



PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA

December 10, 2025 at 6:00 PM

Wilsonville City Hall & Remote Video Conferencing

PARTICIPANTS MAY ATTEND THE MEETING AT:

City Hall, 29799 SW Town Center Loop East, Wilsonville, Oregon

YouTube: <https://youtube.com/c/CityofWilsonvilleOR>

Zoom: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/87239032604>

TO PROVIDE PUBLIC TESTIMONY:

Individuals may submit a testimony card online:

<https://www.wilsonvilleoregon.gov/PC-SpeakerCard>

or via email to Mandi Simmons: msimmons@wilsonvilleoregon.gov, 503-570-1571

Written materials must be submitted by 2:00 PM on the date of the meeting noting the agenda item for which testimony is being submitted in the subject line.

CALL TO ORDER - ROLL CALL [6:00 PM]

Matt Constantine

Ron Heberlein

Nicole Hendrix

Andrew Karr

Yana Semenova

Jennifer Willard

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

CITIZEN INPUT

This is the time that citizens have the opportunity to address the Planning Commission regarding any item that is not already scheduled for a formal Public Hearing tonight. Therefore, if any member of the audience would like to speak about any Work Session item or any other matter of concern, please raise your hand so that we may hear from you now.

ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

- [1.](#) Consideration of the November 12, 2025 Planning Commission minutes

WORK SESSION [6:10 PM]

- [2.](#) Housing Statutory Compliance-Part 1 (Rybold)(60 minutes)

INFORMATIONAL [7:10 PM]

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

ADJOURN [7:15 PM]

Time frames for agenda items are not time certain (i.e. agenda items may be considered earlier than indicated). The City will endeavor to provide the following services, without cost, if requested at least 48 hours prior to the meeting by contacting the Planning Administrative Assistant at 503-682-4960: assistive listening devices (ALD), sign language interpreter, and/or bilingual interpreter. Those who need accessibility assistance can contact the City by phone through the Federal Information Relay Service at 1-800-877-8339 for TTY/Voice communication.

Habr   int  rpretes disponibles para aqu  llas personas que no hablan Ingl  s, previo acuerdo. Comun  quese al 503-682-4960.



PLANNING COMMISSION

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 10, 2025

ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

1. Consideration of the November 12, 2025 Planning Commission minutes



**Wilsonville Planning Commission
Regular Meeting Minutes
November 12, 2025**

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

CALL TO ORDER - ROLL CALL

Chair Hendrix called the meeting to order at 6:30 pm.

Present: Nicole Hendrix, Ron Heberlein, Jennifer Willard, Yana Semenova, and Matt Constantine

Excused: Andrew Karr

Staff Present: Jeanna Troha, Cindy Luxhoj, Matt Lorenzen, and Mandi Simmons

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

CITIZEN INPUT

There was none.

ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

1. Consideration of the October 6 & 8, 2025, Planning Commission Minutes

The October 6, 2025, Joint Planning Commission/City Council minutes were accepted as presented.

The October 8, 2025, Planning Commission minutes were accepted as amended.

Commissioner Semenova moved to approve the October 6, 2025 meeting minutes as presented and approve the October 8, 2025 Planning Commission minutes, amending her comments on Page 6 to reflect that citizens, not PGE, have control by voting. Commissioner Heberlein seconded the motion. The motion passed by a 5 to 0 vote. (Ayes: Hendrix, Willard, Heberlein, Semenova, Constantine. Nays: None.)

WORK SESSION

2. Wilsonville Industrial Land Readiness (Citywide EOA & EDS) (Luxhoj/Lorenzen)

Nicole Underwood, EConorthwest, presented the Wilsonville Industrial Land Readiness (WILR) Citywide Economic Opportunities Analysis (EOA) and Economic Development Strategy (EDS) via PowerPoint, first explaining that WILR had both a Basalt Creek and citywide track and highlighting the project schedule and EOA conclusions, noting Wilsonville has enough industrial

land to support growth, but unlocking it would take focused effort and that while vacant commercial land is limited, substantial redevelopment potential exists. (Slides 2-5)
Commissioner comments regarding the EOA were as follows with the project team addressing questions as noted:

- Is there a percentage to identify how much of the city's approximately 2,000 acres of developed industrial land is underdeveloped? One discussion around the Basalt Creek and Coffee Creek areas was the lack of infrastructure and those associated costs. However, if underdeveloped industrial land was available within the city limits already, then that same cost constraint would not exist.
 - **Beth Goodman, ECONorthwest**, explained that some underdeveloped land could be considered as what the project team classified as partially vacant land, which was land parcels between two and five acres that had some development on it and could reasonably have more development. About 130 acres of the city's 308 acres of buildable industrial land was partially vacant. (Exhibit 36, Page 100 of the Agenda packet) Additionally, some industrial lands have more infill potential for higher and better uses but that amount was not quantified because that analysis would be on a site-by-site basis and depend on how the land was being used. Aside from the Buildable Lands Inventory (BLI), she understood some Basalt Creek land had been underutilized.
 - **Economic Development Manager Lorenzen** added he would not say there was a general trend of underdevelopment but select properties, such as the Peyton Building, which fronts I-5 and used to be the Hollywood Video headquarters and Payless, had a massive parking field that could likely accommodate another building, but for all intents and purposes, the project team considered the site fully developed.
- The Mentor Graphic campus was other property that the City would probably consider being fully developed but had space available that could be utilized in a different way.
 - **Ms. Goodman** noted the answer would be different for commercial land, where a lot of land was underutilized.

Ms. Underwood continued the PowerPoint, presenting the Economic Development Strategy (EDS), six desired outcomes over the next ten years, feedback from engagement, and six key focus areas with specific actions using existing and new resources so the City progressed toward the desired outcomes. She reviewed key questions the project team sought the Commission's feedback on (Slide 17) and highlighted next steps.

Comments and feedback from the Commission regarding the EDS and the questions provided by the project team (Slide 17) were as follows with responses to Commissioner questions as noted:

- **Ms. Underwood** explained the EDS was not a required strategy by the State, like the Housing Production Strategy. She confirmed the City wants to grow, clarifying that growth was driven by the State.
- **Economic Development Manager Lorenzen** clarified the City was required by State law to maintain a 20-year buildable land inventory for both employment and residential use. The purpose of an EOA was to look at that inventory within that 20-year horizon, but while there was a State mandated dimension to the EOA, the City initiated the EOA and EDS

development process at this time because it made sense, not because the City was up against a deadline that the State had mandated.

- Was any funding coming from the State as both the Housing Production Strategy (HPS) and EDS projects run parallel, or was that on the City to figure out?
 - **Ms. Underwood** said for industrial lands, the Regionally Significant Industrial Sites (RSIS) Program through Business Oregon had funding available.
 - **Ms. Goodman** stated that sometimes infrastructure was more likely to be State funded. The recommended actions in the EDS were geared toward what Wilsonville wanted to do, not on how to meet some State mandate. Some of the bigger pieces regarded infrastructure costs, but other pieces were more local, addressing local desires, such as a wider bank of commercial uses to have more restaurants and commercial businesses local to Wilsonville. Some of that funding might come regionally, but probably not much from the State unless there was a special program.
 - **Economic Development Manager Lorenzen** added there was a remote possibility that City Council would commit General Fund dollars to some of these efforts, but because those dollars were in high demand, that was not something to count on. The other piece mentioned a couple of times in the context of Town Center and Basalt Creek was urban renewal. Tax Increment Finance (TIF) did not require the City's General Fund. TIF was a reallocation of existing and future tax revenues to take a slice of existing tax revenues to grow the overall pie. He confirmed that essentially, capital investments would be financed with the hope that more tax income would be generated in the future to cover the investment.
 - Generally, system development charges (SDCs) were collected for infrastructure construction. At the time of new development, redevelopment, or a change of use greater in intensity than the previous use within a property or building, the City charges SDCs for water, sewer, parks, transportation, and streets which are put into special SDC funds to build new roads, water lines, sewer lines, etc. SDCs were an expense to development at the time of development application and not an expense to Wilsonville taxpayers.
- Rather than being concerned whether a business was a major regional employer, it was important that they were a size appropriate for the development in the area to make a meaningful difference. Did major regional employer really mean anything? If the City has 10 small employers that net the same result as a major regional employer, should the City care?
 - **Economic Development Manager Lorenzen** agreed that 10 employers employing 20 people could be equivalent to a 200-employee establishment, noting the only critical difference was that larger employers generally tend to offer better wages and benefits. The language could be wordsmithed to provide an equal look at all business sizes.
- **Ms. Underwood** confirmed that the order of the words, placing business before residents, was not intentional but simply reflected this being an economic development strategy. She was amenable to prioritizing residents in the desired outcome language. (Slide 8)
 - She confirmed that the actions were not ordered by importance, but rather by how quickly they could be started with actions using existing resources listed first, followed

by those requiring new resources. The project team sought to understand the priorities of both the Commission and City Council in ordering the actions. (Slide 12-16)

