence that a proposed data center would draw substantial power or water in an area already approaching maximum capacity could provide a basis for denial.
 - **City Attorney Guile-Hinman** read the general CUP standard, Section 4.184.1, which stated that a conditional use was generally not compatible with surrounding uses unless mitigating conditions of approval were established and allowed the DRB, following a public hearing, to establish conditions necessary to implement the Comprehensive Plan or ensure compliance with Code standards based on the record. In addition to the general standards, the City could establish specific considerations for data centers that the DRB would confirm had been adequately addressed during CUP review.
 - Another regulatory option related to properties being sold or divided over time was requiring an accessory data center to be located on the same site as the primary use rather than on an adjacent property. This would prevent a company with multiple properties from consolidating the allowable data-center space from those properties into one location and creating a substantially larger data center.
- **Commissioner Hendrix** supported a CUP because it would keep options open while maintaining City control. Given the number of potential regulatory mechanisms being discussed, she was not ready to commit to one approach but supported combining a CUP with a square-footage limitation. The Siemens data point would help visualize or understand an appropriate limitation. In response to Staff's clarification, she was comfortable prohibiting data centers in all subdistricts except High-Tech.
- **Commissioner Zundel** believed the Commission was speculating about technology and uses that could not yet be anticipated, noting that even Craft Industrial might have a need for a data center as technology evolved. Rather than prohibiting data centers in certain subdistricts, he favored allowing them as a Conditional Use in all subdistricts to leave the door open for future development that could not be anticipated today. This would allow proposed data centers to be evaluated on a case-by-case basis and provide a more defensible position for the City.
- **Commissioner Karr** questioned whether prohibiting data centers outside High-Tech would provide greater specificity while still allowing the regulations to be changed later. He agreed that the issue also depended on how a data center was defined, questioning whether something as small as a laptop used within a craft business could meet the definition.

- **Chair Semenova** did not support prohibiting data centers, noting they could bring tax revenue, investment, and development that benefited the community despite providing relatively few jobs. She supported keeping options open given how quickly technology, data storage, and computing could change, while ensuring data centers did not consume resources needed for further development. She favored a CUP with criteria addressing those concerns.
 - Commissioners noted that tax benefits could depend on whether incentives were provided and that, if a data center was limited to an accessory use, the primary use could provide much of the taxable value.
 - **Senior Planner Myers** noted that, based on those concerns, the safest approach might be to allow data centers conditionally in all four subdistricts, subject to further City review, while also limiting them to a percentage of the total structure and a maximum of 25,000 sq ft.
- Commissioners reiterated the need to refine the data center definition and supported developing an interim City definition rather than waiting for the State's definition.
- **Planning Director Bateschell** summarized the regulatory tools identified by the Commission, including restrictions on accessory-use size, requiring the data center to be on the same property as the primary use, requiring all data centers to go through the CUP process, and adding review criteria addressing infrastructure usage. Staff would advise City Council that the Commission was split on whether data centers should be allowed only in the High-Tech subdistrict or in all subdistricts. The use table would be refined accordingly.

5. Chapter 4 Code Enforcement (Guile-Hinman)

City Attorney Guile-Hinman introduced the City's Code Enforcement Update via PowerPoint, an approximately 18-month effort implementing 2025–2027 City Council Goal 2, Strategy 2.2. The City's general enforcement regulations in Chapter 1 dated largely from the 1980s and lacked specificity, consistency, and effective tools. The City followed a compliance-first approach, but that approach was not codified. Most substantive changes would occur in Chapter 1, with the Planning Commission responsible for recommending related Chapter 4 amendments.

- The proposed Chapter 1 update would establish a standardized administrative process for civil Code violations, formally incorporate compliance agreements, provide a broader fine structure and administrative appeal process, and add enforcement tools such as stop-work orders and withholding permits. Processes governed by other laws would remain separate. Chapter 4 amendments would generally conform to the new Chapter 1 process while retaining necessary exceptions, such as tree-preservation mitigation, and clarifying enforcement responsibilities.
- The Planning Commission would review the Chapter 4 amendments in September, followed by a public hearing in October. City Council consideration of the full Code package was planned for November, with an anticipated effective date of January 1, 2027.

City Attorney Guile-Hinman addressed questions as follows:

- The City would conduct a public information campaign through the *Let's Talk Wilsonville* project page and *Boones Ferry Messenger*. Citations were currently rare in Wilsonville because most Code enforcement matters did not need to reach that point.
- Nearly all applicable Chapter 4 enforcement provisions would be addressed in Chapter 1, with specific exceptions retained where needed, such as the tree preservation mitigation process.
- The Code enforcement update project, which became a Council Goal, originated from recent land use and Code violations where the existing Code had been challenging to work within, and Staff had to get creative in gaining compliance.
- When Staff could not gain compliance, police could issue a citation, which would then proceed through Municipal Court. A recent case involved \$500 per violation per-day fines that were not sufficient to gain compliance, but the pressure of going to court and having the fines assessed eventually brought the violator to the table to enter into an agreement with the City.
 - **Planning Director Bateschell** added that several provisions of the agreement had not been completed as required, although complete compliance was anticipated within a few months.
- The proposed Code would provide additional tools for gaining compliance, including recording unpaid fines in the City's lien docket, which generally would not require payment until the property was sold; issuing stop-work orders; and withholding permits on other properties owned by a violator.

INFORMATIONAL

6. City Council Action Minutes (July 13, 20, & 30, 2026)(No Staff presentation)
7. PC Work Program (No Staff Presentation)

Planning Director Bateschell provided the following updates:

- Due to the Veterans Day holiday, the November Planning Commission meeting would be held on Thursday, November 12. The Commission would convene as the Committee for Citizen Involvement and host the annual housing cost burden community conversation, with the annual housing report also presented.
- As part of the Housing Statutory Compliance Part Two project, Staff planned a September meeting with arborists, technical professionals, and engagement experts to help develop clear and objective tree standards. The discussion would consider measurable standards that supported the City's tree preservation objectives and could be readily assessed by arborists. Commissioner Zundel volunteered to serve as the Commission liaison. Staff would notify the Commission once the meeting was scheduled so other Commissioners could provide input.
- A *Let's Talk, Wilsonville!* page was being developed for the tree standards project, and Staff planned to gather community input on what residents valued about trees through a brief survey at Party in the Park on August 20.
- Party in the Park would also include this year's volunteer appreciation event, with a booth for City volunteers.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:42 p.m.

ABC Transcription DRAFT