



PLANNING COMMISSION

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 11, 2026

ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

2. Consideration of the December 10, 2025 Planning Commission minutes



CALL TO ORDER - ROLL CALL

Chair Hendrix called the meeting to order at 6:01 pm.

Present: Nicole Hendrix, Andrew Karr, Ron Heberlein, Yana Semenova, and Matt Constantine. Jennifer Willard arrived after Roll Call.

Excused: None

Staff Present: Miranda Bateschell, Kimberly Rybold, and Mandi Simmons

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

CITIZEN INPUT

There was none.

ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

1. Consideration of the November 12, 2025 Planning Commission Minutes
The November 12, 2025 Planning Commission minutes were accepted as presented.

WORK SESSION

2. Housing Statutory Compliance-Part 1 (Rybold)

Kim Rybold, Senior Planner, and Heather Austin, 3J Consulting presented the Staff report via PowerPoint, providing a high-level overview of Part 1 of the Housing Statutory Compliance project, which was largely procedural and intended to bring the City's Codes into compliance with legislation passed during the 2025 Oregon legislative session, specifically Senate Bill 974 (SB 974). The project follows guidance from the Housing Accountability and Production Office and Part 2 would be addressed mid-2026. The presentation included an explanation of the project requirements, potential impacts on the current land use application process, an overview and analysis of the City's current land use review process, and the changes required by SB 974, which mandates that certain residential development applications be reviewed through an administrative process, similar to the existing Class II Administrative Review. The statutory deadline for compliance is July 1, 2026, requiring the acceleration of Action C from the City's Housing Production Strategy (HPS), adopted in June 2025. Action C previously directed the City to consider shifting residential land use processes to an administrative review. While the shift to an administrative review is necessary, Staff intends to maintain public access, transparency, and

a customer-service-friendly process. Recommendations were made for five key policy areas, the annexation process, Comprehensive Plan map amendments, mailed public notices, Land Use Review Board roles, and updates to Administrative Review thresholds.

Commissioner comments regarding the five key policy areas warranting Code amendments were as follows with the project team addressing questions as noted (Slides 8-13):

Annexation

- Commissioner feedback indicated strong support for using the expedited hearing process, similar to Coffee Creek, which was consistent and had a track record to expedite housing production.
- Staff confirmed that the expediting hearing process could be written to be contingent on the land being master planned. Metro's process would be agnostic to the City's requirements, but the City could add its own eligibility criteria. However, currently, any land annexing must be added to the urban growth boundary (UGB), therefore requiring that the land be both concept and master planned. Any change to that requirement would involve a lot of unraveling of both state and regional requirements and State statute, including regional urban growth boundary processes and annexations. Given the established urban reserve system in the Metro region, such changes were unlikely, but Staff would consider the implications of making the expedited hearing process contingent on master planning the land explicit in the code language.
- Staff confirmed this annexation process would only apply to residential development.
- **Ms. Austin** clarified that while Metro's expedited decision procedure did not require a hearing, its criteria and requirements for annexation still apply to Wilsonville.
- Staff explained the expedited hearing process would be a City Council decision and would be similar to what was known as a Type 4 decision statewide. Staff would likely amend the language in a specific section of Development Code Section 4.700 pertaining to Annexations for Coffee Creek applications that meet the Master Plan, so the annexation applications go straight to Council, and would be sure this is drafted in a way so that it doesn't apply to areas unintended for it.
- Public comment would still be part of the annexation process at City Council hearings, but the scope would be limited to the annexation and not necessarily to the details of the development proposal.

Comprehensive Plan Map Amendments

- The Planning Commission consented to retain the existing public hearing process due to its limited scope.

Other Applications

- Staff clarified that SB 974 prohibits the DRB from calling up mandated residential applications for Stage 1, Stage 2, and Zone Map amendments, if included, but they could be appealed to the DRB. The Site Design review, Subdivision Plat, and Type C Tree Plan were

not subject to SB 974, so technically, those applications could still be called up by the Development Review Board (DRB).

- Staff did not believe the Class II Administrative Review process needed to be modified for SB 974 because changing the process for qualifying applications would remove the ability to call up those applications. Staff would need to be clear in how the draft Development Code language was drafted so that a certain subset of applications could not be called up. The Commission would review the draft Code amendments in March to ensure that nuance was captured.
- A question was posed to staff: Stage 1 and 2, Zone Map amendments, Variances, and Waivers must be moved to Class II (Slide 7), and now if Site Design Review, Tentative Subdivision Plat, and Type C Tree Removal (Slide 10) were also moving to Class II, could they be called up by the DRB?
 - Staff replied it was probably an overgeneralization to explicitly categorize the items that must be moved as Class II, since they can't be called up.
 - **Ms. Austin** noted Page 26 of the packet stated, "remove call up from Class II (at least for residential projects)" so the call up ability had to be removed for the applications on Slide 7, but the call up ability could be retained for the Other Applications.
 - Staff noted the City historically retained a process where all project applications were processed altogether, partly because most everything was reviewed by the DRB. When considering what should be called up and what needs to be a Staff administrative process, Staff could also consider whether staging the review made more sense for certain applications. Other applications could be reviewed based on an initial administrative decision, therefore making the other decisions easier to make.
 - While a sequential application process could be implemented, similar to other cities, to streamline the decision-making process, the City's approach in reviewing the applications all together provided an efficiency and service to its customers and applicants, which would be beneficial to retain if possible.
- Commissioners supported consolidating the review of the applications into the Class II Administrative Review process with the ability for the decision to be reviewed with public comment allowed. (Slide 10)

Mailed Notifications

- Commissioners were surprised the State mandate favored a smaller 100 ft radius, which equated to notifying only about three houses in a neighborhood. However, reducing the radius would be more consistent with other processes and limit legal risk.
 - Requiring a 250 ft radius provided the opportunity for more public input.
 - Being consistent with the noticing radius was important across different processes.
 - With all the movement at the State level around housing, perhaps language stating the radius must be consistent with statutory requirements was better than a specific distance.
- Staff clarified the notification radius was used for anything that applied to the City, including quasi-judicial hearings, limited land use decisions, and the items named in SB 974.

