

DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD MEETING

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 9, 2026
6:30 PM

Staff Communications:

5. Housing Statutory Compliance Project



DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD PANEL A MEETING

STAFF REPORT

Meeting Date: February 9, 2026	Subject: Housing Statutory Compliance Staff Members: Kimberly Rybold, AICP Department: Community Development
Action Required	Advisory Board/Commission Recommendation
<input type="checkbox"/> Motion <input type="checkbox"/> Public Hearing Date: <input type="checkbox"/> Ordinance 1 st Reading Date: <input type="checkbox"/> Ordinance 2 nd Reading Date: <input type="checkbox"/> Resolution <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information or Direction <input type="checkbox"/> Information Only <input type="checkbox"/> Council Direction <input type="checkbox"/> Consent Agenda	
<input type="checkbox"/> Approval <input type="checkbox"/> Denial <input type="checkbox"/> None Forwarded <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable	
Comments: N/A	
Staff Recommendation: N/A	
Recommended Language for Motion: N/A	
Project / Issue Relates To:	
<input type="checkbox"/> Council Goals/Priorities:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adopted Master Plan(s): Housing Production Strategy
	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable

ISSUE BEFORE BOARD:

Staff will introduce the Housing Statutory Compliance project and seek Development Review Board (DRB) input on members' experiences serving on the DRB.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

In June 2025, City Council adopted the Housing Production Strategy (HPS), a document required for the City's continued compliance with Statewide Planning Goal 10 (Housing). The HPS includes seven actions the city will pursue over the next six years to help address Wilsonville's unmet housing needs. Among these is Action C, Evaluate Use of Administrative Review Processes for Residential Development. Action C recommends the City assess the Development Code and propose updates to the City's land use review process for residential development to allow administrative review for new subdivisions and multifamily developments that meet clear and objective standards. Processing these applications administratively via the Class II review process would reduce the overall review time. In the 2025 Session, the Oregon Legislature passed Senate Bill (SB) 974 requiring cities and counties to issue decisions without a public hearing on certain residential development applications, including Wilsonville's most common residential land use applications. This statutory requirement overlaps with HPS Action C. Because of SB 974, the City must undertake these Development Code amendments now as they must be effective by July 1, 2026.

Current Land Use Review Process

Development permit applications in Wilsonville generally fall under one of three review processes:

- **Class I Administrative Review** – Applications are processed as ministerial decisions made by the Planning Director without public hearing or public notice and are not subject to appeal or call-up. These decisions do not involve discretion on the part of the Planning Director and include applications that verify compliance with prior development approvals.
- **Class II Administrative Review** – Applications are processed as administrative decisions by the Planning Director, with public notice, subject to appeal or call-up by the Development Review Board (DRB). These decisions may involve limited discretion on the part of the Planning Director but generally involve application of clear and objective development standards. This process is used for minor modifications to previously approved development plans.
- **Class III Quasi-Judicial Review** – Applications are processed as quasi-judicial decisions by the DRB, with public notice and a public hearing, subject to appeal or call-up by City Council. This is the City's current land use review process for applications associated with new development, including residential land use applications. State law requires the use of clear and objective standards for residential development; however, applicants may choose to request discretionary waivers to certain development standards subject to DRB review and approval. Final decisions on applications for annexation, Comprehensive Plan Map amendments, or Zone Map amendments are made by City Council.

While most land use applications for new development are reviewed and approved by the DRB as described above, the City has precedent for establishing an administrative review process for land use applications for new development meeting clear and objective standards in the Coffee

Creek Industrial Design Overlay District. Adopted in 2018, this process allows the City to review most development applications associated with development through the Class II administrative review process, with review and approval for annexation and zone map amendment applications heard by City Council without prior DRB review. This process was adopted with the intention of providing a faster, more predictable review process for applications meeting clear and objective standards while still allowing an opportunity for public input. The City could implement HPS Action C in a similar manner, provided that the requirements contained within SB 974 are met.

To understand the potential impact of shifting from DRB review of residential land use applications to a Class II process, staff evaluated the 67 DRB applications received from 2020 to October 2025, excluding withdrawn applications. Of these, 16 applications (approximately 24 percent) were for new residential development projects, with all but two including an action requiring City Council approval. Just as the overall volume of development applications varies from year to year based on market factors, the percentage of residential applications varied from a low of 12.5 percent to a high of 37.5 percent of DRB applications in a single year. While this yearly variation will continue based upon development readiness of areas such as Frog Pond East and South, processing of residential land use applications via a Class II process would reduce the overall volume of applications reviewed by the DRB.

Planning Commission and City Council Work Sessions

To help the City determine how to best implement HPS Action C while meeting the requirements of SB 974, the project team held work sessions with Planning Commission and City Council in Fall 2025 to get direction on preferred approaches to the Development Code amendments. Recognizing the overall volume of applications subject to DRB review could drop by approximately 20-30 percent and that DRB meetings are typically cancelled when there are no agenda items, there likely will not be enough application volume to support having two DRBs going forward. To ensure effective use of community volunteers' time, the project team sought Planning Commission and City Council feedback on the role of the City's DRB and the following approaches:

- Keep one DRB to review land use applications that remain subject to a quasi-judicial land use review process, including appeals of Class II administrative decisions; or
- Eliminate the DRB and place all quasi-judicial public hearings and decisions with the Planning Commission. This may require adding a second meeting per month if application volume warrants it.

Both Planning Commission and City Council expressed support for the continued role of the DRB in reviewing quasi-judicial land use applications but agreed that moving to a single DRB likely made sense given the anticipated reduction in application volume. In doing so, City Council expressed interest in finding a way to maintain the scheduling flexibility that the two panel structure currently allows as it ensures the City can meet its application review timeline requirements and it provides a better customer experience for applicants. Before making a final decision, both Planning Commission and City Council requested the project team conduct

outreach with both DRB panels to learn more about Board members' experiences serving on the DRB. Feedback gathered during this discussion will inform final recommendations on potential modifications to the DRB.

Discussion Questions

- What, if any, impact does the cancellation of DRB meetings have on your overall feeling of being well-trained and prepared to serve in this role?
- How much time do you spend preparing for meetings? If you had to occasionally plan and prepare for a second meeting per month or if staff needed to schedule a special meeting due to application timing or volume, would that be too much of a time commitment?
- Are there other weekdays or times that you would prefer for the DRB to meet?
- What additional questions or comments do you have about proposed changes to the DRB or the proposed review process changes?

EXPECTED RESULTS:

Input on Board members' experiences serving in their roles on the DRB.

ATTACHMENTS:

N/A