- There was a sequenced proposal for how the actions are implemented in the plan. Currently, the Focus Areas show “Existing Resources” and “New Resources” which aligns with the sequencing. For example, the exploration and starting of Actions 4.1, 4.2, and 4.3 could start immediately. How far along the City gets in the implementation may require additional resources, so that piece would come later. Some actions were a bit less discreet, while others were much more. (Slide 15)
- **Ms. Goodman** noted Actions 4.2 and 4.3 could also be said to be supplements to 4.1.
- **Ms. Underwood** agreed, adding that she went back and forth on that; however, it seemed Action 4.1 could be a broader action that applied to more businesses, whereas 4.2 was really more targeted towards the food cart program and the affordable commercial space.
- How has Action 3.1 been implemented so far since the city already has commercial uses in select industrial areas. How did developers get approval to put a cross-fit gym in an industrial area or were they all in commercial areas? (Slide 14)
 - **Associate Planner Luxhoj** explained that current restrictions limit non-industrial uses in industrial areas to 5,000 square feet within a building or 20,000 square feet within multiple buildings on a site, which generally includes all the indoor/outdoor retail functions of a particular business.
- Action 3.1 was the most concerning because the industrial areas were meant to be industrial areas and given that the city already had a lot of underutilized commercial land, caution should be taken about allowing more commercial use in an industrial area because it might be easier to partition a big building for commercial use. Expanding commercial use might lead to the permanent loss of industrial land.
 - **Ms. Goodman** agreed that was a valid concern, having watched some cities turn all their industrial land to commercial uses. It was important to note the discussion regarded non-retail uses, such as flex uses because sometimes, the line between light industrial and heavy commercial was pretty blurry. For example, architects often like to locate in old industrial spaces, not Class A office space; businesses that were not necessarily manufacturing and not quite a traditional office use; not a grocery store or even a hair salon, but other employment uses that were happy enough to locate in an industrial area where space was less expensive.
 - The Action 3.1 section states, “commercial recreation, gyms, climbing facilities, entertainment venues, and offices or co-working spaces that are not directly tied to an industrial operation.”
 - **Ms. Goodman** suggested limiting the uses more to the type of employment the Commission believed would be more helpful to see in industrial areas or less threatening to industrial areas.
 - The benefits of the commercial recreation side were understood, but the uses were not large employers or provide high wage jobs. The City would not be getting many of the benefits the Commission was looking for from industrial land by allowing those uses, so was it really something to focus on?

- **Ms. Underwood** replied the project team would consider that feedback and bring it to Council as well.
- The EDS was helpful. Having the focus areas were appreciated, including how the actions were tethered directly toward the focus areas, which seemed to make logical sense. Action 3.1 regarding the expansion of allowable non-retail uses did say “consider” which was a broad term. (Slide 14)
- Adding language was suggested to support minority-owned businesses or put an emphasis on how to bring in people with different identities that could bring unique opportunities to the city. Maybe an action could be added to Focus Area #4 Lack of unique retail and dining experiences or perhaps the topic was just something to be mindful of. (Slide 15)
 - **Ms. Underwood** believed it could live within some of the actions as an area for the City to focus. It could be also an action or part of the implementation.
 - Perhaps language could be added in Action 4.4 to be more explicit around diverse restaurants and shops. The goal was to identify a couple areas that would be unique.
 - The project team was asked to consider opportunities to include more of the suggested language.
 - **Economic Development Manager Lorenzen** suggested Staff consult with the City’s Legal Department about how to execute the concept without being preferential or discriminatory.
 - **Ms. Underwood** clarified that Action 4.4 called out Town Center because it was from the Town Center Plan, which was where the City was most likely to have additional funding if an urban renewal area (URA) were to function.
- Does the City have data on the kind of unique retail or dining experiences people were leaving Wilsonville for?
 - **Ms. Underwood** noted that interviews and the Town Center Plan indicated a desire for more non-chain restaurants and specialty items like food carts.
 - **Economic Development Manager Lorenzen** confirmed food carts was definitely a recurring theme, which was reflected in the EDS. As far as what people were leaving for, whatever reasons the Commissioners would leave for was probably aligned with the general population.
- Having more concrete goals for Focus Area #4 about what specific things the City wants to develop in the future Town Center would be helpful to make sure the public is aligned on the goals or provide feedback otherwise.
 - **Economic Development Manager Lorenzen** agreed Action 4.4 was stated in pretty broad terms but it would be fine-tuned if the City implemented a program to accomplish the goal with input from the Planning Commission, City Council, and other committees to tailor the program to the community's desires.
 - Hearing what the community wants might spark somebody to start that unique opportunity.
- There was a lot of talk about recruiting or attracting, but some beloved local businesses have gone out of business. Does the EDS include support for retaining existing restaurants, retail and other local businesses that were struggling?

- **Ms. Underwood** clarified that Actions 4.1, 4.2, and 4.3 (Slide 15) could support local businesses. The project team heard that high rents were the major cause of local businesses closing. Exploring commercial space models (Action 4.3) could be for local residents who have a business idea and want to grow or are already established in Wilsonville. If that was not clear in the EDS, she would be sure to clarify the language.
- Could the City act as a resource connector to outside programs, such as the County's vocational rehab program, for businesses struggling to find qualified workers?
 - **Ms. Underwood** stated Actions 5.1 and 6.1 were intended for the City to act as a connector/convener role or one stop shop to existing resources and programs. (Slide 16)
- Some nearby communities have new restaurants and grocery stores. Has the City benchmarked with other metro cities' policies regarding successful economic development plans and incentives?
 - **Ms. Underwood** confirmed the project team generated ideas from other cities, including Hillsboro for workforce connections, Gresham for business communication elements, and Tigard for food cart launch programs, but did not do specific benchmarking. Some ideas could live under these Actions to refer back to what other cities are doing successfully.
 - **Economic Development Manager Lorenzen** added Hillsboro and Portland had executed land aggregation in their industrial areas successfully.
- Retail, industrial, and dining came to mind when thinking of Sherwood, which had a lot of industrial development and fresh new restaurants that did not seem to be struggling.
 - **Economic Development Manager Lorenzen** noted a big factor in Wilsonville was the lack of affordable space, which the City had little control over. A good piece of Town Center and almost all of Old Town Square was owned by one real estate investment trust, which changes how market dynamics work as one major player was setting the bar. The City was not powerless to do anything, but some complicating factors exist. The fact that Wilsonville was on I-5 is both a blessing and a curse. Landowners in the city could wait for a credit tenant, which was not usually a mom-and-pop establishment, but a national brand that will pay reliably month after month. It was great that the city's commercial property was in high demand, but that did cause a degree of turnover and more national brands than the small unique businesses everyone wanted.
- Perhaps some language could be added around business retention to be very clear about that intent.
- The desired outcomes included discussion around employment opportunities and increasing wages but perhaps the desired outcomes or some of the strategies could emphasize the importance of maintaining and growing existing Wilsonville businesses, which was a gap in the EDS, as well as recruiting additional businesses.
- Priority actions should include anything related to helping land get ready to be developed, as well as any dedicated funding sources for making things happen. The Commission had multiple conversations about not being in a place to bring on opportunities.

