



# **PLANNING COMMISSION**

## **WEDNESDAY, JUNE 10, 2026**

### **ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS**

1. Consideration of the May 13, 2026 Planning Commission minutes



**Wilsonville Planning Commission  
Regular Meeting Minutes  
May 13, 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, Andrew Karr, Rob Candrian, and Jeff Zundel

Excused: Nicole Hendrix.

Staff Present: Miranda Bateschell, Amanda Guile-Hinman, Kim Rybold, and Mandi Simmons

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

**CITIZEN INPUT**

**George Dunn, Wilsonville resident**, spoke regarding the proposed removal of the Town Center height waiver, noting that housing costs are pushing younger residents out of the community they grew up in. Most of the conversations he hears about the waiver revolve around fears of turning into Portland, of building heights, change, and losing the town's culture. However, Wilsonville's culture is not derived from big box stores and empty parking lots, but from its residents. These fears distract the community from its real issues, including an aging population, a shrinking workforce, and the fact that those who keep the community vibrant can no longer live here. For years, many residents have treated Wilsonville like a gated community, but gated communities are expensive, both financially and socially. For Wilsonville to remain strong, housing is needed for young workers, young families, and even the aging parents they care for. Currently, he and his wife must drive more than an hour to provide healthcare transportation for her parents, and the family cannot afford to have them live in town. He asked the Planning Commission to not eliminate the height waiver, which was not a blank check as any project would still be required to go through community review. The Town Center Plan was a 40-year plan and the Planning Commission's decisions would shape the options available to people who are not yet born. By the time the Plan reaches completion, his infant son would be in his 40s, having possibly served a full term on the Planning Commission. If the concern was the pacing or scale of the project, he suggested implementing something like a 10-year moratorium to allow a pause for a decade, giving future generations the opportunity to review the plan based on their needs at that time. It would also give everyone time to breathe and take time with the issue, without removing a tool from future generations that might desperately be needed. He asked that the Commission not take away options from the people

who will inherit the city and urged them to plan for a Wilsonville that welcomes its youth back instead of pushing them away.

**Adam Cunningham, Wilsonville resident**, had read and reviewed all 1,611 pages of the Town Center Outreach Phases 1, 2, and 3, which were not included in the Planning Commission packet materials but should have been. All policymakers involved with Town Center should review the documents in detail because this is where the community's voice can be found, especially given how frequently the award-winning outreach document claims to support the formation of a community-driven plan. Given the three-minute speaking limit, he submitted a written summary of his observations for the record and had 36 pages of detailed notes available upon request. Within more than 1,600 pages of documentation, he found only six references to building heights above five stories. The first reference came from the initial task force meeting in March 2017, when an unidentified participant stated, "Development of taller buildings, even as tall as seven or ten stories, was seen as most appropriate along the freeway corridor." He questioned how this could have been known before any community feedback had been received. Two references in Phase 3 originated from Planning Commission meetings in 2018, neither of which was born of any detectable community input. The remaining three references came from surveys and a Question of the Month. The survey examples, which were actual community input, indicated disfavor by more than 50 percent. The Question of the Month demonstrated a clear preference for the other listed option of four- to six-story mixed-use buildings. Any other time a building of up to six stories was presented to citizens to gauge interest, only disinterest was found. If residents asked for six-story buildings, it was not documented in the City's award-winning outreach. By all appearances, most conversations in these documents centered on three to four stories, and respondents tended to shy away from high-rises. If the award-winning outreach truly accomplished what it purported to do by developing a plan based on a community-driven vision, City staff should be able to provide direct, specific citations from the outreach to support any policy guidance on additional building height. The 2025 Town Center Survey was another critically important document in the discussion. If the Planning Commission had not reviewed the survey results, they were not operating with all the information necessary to advance community-driven policy. Question 6 asked which downtowns residents would like to see Wilsonville emulate, and the top five answers, accounting for more than half of all responses, were Lake Oswego, West Linn, Sherwood, McMinnville, and Canby. He questioned whether anyone had seen a six-story building in any of those towns, particularly in their downtowns. If citizens did request six-story buildings, it should be easy to point to those specific requests. He urged the Planning Commission to be curious about how the City arrived at this point and to demand answers and accountability, adding that citizens deserve it.

