



PLANNING COMMISSION

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 12, 2026

ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

1. Consideration of the July 8, 2026 Planning Commission minutes



**Wilsonville Planning Commission
Regular Meeting Minutes
July 8, 2026**

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

CALL TO ORDER - ROLL CALL

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

Present: Matt Constantine, Andrew Karr, Rob Candrian, Jeff Zundel

Excused: Yana Semenova, Nicole Hendrix

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

CITIZEN INPUT

- A 12-page handout was distributed to the Planning Commission that featured presentation slides referenced by those providing Citizen Input.

Zac Arino, VLMK Engineering and Design, discussed systemic issues regarding the draft Northwest Industrial (NWI) Zone code, noting that all four Coffee Creek Industrial Zone projects required waivers, 75% of which required waivers for both the addressing street parking requirements and driveway width standards. None of the projects used the Track 1 Clear and Objective Track. (Slide 2-3)

- The Track One path already had several contradictions within the Code, including the unintentional ban on parking between supporting streets and buildings due to the differences in the required building setbacks shown in NWI Tables 4 and 5. (Slide 4)
- Another example was the unintentional requirement that all entrances face the addressing street even if a building was not bounded by one. NWI Table 5 also addresses visibility standards, stipulating conditions for various situations, which were then contradicted by requiring all entrances to be visible from the addressing street with no consideration for other scenarios. (Slide 5)
- Customary setback standards applied to a typical 40-acre flex industrial development, reduces the usable area to about 94%, then to about 56% after applying connectivity standards, and then to 46% once the building footprint is added. Once parking and dock requirements are applied, the usable area is about 33% of the site. (Slides 6-8)

Mimi Doukas, AKS Engineering and Forestry reviewed the proposed changes requested to the draft Code based on Mr. Arino's comments.

- The parcel access standards in NWI Table 4 required two access points, a maximum 24-foot-wide primary access for visitors and vehicles, and a 40-foot-wide secondary access for industrial vehicles. Since industrial land was designed for industrial vehicles, only requiring the maximum 40-foot access was requested with no 24-foot access requirement. Waivers to this standard were requested on two previous applications, showing the standard was difficult to meet for industrial uses. (Slide 14)
- Regarding pedestrian access, NWI Table 4 required an 8-foot minimum sidewalk width to the primary entrance. AKS requested that the standard be changed to six feet due to the low pedestrian use, which consisted mostly of vehicles and employees who would not use the front entrance. (Slide 15)
- Parking Location and Design. The draft code limited the amount of parking between the building and the primary street and required 50% of it for visitors. Due to the low visitor use, increasing employee parking to 28 spaces maximum was requested with only 10% limited to visitors, which matched industry standards and was more functional. (Slide 16)
- Grading and Retaining Walls. NWI Table 4 required a 5-foot step per 5 feet of height, stretching out the grades substantially. Given Basalt Creek's significant topography, retaining walls would be critical to get production from the land. Treatments could be used to make retaining walls more aesthetically pleasing, as seen in Happy Valley. A graphic showed standard retaining walls compared to the 5-foot stepped approach with blue shading illustrating how much more land the stepped walls would consume. (Slide 17-18)
- She noted remaining slides were provided for the Commission's review and clarified that both she and Mr. Arino worked with Schnitzer Properties, LLC.

Kristine Connolly, Kittelson & Associates, Inc., representing Schnitzer, continued reviewing the slides in the handout and addressed traffic circulation, reiterating that industrial uses generate primarily vehicular traffic, not significant walking traffic compared to commercial or mixed-use development, so the 600-by-600-foot block spacing standard was not needed.

- Industrial users want trucks kept separate from pedestrians and cyclists for safety reasons, since mixing them increases the risk of high-severity crashes. Placing sidewalks and bike facilities along the site's perimeter was safer and would support the desired trail network in the Transportation System Plan (TSP).
 - A 600-foot grid also created operational problems, as heavy vehicles need larger turning radii; some industrial tenants have security requirements, such as gating or segregating different vehicle types, such as staff parking fully separated from truck loading; and providing room for staging on-site so deliveries did not occur on public streets; all of which pointed to needing larger industrial sites.
- Three graphics of the area east of Grahams Ferry Road and north of Day Road were displayed with the first showing that a 600-by-600 grid was not conducive to larger industrial buildings. The second and third images showed how the more desirable connectivity layout could be very compatible with trail plan desired for the area. (Slide 24)