Chair Hendrix confirmed there was no public comment.

INFORMATIONAL

3. City Council Action Minutes (October 6, 9, & 20, 2025) (No staff presentation)
4. 2025 PC Work Program (No staff presentation)

Chair Hendrix congratulated former Commissioner Sam Scull, who was now on City Council, and shared her experience applying for City Council, encouraging other capable Commissioners to consider applying in the future.

ADJOURN

The meeting was adjourned at 6:55 p.m.



PLANNING COMMISSION

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 10, 2025

WORK SESSION

2. Housing Statutory Compliance-Part 1 (Rybold)(60 minutes)



PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING STAFF REPORT

Meeting Date: December 10, 2025		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 COUNCIL:

Staff will introduce the Housing Statutory Compliance project and seek Planning Commission input on information needed to draft Development Code amendments.

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, which would update the City's land use review process for residential development to process most land use applications administratively via the Class II review process (Attachment 1). The HPS commits the City to undertake this action by the end of 2029.

In an effort to promote the development of a variety of housing types throughout the state, the Oregon Legislature passed two bills in the 2025 Session affecting Wilsonville's Development Code standards and review process for residential development. Senate Bill (SB) 974 requires 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. SB 974 also contains provisions that do not directly impact the City's Development Code, including temporary limitations on application of design standards for certain residential land use applications and new review procedures for some public works permits. Planning staff will coordinate with the Engineering Division and Legal Department to determine compliance approaches for these statutory requirements.

Additionally, the Oregon Legislature passed House Bill (HB) 2138, requiring cities to update land use regulations related to middle housing allowances and related standards. As there is significant overlap between these statutory requirements and HPS Action C, the City will undertake these Development Code amendments under a single effort, the Housing Statutory Compliance Project. The project is divided into two parts based on timing related to statutory deadlines:

- **Part 1:** This part of the project will address process related components of SB 974. These requirements become operational on July 1, 2026, requiring hearings-ready Development Code amendments by early spring 2026. The project will integrate HPS Action C, which calls for the City to implement an administrative review process for residential development.
- **Part 2:** This part of the project will focus on modifications to the City's middle housing definitions, middle housing land division process, and other related Development Code amendments consistent with HB 2138. Some requirements of this bill are already in effect, with others becoming operative on January 1, 2027.

This work session will focus on Part 1 of the Housing Statutory Compliance project. The project team will provide Planning Commission with background information on the City's current land use review process for new residential development and present the results of a Code Audit Memo that identifies the City's options for Development Code amendments.

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 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.

Development Code Audit

To help the City determine how to best implement HPS Action C while meeting the requirements of SB 974, 3J Consulting prepared a Development Code Audit Memo (Attachment 2). This memo identifies statutorily required changes to the Development Code resulting from SB 974, and where additional updates would best implement HPS Action C while maintaining a clear, consistent, and transparent land use review process for related application types. While the required changes will result in residential land use applications for Planned Development, site-specific Zone Map amendments, and variances being reviewed and approved administratively, the memo also identifies areas where additional direction is desired from Planning Commission and City Council to determine the City's preferred process updates consistent with HPS Action C. These areas include the following:

- **Annexation** – SB 974 does not require updates to the current annexation process for residential development. To best implement HPS Action C, the City could pursue two options:
 - Adoption of an expedited hearing process for residential development similar to what is used in Coffee Creek, where a public hearing on the annexation request is scheduled at City Council once a land use application is deemed complete. This reduces the number of required public hearings from two to one, allowing for all related land use applications to be approved and effective approximately one month sooner.
 - Adoption of Metro's Expedited Decision process for residential annexation requests. For qualifying applications where 100 percent of property owners and at least 50 percent of the electors, if any, consent to the request, the annexation request can be reviewed and approved administratively without a public hearing. While there are minor differences in the required noticing period, this could be processed concurrently with other related land use applications.

For consistency with established City processes, staff recommends adoption of Development Code updates establishing an expedited hearing process for residential development applications consistent with annexations in the Coffee Creek Industrial Design Overlay District.

- **Comprehensive Plan Map Amendments** – SB 974 does not require updates to the current process for residential Comprehensive Plan Map Amendments. To implement HPS Action C, the City could pursue adoption of an expedited hearing process similar to what was adopted in Coffee Creek, where a public hearing on the Comprehensive Plan Map amendment request is scheduled at City Council once a land use application is deemed complete. This would reduce the number of required public hearings from two to one, allowing for all related land use applications to be effective approximately 2-4 weeks sooner. Since the vast majority of the City's residential land use applications do not require Comprehensive Plan Map amendments, including applications in the City's new

urban growth areas, this would only apply in limited circumstances within the City where an applicant seeks additional density beyond what is currently planned, or where an applicant requests a change from a non-residential to a residential Comprehensive Plan Map designation. As decisions on these Comprehensive Plan Map amendments require a review of detailed findings in support of the Comprehensive Plan Map amendment and involve a high level of discretion, *staff recommends retention of the existing review process for quasi-judicial Comprehensive Plan Map amendments associated with residential development.*

- **Other Residential Land Use Applications** – Site Design Review, Tentative Subdivision Plats, and Type C Tree Removal and Protection Plans are not directly affected by SB 974. To best implement HPS Action C, these application types could continue to be reviewed concurrently with other related Planned Development applications, also shifting to a Class II administrative review process, similar to the approach taken in Coffee Creek. *Staff recommends adoption of Development Code amendments implementing this approach.*
- **Mailed Notifications** – To comply with statutory requirements in SB 974 and ORS 197.195, the City will need to modify the public notice period for Class II administrative land use reviews from 10 days to 14 days. SB 974 also requires a minimum notification radius of 100 feet, consistent with statutory requirements for administrative land use reviews and quasi-judicial public hearings. For reduced legal risk and consistency with state statute, the City could modify the notification radius for quasi-judicial hearings from 250 feet to 100 feet. *Staff recommends adoption of Development Code amendments implementing this approach.*
- **City Board Roles** – By modifying the review process for residential development applications to a Class II administrative review, the overall volume of applications subject to DRB review and approval could drop by approximately 20-30 percent. As 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 City could consider 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.

Staff recommends adoption of Development Code amendments implementing one of these two approaches.

Discussion Questions

- Does the Planning Commission agree with staff's recommendations? What additional information should be considered in preparing draft Development Code amendments?

- Based on these recommendations, are there updates to the administrative review thresholds for other uses that should be considered with this Development Code amendment process?
- What type of community input will best assist you in making final recommendations on the draft Development Code amendments?

EXPECTED RESULTS:

Planning Commission input on implementation options for the Development Code amendments.

TIMELINE:

The project team will present the Code Audit Memo to City Council at a work session on December 15. Feedback received from these work sessions will inform the draft Development Code amendments, which will be presented to Planning Commission and City Council at work sessions in March 2026. Completion of Part 1 of the Housing Statutory Compliance Project must occur by July 1, 2026, with a Planning Commission public hearing on the Development Code amendments scheduled in April 2026.

CURRENT YEAR BUDGET IMPACTS:

Planning's Professional Services budget will cover project expenditures occurring prior to execution of a grant agreement with DLCD. The majority of the project costs will be covered by a \$120,000 DLCD grant throughout FY 2025-26 and FY 2026-27.

COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT PROCESS:

Public work sessions will be held by the Planning Commission and City Council in addition to public hearings. Public outreach is planned for early 2026 to inform the community and gather feedback on the Development Code amendments.

POTENTIAL IMPACTS OR BENEFIT TO THE COMMUNITY:

Implementation of HPS Action C will enable the City to develop a clear and predictable development review process for residential development that continues to allow for and respond to public input while avoiding the confusion of City Code that is superseded by conflicting state statute.

ALTERNATIVES:

Failure to complete the mandated updates by the statutorily required deadlines will expose the City to legal risk if affected residential land use applications are not processed consistent with state law. If the City does not implement HPS Action C, it will have to select an alternative action meeting similar housing production goals at the time of the HPS Midpoint Report in 2028.