**Brad Williams** noted his address and contact information were on file and shifted his intended remarks based on earlier testimony. His personal journey to home ownership in Wilsonville began with working at Mentor Graphics in 1998, living in an apartment across from the high school, and then moving through homes in West Linn, Beaverton, and Hubbard to build equity before eventually being able to live in Wilsonville. He purchased a brand new four-bedroom

house in Hubbard because a new home there was \$75,000 to \$100,000 less than in Wilsonville, even though he did not truly want to live outside the community. This was the necessary process many people go through to build equity unless they are considerably wealthy, which he clarified he is not. The Town Center Plan does not genuinely address affordability, as demonstrated by prices at Vuela, which many people mock online because even that development, intended as an answer to low-income housing, is unaffordable, with some apartments renting for more than his combined mortgage, taxes, and insurance. Increasing building height or the number of units will not make housing more affordable. Suburbs were created so people could get away from high density, overcrowding, and the crime that accompanies those conditions, and he was baffled that the City might recreate those issues in Wilsonville. Wilsonville is not affordable for everyone, but it has many qualities that make it worth the sacrifice of building equity elsewhere to eventually return and live here. The Town Center Plan drawings consistently depicted four-story buildings, and when people are shown a picture of what will be built, they expect that to be the final result. He did not understand why the project continued to get bigger despite the outreach and feedback and questioned whether the Town Center project was being driven by developers and realtors or by Wilsonville's citizens.

**Dina Ochs** stated that this was her first Planning Commission meeting. She grew up in Wilsonville, raised her family here, and had naively assumed community input was taken into account. After hearing that a city official remarked that nobody attended Planning Commission meetings, she made a point of being present, though she did not wish to be and felt she should not have to be present to ensure the community was heard. In May 2024, the Urban Renewal Advisory vote for Town Center failed. Although the vote related to the financing option, it should have been taken as a red flag regarding how people felt about the current Town Center Plan. Ms. Ochs had completed all the surveys and knew residents were never asked about building heights. The most recent City survey clearly showed housing at the bottom of residents' priorities, which did not mean the city should not have housing, only that it was not the foremost priority. Residents expressed a desire for something similar to Lake Oswego, West Linn, Canby, and other cities, none of which have five- to seven-story buildings. Instead, they feature bustling, vibrant communities with ample parking. She recently had dinner in Lake Oswego and found it charming, noting that the city maintained its culture while incorporating a fitting lifestyle. Seven-story buildings did not honor the Wilsonville community. She urged the Planning Commission to review the most recent survey results, which reflected what citizens want, and stated it was the Commission's responsibility to listen to the people, not advance an agenda.

**Kate Johnson, Town Center Building Height Waiver Task Force member**, stated she was present to raise concerns about critical talking points she said continue to be dismissed and had not been raised during Task Force meetings. The future of Town Center is being decided, and the community the Commission serves must guide the decision, not follow it. These decisions are permanent and will reshape the character of Wilsonville for generations. Those most affected deserve more than courtesy consultations, particularly during an affordable housing

crisis, and she questioned the connection. The City is moving too rapidly toward granting developers broad flexibility to construct six- and seven-story apartment buildings in Town Center, backed by public funding as the sole funding mechanism. These are not minor administrative adjustments, and the Commission should slow down and ensure the matter is handled correctly. The Town Center Building Height Waiver Task Force, the body charged with guiding the process, has serious structural problems that undermine its legitimacy. The Task Force's composition does not represent the community. Two members are not Wilsonville residents, and Town Center business owners were largely absent from the table. Community outreach conducted last fall produced clear feedback that was not included and does not appear to be driving the Task Force's work. The process lacks transparency, with key materials and links difficult to access or appearing to downplay what residents actually expressed. The outcome also appears predetermined because every option presented to the Task Force assumes height waivers will continue, while eliminating them was never offered as a choice. The questions being asked do not reflect community concerns, and small group discussions have steered away from the issues residents care most about. During her small group discussion, one Development Review Board (DRB) member remarked that the group had to consider what would appeal to developers. Most tellingly, at the first Task Force meeting, the City's Planning Director framed the Town Center Plan as an urbanization of Wilsonville but never defined the term. What the urbanization of Wilsonville means with respect to waivers should give every Wilsonville citizen pause and every Commissioner reason to ask difficult questions. She clarified they were not asking the Commission to stop development, but to demand a process that is fair, transparent, and genuinely accountable to Wilsonville citizens. The Commission was urged to require that the Task Force reflect the full community, that citizen feedback be meaningfully incorporated, and that all options, including elimination of height waivers, be placed on the table. The window to act is now, and the Commission should use its authority to ensure Wilsonville's future is shaped by its residents, not decided for them.