Ryan Schera, Schnitzer Properties, LLC, introduced himself as a long-term industrial owner-operator serving manufacturing, wholesale, supplier and high-tech users. He compared a typical 40-acre flex industrial layout against the NWI Standards, noting that the NWI connectivity and layout standards would yield smaller buildings, thus limiting the range of employment users the City could attract; larger buildings were needed with the power that was available. (Slide 25)

- Schnitzer provides fully functional developments of different depth and sizes specifically to attract different sized employers for long-term leases with truck courts, parking located at every front entrance, and multiple front entries since the number of tenants and the space each would require was unknown; some need three bays, others ten.
 - Economically, smaller development meant lower assessed values, translating to only about half of the tax increment revenue flowing into the urban renewal district, money for public infrastructure, including parks, water, sewer, and transportation improvements the Basalt Creek area would need.
- Urban renewal growth scenario. If the NWI Code standards did not support development, landowners would simply hold the land and the tax revenue would be based under the existing County or farm zoning, leaving the City with minimal tax revenue. (Slide 26)
 - Schnitzer's site was currently just a nursery and Coffee Creek had small farms with houses. Without standards that attract developers to aggregate, then development would not occur and the assessed value and revenue would not come into the urban renewal district.
 - The chart showed a significant difference in projected urban renewal revenue between Flex Industrial and NWI development for both the Coffee Creek and future Basalt Creek areas.

ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

1. Consideration of the June 10, 2026 Planning Commission Minutes

The June 10, 2026 Planning Commission minutes were accepted as presented.

WORK SESSION

2. Wilsonville Industrial Land Readiness (Basalt Creek Master Plan) (Myers/Lorenzen)

Senior Planner Myers presented the changes to the Basalt Creek Master Plan (BCMP) via PowerPoint, reviewing proposed Development Code edits, including new definitions; the Northwest Industrial Pattern Book, formally the Coffee Creek Industrial Overlay District, featuring Track 1, clear and objective standards, and Track 2, allowing waivers with DRB approval; and additions and deletions to the allowed use table. He concluded noting a third work session would be held on August 12 to review the final Master Plan draft as well as the technical infrastructure work for water, sewer, and stormwater with input from the City's consultants.

Staff addressed questions as follows with Commissioner comments as noted:

- The maximum building sizes applied only to specific uses, like data centers and did not limit broader industrial uses, such as distribution warehouses.

- Existing contractor establishments would not be impacted by removing contractor establishments from the use table, unless perhaps, some change or development was proposed on the property.
 - The City's Economic Development Strategy continues to include actions intended to encourage transition of the area toward industrial uses in line with the City's vision, and additional City Code or policy changes could be considered in the future.
 - Washington County was currently assessing its code regarding contractor establishments, particularly in the FD-20 Holding Zone where many were frequently expanding and operating unpermitted. Through its code assessment project, the County might propose code amendments, so the City preferred to wait for the County's findings and potential outcomes before revisiting any modifications to the City's code.
 - Currently, the City's Code did not outright preclude contractor establishments. Some uses within the city limits operate very similarly to a contractor establishment but are held to the same design and use standards of any industrial development. The economic study found that new contractor establishments were not likely to annex into the city given the additional standards and City taxes to continue that use.
 - Existing contractor establishments would remain under FD-20 unless some type of development triggered them into the City's Development Code or annexation if they needed to connect to municipal services.
- Specifications for supporting streets and through connections were depicted within the regulating plan and NWI standards. Addressing and supporting street delineations are specific to Coffee Creek due to the Form-Based Code and were not a citywide street classification. Within the Coffee Creek area, addressing streets are held to a higher design standard, while connectivity spacing standards for typical city streets are fairly similar throughout the city, except in special areas like Town Center where the connectivity standards were higher to achieve smaller blocks for the highly pedestrian-oriented area.
 - Garden Acres was an addressing street for development along Garden Acres in Coffee Creek, and the Black Creek development, the site farthest north on the west side of Garden Acres, had constructed supporting streets on the north and south sides of its property.
 - The subject standards allow larger blocks due to the Industrial area and modeled on standards for 95th Avenue to support the same type of employment development which was supported by City Council and the Planning Commission.
 - Visual examples would be brought back for the Commission's review in August.
- Trucks were expected throughout the NWI District. The intent was to have 40-ft wide truck access from supporting streets and a 24-ft wide visitor/employee access on addressing streets where the building faced the street with parking in front. Although the Tracks in the Pattern Book added a layer of complexity to land use applications, applicants could request changes through the Track 2 process.
 - During the Basalt Creek master planning, the Planning Commission and City Council fully supported extending the Coffee Creek Design Overlay into Basalt Creek and now the NWI Area encompassed both areas. Design Overlay standards had not changed, but the proposed amendments would integrate the use table to make distinctions between the

High-Tech, Craft Industrial, Light Industrial, and West Railroad subdistricts while maintaining the use standards in Coffee Creek, a Regionally Significant Industrial Area (RSIA) brought in by Metro Title 4. Essentially, parts of the Code were being combined to ensure the Design Overlay applied to both Coffee Creek and Basalt Creek while maintaining use zoning correctly.