ATTACHMENTS:

1. Housing Production Strategy Excerpt – Action C
2. Development Code Audit Memo – December 3, 2025

- Hold public hearings with the Planning Commission and City Council to implement approaches.

Funding or Revenue Implications: Most costs can be covered using existing staff resources, though consulting services will require additional funds.

C. Evaluate Use of Administrative Review Processes for Residential Development

Rationale: Streamlining the administrative review process for development processes that use clear and objective development standards can make the development process faster and increase certainty in the process.

Description: In most cases, new subdivisions and multifamily residential developments are approved through a public hearing process, even when applications meet clear and objective standards of the Development Code. Processing these applications administratively, and taking public comment in writing rather than at a public hearing (with appeal rights retained), would reduce the overall review time and the potential for additional regulatory delay. To maximize effectiveness, the City will consider adding an administrative review process for adjustments to certain clear and objective standards.

Anticipated Impacts

Income Level Served: All incomes

Population: All residents

Tenure: Renters and owners

Impact on Housing: Small

Magnitude of Units Produced or Preserved: Will not directly result in new production of housing but will ease the development process.

City Role: Lead The City would analyze current review processes, identify opportunities for streamlining, and draft Development Code amendments to reflect updated administrative review processes.

Staffing: Existing staff

Partners: Stakeholders in Wilsonville, providing input on the development review process for housing.

Implementation Steps:

- Develop draft edits to the Development Code to allow administrative review processes for residential development.
- Collaborate with stakeholders and the Planning Commission to review proposed changes, including public notification methods (e.g., site postings), to ensure continued opportunities for public input on development.
- Hold public hearings with the Planning Commission and City Council to adopt Development Code amendments to allow for administrative review processes.

Funding or Revenue Implications: This is primarily a development review process change that can be implemented by existing staff.



TO: City of Wilsonville

FROM: Heather Austin, AICP, 3J Consulting, Inc.

RE: Development Code Audit Memo
Housing Statutory Compliance Report

DATE: December 3, 2025



Background and Context

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, which would update the City's land use review process for residential development to process most land use applications administratively via the Class II review process.

In an effort to promote the development of a variety of housing types throughout the state, the Oregon Legislature passed Senate Bill (SB) 974 in the 2025 Session. Sections 2-5 of this bill require 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.

This Code Assessment Memo has been prepared as a guide to help the City determine how to best implement HPS Action C while meeting the requirements of SB 974. This memo identifies statutorily required amendments to the Development Code resulting from SB 974, and where additional amendments would best implement HPS Action C while maintaining a clear and transparent land use review process.

A detailed inventory of City Code sections subject to SB 974 and/or Wilsonville HPS Action C is included with this memo. This inventory is meant to support discussion of preferred code updates and provide a framework for an update to the Development Code.

Typical Residential Application Types and Review Processes

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, as well as for applications for new development in the City's Coffee Creek Design Overlay District.

- **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.

The provisions of SB 974 are applicable to the development of housing. The goal of SB 974 is to increase housing production in cities throughout the state by making it quicker and easier to obtain local approval of residential development applications. SB 974 aims to meet this goal by amending the regulatory framework applicable to residential development applications and prioritizing efficiency in areas planned for or zoned for residential development. To do this, SB 974 requires cities to review residential land use applications in a manner similar to limited land use decisions (ORS 197.195). A limited land use decision is one that is made administratively (without a public hearing) and is based on specific criteria and standards. Per ORS 197.195, a limited land use decision process requires public notice to be mailed to all owners of property within 100 feet of the subject property to allow for a 14-day comment period. A public hearing may be conducted for an appeal of a limited land use decision.

In Wilsonville, there are several application types and review processes that are affected by the provisions of SB 974 or recommendations of HPS Action C:

- Planned Development Process

Section 3 of SB 974 requires the City to make an initial decision on a Planned Development application without a hearing through an administrative review process. The City may hold a public hearing on appeal of the initial decision. Wilsonville's Planned Development process requires four distinct phases, which are typically reviewed concurrently, but may be applied for separately at the applicant's discretion:

- 1) Zone Map Amendment (and concurrent Comprehensive Plan Map Amendment if needed)
- 2) Stage I Preliminary Plan (review of land uses)
- 3) Stage II Final Plan (review site function and layout), and
- 4) Site Design Review (review of design and materials).

To comply with SB 974, the City should update the procedures such that the Stage I Preliminary Plan and Stage II Final Plan for residential development are each a Class II administrative review. This would also include review of any requested waivers to development standards that are included in the Planned Development Review criteria, as these are evaluated with Stage II Final Plan applications.

Converting the two stages of Planned Development (PD) review for residential development to administrative reviews will have some impact on review process and timelines. While the process of reviewing applications against the relevant Development Code criteria and making findings will remain the same, decisions will be issued upon completion of this review, shortening the overall review timeline. Any appeals of an administrative decision on a Stage I Preliminary Plan or Stage II Final Plan would be reviewed through a public hearing before the DRB.

- Comprehensive Plan Map and Zoning Map Amendments

Comprehensive Plan Map and Zone Map Amendments are decisions of the City Council. In the case of a quasi-judicial map amendment, the DRB conducts a public hearing and makes a recommendation to the City Council. For legislative amendments, Planning Commission conducts a public hearing and makes a recommendation to the City Council.

SB 974 requires residential Zone Map Amendments that result in an increase in density to be administrative decisions issued without a public hearing. The bill is not clear in how to determine an “increase in density”, but this has been interpreted by the state’s Housing Accountability and Production Office (HAPO) to mean:

- An increase in the total number of permitted housing units
- A change to the types of housing units permitted
- A decrease in the overall minimum lot size
- A reduction in development standards that limit density, such as maximum building height or FAR or minimum setbacks or off-street parking

To comply with SB 974, the City should update the Zone Map Amendment process to allow an administrative review, without a public hearing, for residential Zone Map Amendments that increase density. Even without a public hearing, SB 974 specifies that the City continues to send a Post-Acknowledgement Plan Amendment (PAPA) notice to the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD).

A Comprehensive Plan Map Amendment is occasionally needed with a Zone Map Amendment. Comprehensive Plan Map Amendment is not included in the provisions of SB 974. The instances in Wilsonville where a Comprehensive Plan Map Amendment would be needed prior to (or concurrent with) a Zone Map Amendment for a residential property that increases density are limited primarily to infill development. The City is not required to update its process for review of a Comprehensive Plan Map Amendment. However, the City has precedent of using an expedited hearing process whereby all Comprehensive Plan Map Amendments in the Coffee Creek Industrial Design Overlay District are reviewed only by City Council without a prior hearing and recommendation from the DRB.

The City should consider applying its expedited hearing process to residential Comprehensive Plan Map Amendments that increase density. This would support implementation of Wilsonville’s HPS Action C.

- Tentative Subdivision Plat

The subdivision of land in Wilsonville, which results in the creation of more than three lots, is currently processed through a Class III quasi-judicial land use review with a public hearing at the DRB. Partitions, which create three or fewer parcels, are processed as Class II administrative decisions. ORS 197.195(12) identifies “a tentative subdivision or partition plan” as a limited land use decision that does not require, but can allow for, a public hearing process.

Though not a specific requirement of SB 974, Wilsonville HPS Action C would support the recommendation to make subdivisions of residential land a Class II administrative decision without a public hearing. Subdivisions are most often associated with residential uses that involve land use applications subject to the requirements of SB 974. In addition, subdivisions are subject to clear,

numerical design standards that do not require decision-maker discretion. This process change to an administrative decision would allow for continued concurrent review of tentative subdivision plat applications with other residential land use applications requiring a Class II administrative review process.