**Doris Wehler** stated she was a 60-year Wilsonville resident and had attended hundreds of city meetings, including early Planning Commission meetings, and had served on the original Town Center Task Force in 2018 and 2019. The original Task Force recommendation was for buildings as high as four stories. Somewhere between then and now, four stories had become five stories, as evidenced by the five-story apartment building planned for the former Shari's restaurant property. The Council was now considering seven stories. Key takeaways from the Town Center public engagement update included feedback that building height and design were too tall, too modern, and too much like a big city. Participants also expressed concerns about the amount of housing, traffic, loss of small-town feel, and the perception that crime is greater in high-density developments. She urged the Commission to consider what five-story versus seven-story buildings would look like in Town Center. For example, Vuela is a five-story building with four residential floors totaling approximately 30 apartments per floor. Based on the Council's current projection of 2,400 living units in Town Center, she calculated that the equivalent would be approximately 20 five-story apartment buildings. Allowing waivers for two additional stories could increase capacity to approximately 3,600 living units if the number of buildings remained the same. Allowing a waiver for each living floor across 20 buildings could

increase density to approximately 4,800 living units, with even greater density possible if the number of units per floor also increased. This was not what Wilsonville citizens wished to see. If the Town Center Plan was to have any hope of receiving public approval, height waivers for additional floors should not be granted. She also urged the Commission to remember that housing was identified as the least desired attribute of the Town Center Plan. The community wanted a re-envisioning of Town Center that it could support, and adding height waivers would effectively end any chance of that occurring.

**Ned Walls** concurred with comments made by Adam Cunningham. A Wilsonville resident for more than 29 years, he has coached youth and high school football in the community for 27 years and has spent decades getting to know Wilsonville families and residents. His central question was where the evidence exists that residents want buildings as tall as five stories or more throughout Town Center. The City's own outreach findings show that residents value Wilsonville's small-town feel, safety, natural settings, and sense of community, while also expressing concerns about increased density and buildings that feel too much like a big city. In his many years of talking with people, he has yet to hear anyone ask for the kind of dramatic change to Wilsonville's character being discussed. The options under consideration appear to assume height waivers will continue rather than asking whether residents want them at all. More importantly, the work of the Task Force does not appear aligned with feedback gathered during the previous fall's community outreach. Residents raised concerns, but the small group discussions appeared focused on questions that do not fully reflect those concerns. The issue is not simply whether one project receives a waiver, but that repeated waivers gradually shift expectations and weaken original height limits over time. What was intended as an exception eventually begins to become the standard. He has worked in law enforcement in Multnomah County for more than 27 years and, for the last nine years, has worked with many jurisdictions along the I-5 corridor. He said he has seen firsthand how the addition of light rail and apartment buildings can affect a community, noting Rockwood as an example. He has also seen what happens when communities increase density dramatically without fully understanding the long-term impacts. Taller buildings mean more units, more traffic, and more demand on infrastructure, and those changes cannot easily be reversed once they occur. He urged the Planning Commission to slow down before making changes that could permanently reshape Wilsonville and to ensure both the impacts and the community's wishes are fully understood. He questioned whether there is enough demand to fill that many additional units and whether residents have clearly stated this is the direction they want for Wilsonville. Growth is inevitable, but it should reflect the vision of the people who live here, not assumptions made without clear public support. He asked the Commission to gather more data, ensure the process is fully transparent, and directly ask residents if this is truly what they want for Wilsonville.

**Elizabeth Peters, Town Center Building Height Waiver Task Force member**, stated it was a privilege to be part of that group. During outreach conducted last fall, the City asked residents what they wanted in a Town Center. The process included focus groups and a survey completed by 555 people, which she described as a strong response for Wilsonville, and the outreach was conducted by professional consultants hired by the City. The feedback was clear. Residents

support local restaurants, retail, parks, and gathering spaces. Most of all, as others had already expressed, residents value Wilsonville's small-town character. The survey also showed clear concerns about density, with increased density ranked as the top concern. Housing variety and affordable housing ranked near the bottom as reasons to support the plan. After reviewing earlier Town Center outreach processes, she could not find evidence that residents were ever directly asked whether developers should be allowed to exceed the original building height limits in the Development Code, which she characterized as concerning. The City asked residents what they wanted, and residents answered clearly that they want a Town Center that fits Wilsonville's character. Residents do not want substantially taller buildings and increased density. Voters also rejected the Town Center Plan in 2024, and that outcome should matter. If the City moves forward without reflecting community priorities, it risks another rejection in the future. For these reasons, she did not support continued building height waivers for developers and concluded height waivers should be removed from the Town Center Development Code.

**Justin Diaz** noted he has lived in Wilsonville since 2018, and his wife has lived here since 2013. He agreed with Councilor Cunningham's earlier testimony and thanked previous speakers for voicing concerns he also shared. Additional concerns had been communicated to him by immediate neighbors, community members, and a few local businesses he patronizes, and he and his wife shared those concerns as well. They are not opposed to urban renewal, acknowledging it is a valuable, if not necessary, tool. However, they do not support high-density apartments or affordable housing, regardless of whether the structures are below five stories or above. They support a community recreation center, community pool, and new businesses, including retail stores and restaurants. He reiterated opposition to high-density apartments, citing the potential problems they might bring and referencing Portland as an example.