- During the Coffee Creek Design Overlay assessment, a number of potential changes were discussed to make Track 1 more viable since no one had been able to utilize it.
- The driveway access standards were also discussed significantly, and the truck access was modified from being a waiver request to requiring an outright 40-foot-wide access, which by Code was designed to come off a supporting street, rather than an addressing street, which had been requested during Citizen Input. However, neither the Planning Commission nor City Council supported changing the primary access on the addressing street where more multi-modal traffic and connectivity would be seen. Summaries of the Commission's and Council's discussions regarding the driveway access standards could be provided.
- The existing retaining wall standard required a 5-foot step back for every 48 inches of height and the proposed Code would increase that to every 60 inches of height. Delta Logistics on Day Road provided a real-world example of a significant retaining wall; however it required a waiver, so it did not follow the Code precisely. Staff could send a link from the City's Projects web page to provide details about the waiver.
 - Some Basalt Creek sites were flat while other sites, especially if adjacent to the Basalt Creek Wetland, could require 20-foot retaining walls, so the 5-foot offsets helped break up sheer walls and avoid angled wall faces. The standards varied depending on whether the wall could be seen from the primary addressing street.
 - Staff would research the historical origin of the 5-ft offset standard, whether it came from the Form-based Code adoption or a code provision that predated that Code. A Task Force and consultant team were involved in the Form-based Code's adoption, so industries were at the table, but industry standards change.
- The limited parking in front of the building was intended for customers, while employee parking was expected to be at the side or rear of the buildings.
 - Concern was expressed about employees parking in the same area as trucks.
- Staff described the extensive, multi-year outreach process to property owners and developers about the rezoning of the area and the proposed changes, including technical advisory committees, letters mailed to property owners, and site visits by the Economic Development Manager to discuss some of the changes with two property owners who responded. Developer interviews were also conducted during the original Coffee Creek Design Overlay District process, and the results were presented to the Planning Commission and City Council at that time.
- Concern was expressed that some Code items being addressed today may not be popular or appropriate in 10 to 20 years, potentially locking the City into having to revisit the Code. Was the City planning primarily for today's preferred industries or creating a flexible framework that could adapt to changing economic conditions to remain viable over the next 10 to 20 years?

- The Craft Industrial, High Tech, and Light Industrial subdistrict designations stemmed from the Basalt Creek Concept Plan and discussed with the Planning Commission, City Council, and with the City of Tualatin. The City's discussions included ways to maximize quality employment with the intent to avoid over-codifying the uses while preserving flexibility to allow for certain conditional uses where appropriate.
 - More than half of the Craft Industrial area was highly constrained by natural resources, making the development area fairly small, so the designation allowed additional industrial types or uses not typically allowed in an industrial area to encourage different uses that work with the land.
- Concern was expressed about the designated subdistricts being too specific and restrictive, making niche, craft-type uses unable to reliably sustain themselves and dooming part of the area to be perpetually vacant.
 - Commissioner comments noted that the Tualatin's residential development area was just north of the Craft Industrial zone, providing a customer base.
- The fee per waiver is \$737 and the highest number requested on a single project was approximately five waivers, costing approximately \$3,500. Following the Coffee Creek Design Overlay assessment, a Code change was made that would have eliminated one waiver requirement from all four Coffee Creek projects.
- The City did not track developers' costs associated with the waiver process, which would depend on each development, the timing of the development, materials and services, as well as the waivers being requested. The developments approved in Coffee Creek showed that development in the city was not cost prohibitive, though it might be to certain developers.
- Residential use had been a component of the Craft Industrial zone for some time due to the existing residential homes, and the definitions determined the type of residential allowed in the area. Residential would not be allowed as the only use on a property, unless superseded by a statutory requirement, and would have to be accessory to or in partnership with the business, meaning BIDUs and live/work units were the only residential types permitted.
 - Being industrially zoned, not all residential types had to be required; essentially, the City allowed certain residential units in conjunction with the employment use. The only exception regarded a Senate bill that allows affordable housing in industrially zoned properties that are publicly owned, so Staff did not anticipate state law superseding City Code at this time.
 - Some existing homes were already live/work, which was a use the City could continue supporting and seemed to be a good transitional use between the City's industrial area and Tualatin's residential area to the north.
 - Given the size of the lots, it made sense to allow people to continue to grow their businesses and develop storefronts while still living on site. Council and the Planning Commission wanted that flexibility, especially in the transition area.
- Data centers were added as a new potential use due to the need and relevance, but the size would be limited. A data center was already operating in the city as a secondary use.