- Site Design Review

All Planned Development applications require Site Design Review as the fourth review phase, which for residential development focuses on elements such as street trees and open space. Residential structures in residential zones are exempt from Site Design Review, unless requesting a waiver to one of the applicable clear and objective design standards (mixed-use residential structures are not exempted) for residential structures in residential zones found in Section 4.113 of the Code. Like subdivisions, “site [design] review” is listed as a limited land use decision in ORS 197.015(12). Because SB 974 requires updates to the Planned Development review process, updating the process for residential Site Design Review to a Class II administrative decision without a public hearing would allow for continued concurrent processing of all application components, consistent with the intent of HPS Action C.

- Variance

Variances are identified in Section 4.196 of the Code as granted by the DRB. SB 974 specifically requires variances to residential development standards to be processed as administrative decisions without a public hearing.

To comply with SB 974, the City should update the code to make variances to residential development standards a Class II administrative decision without a public hearing.

- Annexation

Annexations are not addressed by SB 974. However, reducing review process and timelines for annexation of residential land would support implementation of Wilsonville Housing Production Strategy Action C. Because Wilsonville is in Metro’s jurisdiction, annexations to the City are subject to Metro Code Chapter 3.09 Local Government Boundary Changes. The provisions of Chapter 3.09 permit an expedited decision without a public hearing, assuming the petition includes written consent of one hundred percent of property owners and at least fifty percent of the electors, if any, within the affected territory.

The City currently uses two public hearings to process an annexation. The preliminary hearing (with the DRB for quasi-judicial requests or the Planning Commission for legislative requests) is used to make a recommendation to City Council, the City’s annexation decision-making body. For annexation into the Coffee Creek area, annexation requests are sent directly to City Council.

The City should consider updating its annexation standards to send residential annexation requests directly to City Council, consistent with the current process for Coffee Creek Industrial Design Overlay District. Additionally, the City could decide to codify the expedited decision procedure by Metro, allowing an application for annexation of residential land to be processed without a public hearing (assuming consent thresholds are met). Both would reduce timelines for annexation of residential land, supporting the implementation of HPS Action C.

- Type C Tree Removal and Protection Plan

A Type C Tree Removal and Protection Plan is currently required for any tree removal associated with a site plan or plat that is reviewed by the DRB, as well for site development applications subject to a Class II administrative review process in the Coffee Creek Industrial Design Overlay District. Similar to other residential development standards, tree removal standards associated with residential development must be clear and objective. While not required by SB 974, in alignment with the goal of increasing housing production of Wilsonville HPS Action C, the City should consider changing the review process for Type C Tree Removal and Protection Plans associated with residential development to a Class II administrative review process, similar to site development applications in Coffee Creek.

Appeals Process

SB 974 specifies that a public hearing may be conducted for an appeal of an administrative decision affecting a residential development process. The City currently processes appeal of an administrative Class II decision through an appeal hearing before the DRB. The provisions of SB 974 do not require a change to the City's appeal process for development decisions processed as a Class II administrative review.

Noticing Process and Options for Public Awareness of Residential Development Applications

SB 974 and ORS 197.195 are very specific about public notice for limited land use and similar actions. The noticing buffer from the subject site is 100 feet and the timeframe for comment is 14 days. Wilsonville's current notice processing standards call for a 250-foot buffer and a 10-day period for submittal of comments for a Class II review. The City's public notice period is longer for applications requiring public hearings (20-40 days), using the same 250-foot radius.

The current noticing procedures are intended to notify neighboring landowners of the opportunity to participate in the review and decision-making process for an application. The public notice procedures in ORS 197.195 are geared more toward notifying neighboring landowners of an action that is taking place, and less toward an opportunity to participate. This difference is based on the premise that the proposed limited land use actions will be reviewed and approved based on only clear and objective standards, without the use of discretion.

The City currently uses other notification methods not specified in the Development Code to build awareness of land use applications and public hearings, including site postings, newspaper notices, and detailed application information on the City's Projects Around the City webpage. While unrelated to any required Development Code edits, the City should consider how these tools can be used during Class II administrative reviews of new development.

Consistent public notice procedures reduce confusion for land use applicants, staff and the public. For consistency, the city should consider amending the public notice buffer radius to 100 feet for all land use submittals. SB 974 requires a 14-day comment period for all residential land use submittals. The city's current notice processing standard of 10 days should be changed to 14 days for compliance with state law.

Development Review Board Role

The City currently utilizes two DRBs, with each board meeting monthly, to review all Class III and IV quasi-judicial applications. The DRB makes decisions on Class III applications (such as variances, site design reviews and planned developments) whereas the DRB makes recommendations to City Council on Class IV applications (such as zone changes and annexations). Whereas, the Planning Commission reviews all Class IV legislative applications (such as Comprehensive Plan and Development Code text amendments) and makes recommendations to the City Council. The Planning Commission meets monthly to discuss the City's legislative land use matters.

Many cities use a single Planning Commission as both the legislative and quasi-judicial review authority. There is some benefit to having the same body that is implementing the City's legislative land use policy also applying that implemented policy directly to submitted applications. In addition, the changes to review procedures required by SB 974 and supported by Wilsonville HPS Action C will reduce the number of applications coming to a public hearing before the DRB for review.

Based on the information above, the City should consider whether they will:

1. Keep the DRB structure as-is with two review bodies;
2. Keep one DRB for all eligible quasi-judicial reviews; or
3. Eliminate the DRB and place all quasi-judicial decision-making and legislative recommendations with the Planning Commission (possibly requiring two meetings per month).

Land Use Application Fee Structure

Wilsonville's Planning Division Fees should be evaluated in light of any changes made to review procedures to ensure they are reflective of the staff time required to process applications. Presently, applications in the Coffee Creek Industrial Design Overlay District, which are generally Class II reviews, are charged the standard application-based review fees because the staff review time and resources are generally about the same as a DRB review as opposed to a Class II review of a minor modification to an approved land use plan. There are costs associated with a public hearing, with administration and project review staff needed for each public meeting. In light of this, the City could consider separating out plan review fees from hearing fees or charging a new standalone fee if a public hearing is involved.

Recommendations Summary

When considering the recommendations of HPS Action C, the City has an opportunity to refine the land use review process for residential development while ensuring consistency with statutory review and noticing requirements. The following recommendations are broken into three categories as follows:

To ensure compliance with the requirements of SB 974, the City of Wilsonville should:

- Change the residential land use review process from Class III to Class II for:
 - Stage I Preliminary Plan Planned Development Review
 - Stage II Final Plan Planned Development Review
 - Zone Map amendments that increase residential density
 - Variances and waivers to residential development standards

- Change the mailed public notice requirements for a Class II review to a 14-day period consistent with the requirements of ORS 197.195 and SB 974

Based on the recommendations of HPS Action C, the City of Wilsonville could consider:

- Applying the same expedited review process (one public hearing before City Council) that applies to the Coffee Creek Industrial Design Overlay District for:
 - Residential Comprehensive Plan Map Amendments that increase density
 - Residential annexation requests
 - Additionally, the City could also codify Metro's expedited decision procedure, allowing an application for annexation of residential land to be processed without a public hearing (assuming consent thresholds are met)
- Changing the review process from Class III to Class II for:
 - Residential tentative subdivision plats
 - Site design review process associated with a residential development application
 - Tree removal and protection plans associated with a residential development application

Accounting for the potential of the above changes to the City's development review process, for consistency and efficiency, the City of Wilsonville could also consider:

- Changing the mailed public notice requirements for Class II review and quasi-judicial public hearings to a 100-foot-buffer consistent with the requirements of ORS 197.195 and 197.797.
- Modifying the City's board structure to better align with anticipated workload by either:
 - Using a single DRB to review quasi-judicial land use applications, or
 - Eliminating the DRB and using the Planning Commission to review quasi-judicial land use applications in addition to legislative land use matters
- Evaluating the fee structure for land use applications to differentiate between minor Class II administrative review applications and applications for new residential development reviewed in a Class II process

Inventory of City Code sections subject to SB 974 and/or Wilsonville HPS Action C