**Rick Peters** agreed with Councilor Cunningham and previous speakers. He continues to hear about incentives and flexibility for developers and asserted that developers should not drive the decisions. The priority voice in decisions and recommendations must be the people who live in Wilsonville. Wilsonville is a suburb, and he questioned why the City is pursuing urbanization when the community has clearly expressed that it values the city for its small-town feel. Tall buildings do not align with what the community desires, and building height waivers should be eliminated. This is precisely why he and his wife are voting yes on Measure 3-632, because the future of Wilsonville belongs in the hands of its residents.

**Kristi Corno** shared her personal experience and opinion after purchasing her first home, a three-story townhouse in Wilsonville, six years ago. What she loves most about the home is her front porch, where she sits regularly, along with a small back deck. She speaks about her front porch often enough that her friends and family know how much it matters to her. She objected to Vuela's design and five-story height. When driving past the building, she wonders where residents sit outside. Mental health is a significant county priority and something she takes seriously, and being outside and having the ability to sit outside on one's own property is important. She felt sympathy for Vuela residents because they do not have decks and appear trapped inside the building. Although she did not know how much influence the Planning

Commission had over building design, picturing many similar buildings in Town Center made her sad. While volunteering at the food bank located on the ground level of Vuela, she met a woman who had recently moved in and asked whether the City would build a small park nearby. The woman then pointed to the wildlife area across the street, which was owned by Metro and designated for wildlife, so she did not believe it would become a park. She acknowledged she may have been reading into the interaction but simply wanted the woman to have a place to sit outside. She could not stand that look or the trajectory she saw the City heading toward. With the former Shari's restaurant property, there would be two five-story buildings with no decks, which was enough for her. Her preference was for two to four stories, which is where she lives. She acknowledged the town does not belong solely to her but asked the Commission to be mindful of the people who will live in these buildings and what their quality of life will be.

**John Ludlow** stated he has lived in Wilsonville for 50 years and became deeply involved with the original Planning Commission in the early 1970s. When Wilsonville was formed, a group west of the city near Edmundson Road and Ladd Hill strongly opposed urbanization. Known as the Lavender Hill Mob, the group fought growth proposals, including two four-story buildings that still exist today as the AGC Center and Holiday Inn. The Planning Commission faced severe criticism over those projects, and later over the arrival of Tektronix, which opponents claimed would be the beginning of the end. At the time, there was little development in the area, and the four-story buildings were eventually approved. People insisted there should never be anything taller than four stories, and those structures were intended for commercial use, not residential use. There was never any consideration given to elevators or balconies in residential buildings because the buildings were designed for commercial purposes. The Planning Commission later developed the idea that Wilsonville did not want to resemble Beaverton. In his view, Wilsonville now does resemble Beaverton. The Commission ultimately concluded that four stories was an appropriate height limit, and that standard remained in place until the current wave of proposals. He suggested the current push comes from the Portland Metropolitan Association of Realtors and others advocating for what they call urbanization, which he defined as increased density. Wilsonville has already exceeded the 50 percent threshold between residences and apartments and has done more than enough for Metro and those who wish to "stack and pack." Four stories should remain the absolute limit.

**Dwight Sims** largely agreed with previous testimony but raised specific concerns about wording in the report summary he read before the meeting. Word choice can make a significant difference in perceptions and feelings. The report contained 515 pages, eight of which were devoted to the building height waiver issue. On page 452, the report stated that at its second meeting on April 21, 2026, the Task Force reviewed drafts of different options for revising the waiver provision. He pointed to the phrase "options for revising the waiver provision," noting this did not ask whether waivers should be allowed at all or whether four- to five-story buildings were compatible with Wilsonville's small-town character. This wording immediately ruled out the broader question of what kind of buildings Town Center should have. If revisions to building height waivers were the starting point, the only direction was literally upward.

Although the report mentioned Option 5, which did not allow any building height waiver, it framed a challenge around having one building, the former Shari's restaurant property, already approved for the additional story, calling it a unicorn in Town Center. He questioned whether avoiding that challenge meant the only option was to build all of them five stories tall or taller. Vuela had already been built to five stories and was not even in Town Center, raising the question of whether the ultimate plan was to eventually place five-story buildings throughout Wilsonville. He has read the *Spokesman* and the *Boones Ferry Messenger* faithfully since moving to the area in 2015 and attended Wilsonville Council meetings regularly for many years but did not recall seeing any public outreach on this question, a point Adam Cunningham and others had also raised. He questioned whether voters' rejection of urban renewal funding for the 2019 version of the Plan stemmed, at least partially, from opposition to placing more than 4,000 housing units in Town Center with buildings only four stories tall. Adding more stories was unlikely to increase voter support for any revised plan. He hoped to hear from the City soon that taller buildings anywhere in Wilsonville would not be on the table for consideration.