- Commissioner comments suggested revisiting whether to include data centers, given their high energy consumption and low employee requirements. At a minimum, data centers should be secondary to the primary use to maximize value in the area.
 - Data centers raise everyone's energy costs..
- While data centers and a residential hospital had been discussed previously, additions were made to the Code to reflect those Planning Commission and City Council conversations; for example, further restrictions were made regarding data centers, limiting them in size and to a secondary use in the two higher use areas, the Coffee Creek and High-Tech Subdistricts. Originally, no maximum building size was included in the other Basalt Creek areas.
- "Secondary use" should be defined to distinguish between ordinary on-site business network/server infrastructure from a standalone data center operation.
- Data centers were previously only discussed a small bit with Council and the Planning Commission, namely around concerns regarding large data centers and the potential impact on utilities, which prompted the square footage limitations.
 - The secondary language was included in the Coffee Creek and High-Tech Subdistricts to help ensure high employment densities the City desired in those areas. Having only the size limitation in the Light Industrial and West Railroad areas seemed to meet the input received from the Planning Commission and City Council. However, Staff sought input about any additional changes or restrictions.
 - Data centers and e-commerce distribution and fulfillment centers did not exist and were not defined the last time uses were substantially updated the Industrial Code 20 years ago.
 - With these uses and definitions now explicitly addressed in the Code, developers meeting all the building standards could not include a data center, claiming it simply supported the industrial use.
 - Adding data centers to the use table was necessary so the City could address whether they were allowed and how they were addressed. The Commission could still recommend prohibiting data centers entirely or making them only a secondary use across the entire NWI District.
- Commissioner comments suggested also clearly defining data centers to avoid restricting tech companies, while not allowing a use that could potentially drain the grid and not provide the employment opportunities desired in the area.
 - Standalone data centers did not make sense if the goal was to maximize employment. Retaining commercial recreation in the use table would be better than allowing data centers given the trade-offs between community benefit, employment, and environmental impacts.
- Commissioners supported looking at options to further limit data centers in the NWI District.
- Information was requested on the rationale for requiring multimodal street design standards along heavily trafficked industrial routes, the benefits of such an infrastructure investment, and how such design requirements had played out in other areas of the city.

- Since the three-minute limit prevented all the material from being presented during Citizen Input, knowing more about the discussions with the landowners and any preliminary plans they might have discussed or submitted would be helpful.

Senior Planner Myers agreed to do further research and return in August with more options regarding data centers and clearer definitions for "secondary use" and "data centers". He confirmed the City's transportation and other consultants would attend the August Planning Commission meeting, as well as Economic Development Manager Lorenzen, who could summarize recent conversations with NWI District landowners.

- He noted the City had met with Mr. Schera and the Schnitzer team and discussed their desires for changes in the Code, which were consistent to the input received during Citizen Input. Mr. Schera had also provided detailed information on what was being requested, and Staff recognized the additional costs involved to do so.
- The City was doing its best to thread the needle between the needs of all developers and what the community, Planning Commission, and City Council has requested over the last 12 to 14 years of the project's timeline.

3. Housing Statutory Compliance, Part 2 (Rybold)

Senior Planner Rybold noted that Part 1 took effect July 1, 2026, and that Staff had been working to get the City's internal processes updated accordingly. Part 2 would address statutory requirements primarily from the 2025 and 2026 legislative sessions, as well as some additional minor carryover items regarding statutory requirements from prior years.