- Staff understood 100 ft had been established in State law for a while, and the City chose to exceed that distance. SB 974 seemed to push to 100 ft and applying it to only one application type would create problems administratively, which could be an issue discussed in the arguments going before the Land Use Board of Appeals (LUBA) that the City was not following State notification procedures, creating an administrative, not just a substantive, reason for the appeal.
- Staff confirmed keeping the 250 ft radius was possible, noting the City Attorney acknowledged the legal risk. The highest priority would be to remain consistency with whatever distance was chosen and Council's feedback could be discussed in March.
- If the radius was reduced, perhaps other communication methods for the public could be considered.
- Commissioners were divided on whether to reduce the radius from 250 ft to 100 ft.

Land Use Review Board Roles

- Commissioners cited the importance of maintaining separation of governmental roles with the Planning Commission developing the rules that the DRB applies.
- Commissioners highlighted that the DRB serves as an important vehicle for public engagement and training future Planning Commissioners and City Councilors. Having Planning Commissioners who served on DRB helped inform the Commission in creating better policies.
- Ensuring DRB members felt empowered and that their work mattered was important; however, some applications were clear and objective, leading to questions about why DRB review was necessary.
- As long as there was work to support the DRB, keeping the DRB was important from a public engagement perspective, giving more people opportunity to participate.
- Staff noted as part of public outreach, input would be sought from the DRB.
- A key concern against eliminating the DRB entirely was the added workload on the Planning Commission, which would require additional preparation and site visits, likely necessitating a second monthly meeting for the Commission, which would be difficult to support.
- Keeping one DRB was recommended using measured approach and real data, as things were changing a lot, so reducing to only one meeting was appropriate and could always be reassessed later.
- Commission generally consented to retaining a single DRB board for quasi-judicial hearings.

Discussion Questions

- Staff explained the updates to the administrative review thresholds regarded the numerical thresholds that trigger DRB review and approval. Multi-family building additions exceeding the 1,250 sq ft threshold must go through a Class II. With potentially more substantive applications potentially reviewed through a Class II review, and considerations about composition and workload, should the impact of that threshold be considered on other existing developments or be maintained as is for now?

- Staff agreed the 1,250 sq ft threshold seemed arbitrary, citing different application scenarios and confirming the threshold change would apply to industrial, commercial, and residential uses.
- Staff confirmed that changing the threshold to 1,500 square feet would result in more applications going through an administrative review and fewer through a Class III review. Were inequities being created? Much of the city did not have the clear and objective commercial and industrial standards seen in Coffee Creek, and smaller reviews in existing developments did not require a lot of discretion.
- Commissioners suggested Staff explore a threshold based on a percentage of the existing building size, combining the percentage with a minimum square footage, and increasing the 1250 sq ft threshold. Examples of different options were requested. Whatever reduced the burden on Staff should be considered.
- Commissioners looked forward to hearing feedback from the DRB on Board Role options and requested benchmarking information on how neighboring cities were responding to the new State mandates in SB 974. Were state representatives and senators collaborating with cities to see the impact the regulations were actually having, especially given the number of changes in a short amount of time.
 - **Planning Director Bateschell** replied, a lot of variety existed in how cities process applications, and Wilsonville was one of the few in the region that still processes the majority of applications through a Board. City Staff felt more pressure to submit the changes needed to comply with SB 974 before the deadline because many City processes did not align with the statute. Many cities believed that all or a vast majority of their processes already complied with SB 974, so those cities did not have such a big project or conversations about the matter. Some cities had less staff or were not paying as close attention during the legislative process. The City had a great government affairs team, and she stayed in tune with the League of Oregon Cities (LOC) to follow the housing bills.

Chair Hendrix confirmed there was no public comment.

INFORMATIONAL

3. City Council Action Minutes (November 3, 12, & 17, 2025) (No staff presentation)
4. 2026 PC Work Program (No staff presentation)

Planning Director Bateschell thanked Vice Chair Jennifer Willard and Commissioner Ron Heberlein, as this was their last Planning Commission meeting. Vice Chair Willard was praised for her knowledge of construction, corporate decision-making, and focus on market realities, while maintaining aspirational goals for the community. Commissioner Heberlein was acknowledged for his involvement in nearly every major legislative decision over the past 11 years, his preparedness, attention to detail, and empathy. Both Commissioners served full terms on the DRB and WPC.

Commissioner Heberlein commented on his history with the DRB and WPC, as well as the support and effort of the DRB members, Planning Commissioners, and Staff over the years.

Vice Chair Willard spoke about how serving on the Commission helped her feel more connected with the community and she commended Staff for their work.

Commissioners made parting comments, thanking Vice Chair Willard and Commissioner Heberlein for their service to the community and contributions to the City.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 7:31 pm.