Code Citation	Code Provision	Analysis
CHAPTER 2 ADMINISTRATION		
BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS (PUBLIC CONTRACTS?)		
Section 2.332.-Development Review Board Powers and Duties		
(2) Applications to be reviewed by the Development Review Board...	Specifically lists subdivisions and major partitions, planned developments, site review, design review, variances and zoning map amendments.	Action: Remove limited land uses for residential development from the powers and duties of the DRB.
CHAPTER 4 PLANNING AND LAND DEVELOPMENT		
ADMINISTRATION		
Section 4.008 Application Procedures- In General		
(.02) Unique features of Wilsonville's development review process	F., G., and H. require a 4-stage review for Planned Developments: 1. Rezoning; 2. Stage 1- Preliminary Plan; 3. Stage 2- Final Plan; and 4. Site Design Review.	Action: Identify Stage 1- Preliminary Plan and Stage II- Final Plan as Class II Review. Subsection G. Update language referring to "zoning changed by action of City Council".
Section 4.012 Public Hearing Notices		
(.01) Published Notice	Notice shall be published between 10- and 21-days prior to the initial public hearing.	Consider: Newspaper notice is not required by the state. This is becoming a less effective (but still costly) way for cities to provide public notice. Many cities are removing this requirement from their codes to reduce timelines and expense and are using other means of providing this type of notice, such as the city's website and social media. Newspaper notice (and posting on the subject site) is still required by Metro Code 3.09.030 for annexations.
(.02) Mailed Notice for Quasi-Judicial Hearings.	Noice shall be mailed to property owners within 250 feet of the site between 20 and 40 days prior to the initial public hearing.	Consider: Update notice buffer to 100 feet and notice timeframe to 14 days for quasi-judicial review for consistency with limited land use buffer and timelines.
Section 4.017 Withdrawal of Application		
(.02) Application withdrawn within one week of submittal...	Application fee refunded less 15% administrative cost.	Consider: This is not identified in the fee schedule. It may not come up very often so it may not need to be addressed.
Section 4.022- Appeal and Call-up Procedures.		
(.01) Administrative Action Appeals.	Appeals of decisions by Planning Director on Site Development Permits are heard by Development Review Board. References two panels of the DRB.	Action: Remove ability of DRB to "call-up" Class II applications. Consider: Reference to two DRB panels.
Section 4.030- Jurisdiction and Powers of Planning Director and Community Development Director.		
(.01) Authority of Planning Director.	B. identifies Class II review process. B.10 identifies Class II review for Stage I and Stage II Planned Development within Coffee Creek Industrial Design Overlay District (CCIDOD). B.12 identifies Type C Tree permits within CCIDOD.	Action: Remove "call-up" from Class II (at least for residential projects) in subsection B. Update B.10 and B.12 to include "residential development projects" (or add new subsections with similar language to CCIDOD provisions).
Section 4.031- Authority of the Development Review Board.		
	The following are subject to review by the DRB: A. Planning Director may refer all Class II development applications to DRB. B. Call-ups of staff decisions. E. Variances. F. Zone Changes. H. Site design review. I. Stage I and Stage II PD applications. Annexations.	Action: Update Subsections A, B, E, F, H, and I to remove residential projects from DRB (or any public hearing board) review. Consider: Update K. to either exempt annexations from DRB (send straight to Council- may need to include this information for CCIDOD) or codify the Metro Code 3.09 provision to allow annexation of residential land without public hearing if consent thresholds are met.

Section 4.035- Site Development Permits.		
(.03) Class II- Administrative Review.	A. 250-foot notice buffer and 10-day notice period.	Action: Update to 100-foot buffer and 14-day notice period.
	B. Allows Planning Director to initiate public hearing.	Action: Remove ability to refer Class II applications for residential development.
	D. Says a decision of the Planning Director may be "called up" to DRB.	Action: Remove ability to call up Class II applications for residential development.
(.04) Site Development Permit Application.	A.j. requires a list of property owners within 250 feet.	Action: Update to 100 feet consistent with limited land use regulations.
ZONING		
Section 4.118- Standards Applying to all Planned Development Zones.		
(.03) through (.08)	References Development Review Board as approval authority.	Action: Update to "review authority" or "Planning Director or Development Review Board" (which occurs many other times in the code).
Section 4.125- V- Village Zone		
(.05), (.06), (.07), and (.08)	References DRB as review authority. Requires compliance with Old Town Residential Design Standards Book.	Action: Update to "review authority" or "Planning Director or Development Review Board" (which occurs many other times in the code).
(.18) Village Zone Development Permit Process.	Requires Specific Area Plan (SAP) approval first by DRB, then a Preliminary Development Plan (PDP), also approved by the DRB, then a Final Development Plan (FDP) with DRB or Planning Director as decision maker.	Action: Allow SAP, PDP and FDP as Class II review for residential development.
Section 4.127- Residential Neighborhood (RN) Zone.		
(.09) Open Space:	References DRB as decision body.	Action: Update to "review authority" or "Planning Director or Development Review Board" (which occurs many other times in the code).
Section 4.132- Town Center Zone.		
	Mixed-use zone. Design standards and DRB as review authority.	Action: Update to "review authority" or "Planning Director or Development Review Board" (which occurs many other times in the code).
Section 4.140.-Planned Development Regulations.		
(.05) Planned Development Permit Process:	References the DRB for Stage I and Stage II approvals. (.07)D and (.09)A allow CCIDOD reviews to be Class II.	Action: Update to allow Class II for residential development, similar to allowances for CCIDOD.
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS		
Section 4.155- General Regulations- Parking, Loading and Bicycle Parking		
(.02) General Provisions:	Lists DRB as review authority and variance-granting authority.	Action: Update to "review authority" or "Planning Director or Development Review Board" (which occurs many other times in the code).
Section 4.176- Landscaping, Screening, and Buffering.		
(.06) Plant Materials:	D. allows DRB to require mix of street trees.	Action: Update to "review authority" or "Planning Director or Development Review Board" (which occurs many other times in the code).
(.11) Street Trees Not Typically Part of Site Landscaping.	DRB may grant waiver or variance.	Action: Update to "review authority" or "Planning Director or Development Review Board" (which occurs many other times in the code).
(.12) Mitigation and Restoration Plantings.	DRB approves mitigation plan.	Action: Update to "review authority" or "Planning Director or Development Review Board" (which occurs many other times in the code).
Section 4.177- Street Improvement Standards.		
(.02)G. Interim improvement standard	DRB has authority to specify alternative interim standards.	Action: Update to "review authority" or "Planning Director or Development Review Board" (which occurs many other times in the code).

(.03)B. Sidewalks	Within a PD, the DRB may...	Action: Update to "review authority" or "Planning Director or Development Review Board" (which occurs many other times in the code).
Section 4.179- Mixed Solid Waste and Recyclables Storage in New Multi-Family Residential and Non-Residential Buildings.		
(.01) All site plans...	References DRB as review for multi-family site plans.	Action: Update to "review authority" or "Planning Director or Development Review Board" (which occurs many other times in the code).
Section 4.189- Non-Conforming Uses.		
(.05) Enlargement and Moving.	Requires Conditional Use Permit by DRB for enlargement up to 20%.	Action: Update to allow Class II review for residential.
Section 4.196- Variances		
(.01) Where difficulties exist...	DRB may grant variances.	Action: Update to "review authority" or "Planning Director or Development Review Board" for variances to residential development standards.
Section 4.197- Zone Changes and Amendments to This Code- Procedures.		
(.01) The following procedure shall...	A. and B. Planning Commission shall conduct a public hearing...	Action: Allow Class II review of residential zone change that increases density (this is different than provisions for CCIDOD which sends zone changes straight to City Council for decision- no hearing for residential zone change that increases density).
(.02) through (.05)	Identify all Zoning Map Amendments as "quasi-judicial" with PC (or DRB) making recommendation for Council to make final decision.	
Section 4.198- Comprehensive Plan Changes- Adoption by the City Council.		
(.03) through (.07) All other quasi-judicial Comprehensive Plan Map Amendments...	Review by DRB, recommendation to City Council (legislative review by PC, recommendation to CC).	Consider: Allow Comprehensive Plan Map Amendments for residential land that increase density to go straight to City Council similar to CCIDOD process already in place.
Section 4.199.30.-Lighting Overlay Zones.		
(.03) Modification of Lighting Zones.	B. identifies DRB as review board to modify designated Lighting Zones as part of the Stage II, Site Design Review Process.	Action: Update to "review authority" or "Planning Director or Development Review Board" for variances or waivers to residential development standards. Note: 4.001 Definitions will need to be updated to support this amendment.
LAND DIVISIONS		
Section 4.202.-General-Authorization		
(.04) No person shall sell any lot...	B. requires lot size reductions by DRB or CC.	Action: Update to "review authority" or "Planning Director or Development Review Board" for variances or waivers to residential development standards.
(.06) New condominium developments...	Requires PD review for condominiums.	Consider: Update to not require public hearing for conversion of apartments to condominiums. Updates to PD provisions will also apply to condo conversions.
(.07) Condominium conversions...	Requires public hearing for conversion of apartments to condominiums.	
Section 4.210.- Application Procedure.		
(.01) Pre-application conference.	B. requires preparation of tentative subdivision plat for presentation to "the Planning Department and Development Review Board." C. Requires the DRB to be decision maker for subdivision (Planning Director for plat) and lists procedures for DRB review and approval.	Action: Update to "review authority" or "Planning Director or Development Review Board" for variances or waivers to residential development standards.
Section 4.237.-General Requirements-Other.		
(.06) Access	Allow DRB to waive lot frontage requirements.	Action: Update to "review authority" or "Planning Director or Development Review Board" for variances or waivers to residential development standards.