**Valerie Boucher** posed the question of why someone chooses to live in Wilsonville. When her husband retired, they had the opportunity to return to Oregon, where they had lived twice before. They began their search in Portland, decided against Portland, and continued moving farther from the metropolitan area until they found Wilsonville. She recalled leaving Wilsonville in the early 1990s, when it was a small spot on the map with a gas station, perhaps a store, and a house or two. Discovering Wilsonville again in 2020, they found a lovely small town situated in the middle of serene, bucolic countryside. They fell in love with Wilsonville, calling it the friendliest place they had ever lived, with some of the most wonderful people. When she speaks with neighbors about the town, they describe it the same way: beautiful, small suburbia. She became aware not long ago that the Town Center had a plan to place 1,600 living units above retail in the downtown area. The plan later resurfaced with numbers that had grown to more than 4,000 units, which she compared to dust in a house that is cleaned one day, accumulates overnight, and reappears the next day. They then learned there could be waivers to the height restrictions, with six or seven stories discussed this evening. She pictured a citadel in the middle of Town Center, with the only thing missing being a moat. If people desire urban living, Eugene is 100 miles south and Portland is 20 miles away. She urged, "Let Portland be Portland and Wilsonville be Wilsonville."

Eric Winters was called but had left due to a family emergency.

**Kristin Roche, President, Wilsonville Meadows HOA**, recounted telling a neighbor that she was going to the Planning Commission meeting to discuss five- to seven-story multi-unit buildings in Town Center and described the neighbor's reaction as incredulous. She asked if the Commissioners had spoken with their immediate neighbors about five- to seven-story buildings and what their reactions had been. She knew her neighbors in Wilsonville Meadows would be appalled; that was why she was present tonight, speaking on behalf of a majority of the 300-home neighborhood, including many original homeowners dating back to 1990. A few years ago, Adam Cunningham uncovered the feasibility study, adding she was disappointed that it

was not posted on the City's website alongside the many documents related to Town Center and community outreach process. The document most important to funding Town Center Plan should have been readily available with the other materials. This raised a red flag for her, and she noted the document still was not listed. She later asked Kim Rybold four questions regarding whether residents were ever asked about density levels, allowed to rank amenities, what the reaction was to a new urbanism model, and what surveys existed beyond the streetscape survey, which received 68 responses. To obtain those basic answers, she received an invoice for \$2,308, which she offered to provide. As an observer of the Task Force meetings on April 15 and April 23, 2026, she expected a more balanced discussion following the failed advisory vote. Instead, she believed the Task Force was weighted toward support for seven-story buildings, with only two members, Liz and Kate, providing critical perspectives. She also observed that no discussions occurred regarding the focus groups or survey feedback from the previous fall, despite having participated in a focus group herself. Not one participant in her focus group supported buildings taller than four stories. Reviewing all Town Center renderings shown to the public by City planners, she found that not a single building exceeded four stories. She did not believe it was right that the public was shown four-story buildings while discussions were taking place regarding five- to seven-story buildings. Greater transparency and honesty with the public were needed. She hoped that Option 5 would be selected, as Options 1 through 4 did not meet the expectations of the majority of the public.

**Bob Milano** stated he and his wife have lived in Villebois since 2016. Villebois is one of Wilsonville's earlier urban renewal districts, developed nearly 20 years ago on approximately 430 acres and approaching 2,700 units. The community includes single-family homes, townhomes, condominiums, apartment buildings, parks, and recreational areas, with approximately 18 homeowner associations. He proudly serves as president of one. Inadequate parking is the single greatest challenge throughout Villebois. His HOA includes 169 single-family residences, yet only five have a driveway. Most homes were marketed as having two-car garages, but in practice, the garages are too small to comfortably accommodate two modern vehicles. Most working families require more than one vehicle for commuting and daily life. Their CC&Rs require at least one vehicle to be parked inside the garage, and he believed other Villebois HOAs have similar rules. As a result, available street parking is already severely limited. Three brand-new, four-story Villebois apartment complexes will house approximately 143 new tenants. Those units were planned at a ratio of one parking space for every two units, meaning at least 70 or more tenants will not have a place to park, further burdening the streets. Most of those 143 units will likely have dual occupancy. The physical layout of Villebois is already well established, and the situation is unlikely to improve; it will remain the same or worsen. The Town Center feasibility study shows approximately the same number of housing units planned for a footprint one-quarter the size of Villebois, which he questioned as reasonable. Although the hope for the future is that people will work remotely, ride bicycles, walk, and use public transportation, he did not believe that reflects current reality. He encouraged the Planning Commission to carefully reconsider the density and number of housing units, which do not adequately account for the infrastructure and traffic patterns of today's economy.

## ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

1. Consideration of the March 30 & April 8, 2026 Planning Commission Minutes  
The March 30 & April 8, 2026 Planning Commission minutes were accepted as presented.

## PUBLIC HEARING

2. Housing Statutory Compliance, Part 1 (Rybold)

**Chair Semenova** read the conduct of legislative hearing rules into the record and called the public hearing at 6:54 pm.