Heather Austin, 3J Consulting, presented Part 2 of the Housing Statutory Compliance via PowerPoint, noting the packet included a matrix identifying each proposed Code update, along with the corresponding legislation required Code cleanup, or the best practice supporting the change. The project team sought the Commission's input on how to engage the public and decision makers for this round of proposed Code updates. The primary focus of Part 2 was to bring the Code into compliance with House Bill 2138, but also to address other legislative updates for compliance with all State legislation and to engage decision makers and the public specifically on tree removal and preservation standards regarding residential development. She reviewed the project schedule, the required Code updates related to HB 2138 and other legislation, and considerations regarding tree removal standards. (Slides 4-8)

Senior Planner Rybold reviewed questions for the Commission's consideration. (Slide 9)

Commissioner questions were addressed by the project team as follows:

- **Ms. Austin** understood State statute only addressed removing relational/familial language from the definition of household, citing HB 2583 from 2022 which prohibits local governments from establishing or enforcing occupancy limits based on familial or non-familial relationships among occupants. The number of occupants was not the concern.

- **Senior Planner Rybold** understood occupancy could still be limited, but familial status could not be used to define a household. Occupancy limits would still be governed by the Building Code based on the unit type.
 - The question was what does household mean in the context of a development code? The State was moving away from the word "family" with regard to development, so single unit/multi-unit was replacing single-family/multifamily as a family did not define a housing unit.
- Removing "household" entirely in favor of "dwelling unit" or "living unit" would align with the State's direction.
 - **City Attorney Guile-Hinman** noted this approach would also better align with the Fair Housing Act.
 - The number of people in a unit was governed by the Building Code; essentially each use or structure had an occupancy limit.
- **Ms. Austin** explained that limiting frontage update requirements was specific to smaller renovation projects to existing developments. State law limits the City's ability to require frontage improvements when renovations to existing development result in an increase in value of less than \$150,000 (2025), subject to statutory adjustments. If for example, a renovation was valued at \$130,000, the City could still conduct a site development review but could no longer require frontage improvements, such as adding a bike lane where one did not exist or updating a curb or an older driveway apron to current standards. She was uncertain how often frontage improvements had been required and what impact the change would have on Wilsonville.
- **Senior Planner Rybold** clarified that Wilsonville has historically required relatively few frontage improvements because the city does not have a lot of older development. However, when older sites did redevelop or have a land use change, frontage improvements, such as upgrading older public improvements to current standards, have often been required as conditions of approval. The proposed amendment was intended to remove requirements that, in some communities, discouraged commercial investment by imposing improvement costs that were not considered commensurate with the scope of the proposed project. She confirmed the amendment applies to commercial and economic development projects, not residential development.
- **Senior Planner Rybold** explained the tree-related amendments only applied to applications for new residential development, such as residential subdivisions or infill development on and existing lot where tree removal was necessary to accommodate residential use, which were circumstances where the City would need to apply clear and objective standards. Existing residential developments and tree removal requests unrelated to new housing would continue to follow the current process.
 - No changes were proposed to the City's current standards. However, tree removal requested during construction of an approved residential development would remain subject to the clear and objective standards because it was still furthering a residential development project, while requests made after the development was completed and occupied would switch to the current tree removal process.

- **Senior Planner Rybold** confirmed only the undeveloped portions of Frog Pond would be subject to the new standard and that the tree preservation changes would apply only to residential development, not industrial or commercial.
- **Ms. Austin** clarified how the proposed unit bonus for middle housing with affordable or accessible units would work, explaining that a duplex or triplex including one affordable unit could add one additional unit, while a quadplex or townhouse project could add two additional units.
 - A single affordable unit could function within a multi-unit development because affordability could be secured through deed restrictions or other legal documents regulating occupancy or rental, which could be challenging.
 - She confirmed Single Room Occupancy (SRO) housing would generally consist of individual rooms with shared facilities, such as a kitchen and bathroom.

Commissioner Karr supported:

- Deferring to Oregon standards regarding the household definition and using “unit” rather than relational language to avoid potential Code changes later.
- Standardizing tree survey requirements to ensure consistent information is provided across residential development applications
- Evaluating trees based on factors such as overall health, size, and proximity to other trees when considering or determining preservation, cautioning against preserving unhealthy trees.
- Enhancing community outreach by using visual examples, photographs, and interactive displays like sticker-voting exercises to help residents compare different tree preservation approaches and provide more meaningful feedback.
- Using before-and-after examples to illustrate the City's intended outcomes as the Code transitions from site-by-site decision making to clearer, more objective standards.

INFORMATIONAL

3. City Council Action Minutes (June 1, 10, 15, & 29, 2026) (No staff presentation)
4. 2026 PC Work Program (No staff presentation)

No comments.

ADJOURN

The meeting was adjourned at 8:04 p.m.