(.07) Through lots.	Allows DRB to require assurance.	Action: Update to "review authority" or "Planning Director or Development Review Board" for variances or waivers to residential development standards.
(.09) Large lot land divisions.	DRB may make restriction of buildings in future street locations a matter of record.	
Section 4.270.-Variance from Land Division Standards.	DRB may authorize a variance from land division standards.	
SITE DESIGN REVIEW		
Section 4.420- Review Authority for Site Design Review.	DRB is identified as the review authority. However, (.01)1. Residential structures in residential zones are exempt from Site Design Review as long as they meet established clear and objective design and siting standards or any allowed adjustments. This exemption does not apply to mixed-use residential structures. However, an applicant may elect to have residential structures approved by the Board through Site Design Review in association with waivers from specific standards. Also, areas covered by Stage II PD (or PDP in Village Zone) require landscaping plans reviewed through DRB if landscaping on residential lots was part of overall site landscaping (25%).	Action: Update to "review authority" or "Planning Director or Development Review Board" for variances or waivers to residential development standards. Consider: SB 974 Section 3. applies to residential development on land “zoned primarily for residential use or mixed residential use or planned for residential use.” May need to expand staff-level review authority for Site Design Review to include mixed-use structures if determined by City Attorney that SB 974 is applicable in the City’s mixed use zones.
Section 4.421- Criteria and Application of Design Standards.		
(.01) The following standards...	Standards applicable to SDR (references DRB as review authority).	Action: Revise standards applicable to SDR so that they are clear and objective as applicable to residential development. Update to "review authority" or "Planning Director or Development Review Board".
(.03) The Board shall...	Applies the purpose section as additional criteria and standards.	Consider: The purpose section is not a review standard typically and should not apply directly to site development. Consider revising to apply just to nonresidential uses.
(.05) The Board may attach...	References attaching conditions but requires the DRB to consider "the effects of this action on the availability and cost of needed housing."	Action: Update to "review authority" or "Planning Director or Development Review Board" for variances to residential development standards. Consider: Is "the effects of this action on the availability and cost of needed housing" clear and objective?
TREE PRESERVATION AND PROTECTION		
Section 4.610.00- Application Review Procedure.		
(.03) Reviewing Authority.	B. Type C. requires review by DRB if development includes a site plan review or plat (subdivision).	Action: Update to "review authority" or "Planning Director or Development Review Board" or specify where Class II review applies.
ANNEXATION AND URBAN GROWTH BOUNDARY AMENDMENTS		
Section 4.700-Procedures Relating to the Processing of Requests for Annexation and Urban Growth Boundary Amendments.		
(.01) through (.05)	Quasi-judicial requests are reviewed by DRB and legislative requests by PC with recommendation to CC (except in CCIDOD, which is straight to CC).	Consider: Allow residential annexations to go straight to Council like CCIDOD. -OR- Consider adopting Metro Expediated Decisions (Metro Code 3.09.045) to exempt residential annexations from public hearing.



PLANNING COMMISSION

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 10, 2025

INFORMATIONAL

3. City Council Action Minutes (November 3, 12, & 17, 2025)(*No staff presentation*)



ACTION MINUTES

November 03, 2025 at 5:00 PM

Wilsonville City Hall & Remote Video Conferencing

PRESENT:

Mayor O'Neil
Councilor President Berry
Councilor Cunningham
Councilor Shevlin
Councilor Scull

STAFF PRESENT:

Amanda Guile-Hinman, City Attorney
Andrea Villagrana, Human Resource Manager
Bill Evans, Communications & Marketing Manager
Bryan Cosgrove, City Manager
Jeanna Troha, Assistant City Manager
Keith Katko, Finance Director
Kerry Rappold, Natural Resources Manager
Kimberly Veliz, City Recorder
Everett Wild, Government Affairs Manager
Fred Weinhouse, Municipal Court Judge
Tobin Montalbo, Legal Intern
Zach Weigel, City Engineer
Zoe Mombert, Assistant to the City Manager

WORK SESSION [5:00 PM]

REVIEW OF AGENDA AND ITEMS ON CONSENT

There was none.

COUNCILORS' CONCERNS

There was none.

PRE-COUNCIL WORK SESSION

1. City Manager Recruitment Process

Staff and consultant summarized progress toward identifying and hiring a replacement for the retiring City Manager.

2. Sewer & Storm Utility Rate Update

Staff sought the Council's direction to identify a preferred rate design and implementation timeline for new sewer and stormwater utility rates to go into effect in 2026.

3. 2026 State Legislative Agenda

Staff presented the 2026 State Legislative agenda, which was to be approved at the regular meeting to follow.

4. Public Safety Council Goal Update: Draft Administrative Warrant Code Provisions

Staff sought feedback on draft revisions to City Code that would create a process for staff to seek, obtain, and execute administrative warrants in Municipal Court when there is reasonable suspicion to investigate potential Code violations.

ADJOURN [6:35 PM]

CITY COUNCIL MEETING [7:00 PM]

CALL TO ORDER

1. Roll Call
2. Pledge of Allegiance
3. Motion to approve the following order of the agenda.

Approved 4-0.

4. Oath of office administered by Judge Fred Weinhouse to newly appointed Councilor Sam Scull.
5. Break for Refreshments

The Mayor recessed the City Council meeting at 7:02 p.m. and called it back to order at 7:10 p.m.

MAYOR'S BUSINESS

Upcoming Meetings (Link to City Calendar: <https://www.wilsonvilleoregon.gov/calendar>)

The Mayor submitted a written report on the meetings and activities he attended.

COMMUNICATIONS

6. Diversity, Equity and Inclusion (DEI) Committee Update

Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Committee Chair and staff detailed the DEI Committee's work to establish and grow new programs and events that make Wilsonville more welcoming to all residents.

7. Community Enhancement Project Update - Heart of the City Project Report

It was noted that this presentation was rescheduled for December 1, 2025.

CITIZEN INPUT AND COMMUNITY ANNOUNCEMENTS

This is an opportunity for visitors to address the City Council on any matter concerning City's Business or any matter over which the Council has control. It is also the time to address items not on the agenda. It is also the time to address items that are on the agenda but not scheduled for a public hearing. Staff and the City Council will make every effort to respond to questions raised during citizen input before tonight's meeting ends or as quickly as possible thereafter. Please limit your comments to three minutes.

COUNCILOR COMMENTS, LIAISON REPORTS AND MEETING ANNOUNCEMENTS

Councilors provided comments, announced prior and anticipated meetings and events.