**Senior Planner Rybold** introduced the agenda item, stating she and Consultant Heather Austin would present the proposed Development Code amendments related to the first part of the Housing Statutory Compliance Project. The meeting packet included an overview of the project's subject matter, as well as an attachment substantially similar to what was presented at the last work session, with the addition of a table serving as an index to identify which amendments are required by statute and which relate more directly to the Housing Production Strategy. The presentation would walk through the proposed amendments and explain their purpose, after which the Commission would have an opportunity for questions and comments.

**Heather Austin, 3J Consulting**, presented the Housing Statutory Compliance Part 1 Development Code amendments via PowerPoint. The project team previously held work sessions with the Planning Commission, City Council, and Development Review Boards and had incorporated the input received into the proposed Development Code amendments for the Commission's consideration and recommendation to City Council, which would render the final decision. She reminded that the work involved a statutory compliance code update package with a few additional components. The City's Housing Production Strategy, specifically Action C, Administrative Review, addresses the City's processes for reviewing residential applications to ensure there are no barriers to housing production and aligns well with the State mandates coming from the housing legislation.

- She explained that both Senate Bill 974 and House Bill 4037, passed in 2025 and 2026 respectively, must be implemented by Oregon cities by July 1, 2026. If the City has not updated its Development Code by that date, State law would apply directly. The proposed Code updates attempt to balance statutory requirements with Wilsonville's customer-service-friendly process. The City's two DRBs and easy access to Staff have helped make Wilsonville a housing-development-friendly city, and that would continue along with public access to the process and transparency where possible. As previously discussed, if public notice requirements are limited, the City must increase its social media presence, website updates, and other information channels to ensure the public remains informed.
- Project Schedule. This is Phase 1 of a two-phase project, with a second set of regulatory requirements due by the end of the year. For the first half of 2026, the project remains on track, with this Planning Commission public hearing and a City Council public hearing in June, where the Code amendments would ideally be adopted by July 1. If there is a small gap before adoption, State law would apply directly during that time. (Slide 4)

- To set the stage for discussing the proposed Code amendments, she reviewed the City's current land use review process for housing, which is divided into three classes, with a fourth class for legislative amendments that was not under discussion. (Slide 5)
  - Class I Administrative Review decisions are made by the planning team under the Planning Director with no public notice and cover items such as building permits and small sign applications.
  - Class II Administrative Review decisions are made by the Planning Director with public notice and can be called up to the DRBs.
  - Class III Quasi-Judicial Review decisions are made by the DRBs and can be called up by the Planning Commission and potentially City Council, both of which receive the agendas and can see the issues being reviewed.
- The proposed amendments are required to comply with both Senate Bill 974 and House Bill 4037. Senate Bill 974 mandates that certain reviews be processed as Class II Administrative Review, meaning a staff-level decision with public notice. These include zoning map amendments that increase residential density, Stage I and Stage II Planned Development review, and variances and waivers specific to residential development standards.
  - Senate Bill 974 also sets the Class II Administrative Review notice period at 14 days, increasing Wilsonville's current 10-day period and providing additional time for public notice before a decision is made. (Slide 6)
- House Bill 4037 works in conjunction with Senate Bill 974 but goes further by making all residential development applications Class II, rather than only the specific application types previously listed. Staff would later address how this impacts definitions and what residential development means, which is important for the City to clarify.
  - House Bill 4037 set the mailed notice radius at 100 feet, which became the standard after the first work session where the Commission had disagreed with that radius.
  - House Bill 4037 also changed appeal rights and waivers, and now only the applicant may appeal a decision on a residential development application. To reflect the changes in Wilsonville's Development Code, a new Code Section 4.119 was proposed for Waivers, and Appeals Section 4.022 had been updated. (Slide 7)

**Senior Planner Rybold** noted the appeal rights are specific to clear and objective standards, which is why the waiver process was separated out, which should be kept in mind for the next work session item [Town Center Building Height Waiver]. A waiver is a request for something outside what is defined as a clear and objective standard in Code, which is where a difference will be seen in what can and cannot be appealed.

- For the Commission's and audience's information, there had been discussion about the mailed notice radius. The City uses other notification methods that are not necessarily statutorily required or included in the Development Code, which is why they are not part of this package. On *Let's Talk, Wilsonville!*, the City currently has a brief one-question survey to better understand where people go for information. The survey will help determine which tools to focus on in the future, in addition to those currently used, to keep the community informed.

- She continued the PowerPoint presentation, explaining that since the project was guided by Housing Production Strategy Action C and the principle of maintaining a customer-service-friendly process that was clear and easily administered and given that the City typically packaged most residential development applications together, Staff examined other elements not affected by the statutory requirements and proposed Development Code amendments to address the following:
  - Annexation, which is the process of bringing in land within the City's urban growth boundary into the city limits. Using the Coffee Creek Industrial Design Overlay District as an example, the proposed Development Code amendments would allow annexation hearings to proceed directly to City Council alongside the related land use applications, recognizing there would no longer be a DRB hearing for the remaining applications. The same approach would be used for annexation requests to keep applications moving through the process in a consistent manner based on feedback received from the Planning Commission and City Council. (Slide 8)
  - Class II Modification Thresholds for existing approved site plans and existing developments. The current square footage threshold for modifications approvable through the Class II process is 1,250 square feet, which is narrow. Based on Planning Commission and City Council feedback, the proposed amendments would increase the threshold up to 10,000 square feet for existing buildings and buildings approved through the applicable development review process, while maintaining the 25 percent limitation of building or site area. As a result, the actual threshold would vary depending on the size of the current development. (Slide 9)
  - Other updates included in the proposed Code amendment package were as follows (Slide 10):
    - A couple new definitions to specify what residential development is and therefore, what qualifies under this process, for ease of reference throughout the Code.
      - References to the DRBs were also replaced throughout the Code with the term “review authority” to distinguish the decision-maker between residential and non-residential development.
    - Edits to the Site Design Review section would codify the City’s existing practice of using clear and objective standards to evaluate residential development. Because the section includes subjective language, amendments were made to tie back to the clear and objective standards relating to those topic areas.
    - The Code’s review timelines and processes were also cleaned up by adding an expiration date to pre-application meetings, removing conflicting language about timelines throughout the Code where review timelines were not consistent with the State statute of 120 days, and refining other application review procedures to reflect current process and practice, including online permit review.
  - Although not included in the proposed Code package because amendments outside the Development Code were involved, the City would move forward with a single DRB panel of seven members, recognizing that the types and therefore, the volume of eligible applications for DRB review will decrease. Based on feedback throughout the process, the single-panel model would maintain responsiveness and flexibility by planning for

one meeting per month, with the option to add meetings as needed to respond to statutory timelines.

- The update would not take effect until January 2027, allowing the current DRB structure to continue for the remainder of the year and preventing members from experiencing a state of flux in the middle of a year or term. Based on feedback from DRB members, serving on the Board was a positive way to give back to the community, but the number of canceled meetings over the past couple of years diminished their feelings of preparedness and contribution. A single-panel meeting structure would hopefully address that issue more consistently. (Slide 11)
- She stated that no written public comment had been received on the subject public hearing item to date and concluded that Staff recommended approval of Resolution No. LP26-0002 recommending adoption of the Development Code amendments to City Council.

**Commissioner Candrian** asked about the difference between the State-imposed rules and the City's proposed changes, specifically whether the City's approach was more restrictive or more permissive than what the State mandated.

- **Ms. Heather** noted the project team's recommended proposed changes fully comply with State statute. The labels HB 4037 and SB 974 in the table at the front of the meeting packet identified direct State statute requirements, while the other components were not related to State statutory requirements. For example, the threshold for modifications being changed was not related to statute but tied to providing greater flexibility in design review for non-residential projects. Additionally, annexation changes were more related to HPS Action Item C to ensure annexations were done in a thoughtful manner, such as sending the Coffee Creek annexation to City Council which was not addressed in any statutory requirements.
- **Senior Planner Rybold** added that the changes were currently permitted under State statute, the difference being that historically, Wilsonville's development process had relied on holding public hearings for new development and was quite limited in what could be approved administratively, so the changes were required because that model would no longer function with the statutory requirements. The optional changes were being made to help everything operate more smoothly.

**Commissioner Zundel:**

- Noted that by putting the onus on clear and objective standards, City Code must anticipate all the elements the City might wish to develop or consider. If a shift in City attitudes occurred on matters, such as street parking or bicycle use, the City would need to update the specific portions of the Code to anticipate those parameters.
  - **Senior Planner Rybold** replied that this was correct. She explained that the broad thought process was that public debate and conversation occur when setting the standards, so by the time the standards were actually implemented, the process did not create unreasonable delay or burden. She noted a particular sensitivity around housing

development and the time it required, adding that many statutory requirements originate from an effort to make the process more predictable and more timely.

- Asked how City Code could be written to allow for a certain amount of variety, such as encouraging high-quality architectural design without restricting developers to a narrow definition of what was an acceptable outcome, and if that was a risk the City was facing with this requirement.
  - **Senior Planner Rybold** explained that many recently adopted residential codes, such as that in Frog Pond, a lot of consideration was given to what those parameters should be, often guided by master planning processes that led to that development code. Additionally, there was considerable conversation at the State level about what types of design standards were clear and objective, particularly with the Middle Housing Code updates in 2021 around model codes. While the City did not directly adopt the State's model code, many design cues were drawn from it which was another sensitive area as over-regulating could be perceived as adding an unreasonable cost to development, which could place the City at risk, so it was a balance. One reason the City has historically used a waiver process was to allow conversations about what to do when unique situations or design ideas do not fit neatly into the defined parameters. The City has used that waiver process historically throughout the years as a means to implement the intent of a standard in a different way, rather than as a way to bypass a standard. A key reason the waiver standards were pulled into a standalone section was to make a clearer distinction for the State that applying clear and objective standards includes an option for a waiver path.