CONSENT AGENDA

8. Resolution No. 3215

A Resolution Of The City Of Wilsonville Approving A Construction Contract With Buell Recreation LLC For The Memorial Park Playground Replacement Project.

9. Minutes of the October 20, 2025 City Council Meeting.

The Consent Agenda was adopted 5-0.

NEW BUSINESS

10. 2026 Legislative Agenda Adoption and DC Lobby Trip Recap

Council moved to adopt the 2026 Legislative Agenda. Passed 5-0.

CONTINUING BUSINESS

There was none.

PUBLIC HEARING

11. Resolution No. 3218

A Resolution Of The City Of Wilsonville Adopting The Climate Action Plan.

After a public hearing, Resolution No. 3218 was adopted 4-1.

CITY MANAGER'S BUSINESS

The City Manager welcomed newly sworn in City Councilor Sam Scull.

LEGAL BUSINESS

There was none.

ADJOURN [9:38 PM]



ACTION MINUTES

November 12, 2025, at 4:00 PM

Wilsonville City Hall & Remote Video Conferencing

PRESENT:

Mayor O'Neil
Councilor President Berry
Councilor Cunningham
Councilor Shevlin
Councilor Scull

STAFF PRESENT:

Amanda Guile-Hinman, City Attorney
Andrea Villagrana, Human Resource Manager
Kimberly Veliz, City Recorder
Zoe Mombert, Assistant to the City Manager

WORK SESSION [5:00 PM]

1. City Manager Recruitment Process

Andrea Villagrana, Human Resource Manager along with Richard Meyers of GMP Consultants lead the discussion on the city manager recruitment process. This item would return to the November 17, 2025, City Council as Resolution No. 3226, a resolution adopting hiring standards, criteria, and policy directives for the employment of a public officer.

ADJOURN [4:41 PM]



ACTION MINUTES

November 17, 2025, at 5:00 PM

Wilsonville City Hall & Remote Video Conferencing

PRESENT:

Mayor O'Neil
Councilor President Berry
Councilor Cunningham
Councilor Shevlin
Councilor Scull

STAFF PRESENT:

Amanda Guile-Hinman, City Attorney
Andrea Villagrana, Human Resource Manager
Anne MacCracken, Transit Management Analyst
Bill Evans, Communications & Marketing Manager
Bryan Cosgrove, City Manager
Diana Kotler, Transit Operations Manager
Dwight Brashear, Transit Director
Jeanna Troha, Assistant City Manager
Kelsey Lewis, Grants & Programs Manager
Keith Katko, Finance Director
Kimberly Veliz, City Recorder
Marissa Rauthause, Civil Engineer
Shasta Sasser, Library Director
Steve Rymer, Interim Parks and Recreation Director
Zach Weigel, City Engineer
Zoe Mombert, Assistant to the City Manager

WORK SESSION [5:00 PM]

REVIEW OF AGENDA AND ITEMS ON CONSENT

There was none.

COUNCILORS' CONCERNS

There was none.

PRE-COUNCIL WORK SESSION

1. Parks Utility Rate (Fee) Funding Strategy

Staff and Consultant provided background and rate analysis for the creation of a potential park utility rate, also known as a parks utility fee. This was in response to the City Council Goal to “maintain existing park maintenance levels of service with upcoming expansion.”

2. SMART Annual Rider Survey Results

SMART staff presented the results of the annual September on-board passenger survey. The theme of the 2025 survey was on rider satisfaction of various elements of SMART transit service.

ADJOURN [6:03 PM]

EXECUTIVE SESSION [6:10 PM]

- ORS 192.660(2)(e) Real Property Transactions
To conduct deliberations with persons designated by the governing body to negotiate real property transactions.
- ORS 192.660(2)(h) Legal Counsel/Litigation
To consult with counsel concerning the legal rights and duties of a public body with regard to current litigation or litigation likely to be filed.

ADJOURN [6:33 PM]

CITY COUNCIL MEETING [7:00 PM]

CALL TO ORDER

1. Roll Call
2. Pledge of Allegiance
3. Motion to approve the following order of the agenda.

Passed 5-0.

MAYOR'S BUSINESS

4. Upcoming Meetings (*Link to City Calendar: <https://www.wilsonvilleoregon.gov/calendar>*)

The Mayor also announced past and future meetings and events.

COMMUNICATIONS

5. Community Enhancement Project Update: Book Bike (*Friends of the Library*)

Council heard a summary of the activities of the Library's Book Bike, a project funded through the Wilsonville-Metro Community Enhancement Program.

CITIZEN INPUT AND COMMUNITY ANNOUNCEMENTS

This is an opportunity for visitors to address the City Council on any matter concerning City's Business or any matter over which the Council has control. It is also the time to address items not on the agenda. It is also the time to address items that are on the agenda but not scheduled for a public hearing. Staff and the City Council will make every effort to respond to questions raised during citizen input before tonight's meeting ends or as quickly as possible thereafter. Please limit your comments to three minutes.

COUNCILOR COMMENTS, LIAISON REPORTS AND MEETING ANNOUNCEMENTS

Councilors provided comments, announced prior and anticipated meetings and events.

CONSENT AGENDA

6. Resolution No. 3224

A Resolution Of The City Of Wilsonville Authorizing The City Manager To Execute Modification No. 2 To The Tri-County Metropolitan Transportation District Of Oregon (TriMet) Subrecipient Agreement For Fiscal Years 2026 And 2027.

7. Minutes of November 3, 2025, City Council Meeting.

The Consent Agenda was approved 5-0.

NEW BUSINESS

8. Resolution No. 3226

A Resolution Adopting Hiring Standards, Criteria, And Policy Directives For The Employment Of A Public Officer.

The Resolution No. 3226 was approved 5-0.

CONTINUING BUSINESS

PUBLIC HEARING

9. **Ordinance No. 900** -*1st Reading (Legislative Non-Land Use Public Hearing)*

An Ordinance Of The City Of Wilsonville Implementing An Administrative Warrants Process By Amending Chapter 1 Of The Wilsonville Code To Add Sections 1.100 Through 1.180.

After a public hearing was conducted Ordinance No. 900 was adopted on first reading 5-0.

CITY MANAGER'S BUSINESS

The City Manager updated Council on initial responses to a public engagement opportunity available to residents and community stakeholders on "Let's Talk, Wilsonville!" on the Town Center Plan and its proposed financing through urban renewal.

Council informally agreed to extend Bryan Cosgrove's contract as the City Manager for up to three months, through March 2026, or until a successor was identified and hired.

LEGAL BUSINESS

No report.

ADJOURN [8:16 PM]



PLANNING COMMISSION

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 10, 2025

INFORMATIONAL

4. 2026 PC Work Program *(No staff presentation)*

2026 DRAFT PC WORK PROGRAM SCHEDULE

Item 4.

Updated 12/3/2025

AGENDA ITEMS			
Date	Informational	Work Sessions	Public Hearings
JANUARY 14		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wilsonville Industrial Land Readiness (West Railroad) 	
FEBRUARY 11		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wilsonville Industrial Land Readiness (Basalt Creek Master Plan) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wilsonville Industrial Land Readiness (Citywide EOA & EDS)
MARCH 11		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Housing Statutory Compliance-Part 1 	
APRIL 8		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wilsonville Industrial Land Readiness (Basalt Creek Master Plan) Housing Statutory Compliance-Part 1
MAY 13	Annual Housing Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
JUNE 10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 		<ul style="list-style-type: none">
JULY 8		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	
AUGUST 12		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	
SEPTEMBER 9		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	
OCTOBER 14			<ul style="list-style-type: none">
NOVEMBER 11 (Veteran's Day)	Cancelled		
DECEMBER 9		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	
JAN. 13, 2027			
2026 Projects To Be Scheduled		Future (2027)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Housing Statutory Compliance-Part 2 WILR (Basalt Creek Master Plan & Code, & Citywide EOA adoption) Water Distribution System Master Plan 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Housing Our Future Implementation Solid Waste and Recycling Code Update 	

Shared Documents - Planning\..Long-Range\Planning Commission\Scheduling