**Commissioner Karr** commended Staff and the consultants for the substantial effort invested in this work, particularly given the compressed timeframe. While the Commission/City did not normally operate at this pace, when the State says jump, the City asks how high.

**Chair Semenova** asked whether alternative methods exist for individuals to receive published notice information, such as opting in to receive push notifications any time the City published information related to development matters, separate from the reduced radius constraint.

- **Senior Planner Rybold** responded that the City currently offers an email subscription for public hearing notices, and that feature was included for responses in the survey currently open for public input. She encouraged anyone with ideas for other notification technologies to complete the survey and use the "Other option" to suggest approaches Staff may not have considered. She noted that the current email subscription alerts may need to be expanded, as the new notices would be development notices rather than traditional hearing notices, so a different notification option might be added.

**Commissioner Zundel** requested clarification on how annexations function, specifically for residential purposes. He understood the current proposal was modeled on the industrial annexation process and asked if residential annexations were different, and whether different procedures were followed for residential annexations.

- **Senior Planner Rybold** replied that the process was not different. When an area is eligible for annexation, findings were made based on what the area was being planned for and typically followed a planning process that predated the annexation. Coffee Creek was referenced because it was the only area in the city where annexation could proceed directly to City Council. When the Coffee Creek code that allowed for Administrative Review was adopted, discussion included that having Administrative Review for everything else did not do much good when a two-step hearing process was also required. The Code had worked well for the handful of annexation applications in Coffee Creek because there was a clear understanding of what the development and uses were supposed to be.
  - She confirmed that the annexation code only applied when an established plan exists for the area, noting the Code amendment was drafted to be consistent with an established plan.
- **Ms. Heather** added that anything annexed into the city would already be within the urban growth boundary and would typically be concept planned for the uses proposed, so the area would always have undergone a prior process.

**Chair Semenova** called for public testimony and confirmed with the Staff that no one in Council Chambers or attending via Zoom wanted to provide testimony. She then confirmed there were no further questions or discussion and closed the public hearing at 7:23 pm.

**Commissioner Karr moved to adopt Resolution LP26-0002. Commissioner Candrian seconded the motion.**

**Commissioner Karr** noted that in many cases, the Commission had little discretion on mandated items, and the State has required the City to take action. He supported making some of the processes easier and more streamlined, noting that reducing time, effort, and complexity contributes to making things more affordable for residents. He agreed with the changes that have been made.

**Commissioner Zundel** agreed, adding that even the amendments not mandated by the State appeared to align with the spirit of the mandates and were well-crafted. He appreciated how the Code was structured. He acknowledged that the mandated items place more onus on the Planning Commission, City Council, and citizens to be more involved in the master planning process and in developing a vision for these areas, but this was something the City already did fairly well and would hopefully continue to improve upon.

**The motion carried 5 to 0. (Ayes: Constantine, Karr, Candrian, Zundel, Semenova. Nays: None.)**

## **WORK SESSION**

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

City Attorney Guile-Hinman presented a PowerPoint overview of the Town Center Building Height Waiver project, reviewing the origin and intent of the waiver provisions, the Town Center subdistrict framework, and the relationship between building-height, floorplate, and affordable-housing bonus provisions. Staff described the historical Planning Commission and City Council discussions that led to the current code language, summarized community feedback regarding building height concerns, outlined the Town Center Building Height Waiver Task Force process and preliminary findings, and presented potential code-refinement options for Planning Commission feedback.

Staff addressed questions from the Board by clarifying that the existing waiver framework was intended to provide flexibility while maintaining consistency with the Town Center vision; that eliminating waivers entirely could create complications for already approved projects; that bonus floors for affordable housing and building-height waivers are separate tools with different purposes; that waiver requests remain subject to review criteria and are not automatically approved; and that current discussions are focused on refining code language, clarifying limits, evaluating transitions between subdistricts, revisiting menu-item criteria, and determining whether bonus floors and height waivers should be allowed concurrently. Staff also noted that broader concerns regarding traffic, parking, infrastructure, development feasibility, and long-term Town Center buildout are addressed through the larger Town Center Plan and should be considered alongside any revisions to the waiver provisions.

#### INFORMATIONAL

4. City Council Action Minutes (April 6 & 20, 2026) (No staff presentation)
5. 2026 PC Work Program (No staff presentation)

There were no comments.

#### ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:12 pm.