



Development Review Board-Panel A

Regular Meeting Minutes

March 10, 2025

Wilsonville City Hall & Remote Video Conferencing

Accepted as Presented

October 13, 2025

CALL TO ORDER - ROLL CALL

Vice-Chair Alice Galloway called the meeting to order at 6:30 pm.

Present: Clark Hildum, Jordan Herron, Alice Galloway and Janis Sanford

Excused: Rob Candrian

Staff Present: Daniel Pauly, Stephanie Davidson, Kimberly Rybold and Shelley White

CHAIR'S REMARKS

CITIZEN INPUT

There was none.

CONSENT AGENDA

1. Consideration of the January 13, 2025 Development Review Board Minutes

Jordan Herron moved to approve the January 13, 2025 DRB Panel A meeting minutes. Clark Hildum seconded the motion, which passed unanimously. (Ayes: Herron, Galloway, Hildum, Sanford; Nays: None.)

PUBLIC HEARING

2. **Resolution No. 439. ParkWorks Class 3 Sign Permit and Waiver.** The applicant is requesting approval of a Class 3 Sign Permit and Waiver for a 603 square foot wall sign at the ParkWorks Industrial Building.

Case Files:

DB24-0010 ParkWorks Class 3 Sign Permit and Waiver

-Class 3 Sign Permit (SIGN24-0013)

-Waiver (WAIV24-0003)

This item was continued to this time and date certain at the January 13, 2025 DRB meeting. No public hearing will be held - the application has been withdrawn.

BOARD MEMBER COMMUNICATIONS

3. Results of the January 27, 2025 DRB Panel B meeting
4. Results of the February 24, 2025 DRB Panel B meeting
5. Recent City Council Action Minutes

No comment.

STAFF COMMUNICATIONS

6. Oregon Government Ethics Commission Public Meeting Training

Stephanie Davidson, Assistant City Attorney, presented the Oregon Public Meetings Law and Regulations Update via PowerPoint, highlighting the historical requirements and describing changes to the Oregon Government Ethics Commission (OGEC) rulemaking, including HB 2805.

Staff provided additional comments as follows:

- Historically, serial communication had not been an issue for DRB, as Staff clarified any questions and shared items with applicants and the general public as needed.
- If Board members sought legal guidance on any matters pertaining to meeting content, the best way to maintain compliance would be to direct any questions to the relevant Staff member for a private conversation. If necessary, Staff could loop in legal counsel, who could address specific questions at the DRB meeting. Any answers provided by Staff would be made part of the record.
 - Board members were cautioned against sending an email to all Board members, Staff and legal counsel or asking Staff to relay information to other Board members which would be a serial communication. Board members were cautioned against using “Reply All.”
- The definition of communication under the Oregon Administrative Rules now includes non-verbal gestures, but the impact and intent of that change was unclear.
 - **Assistant City Attorney Davidson** stated after briefly searching “communications” within the relevant parts of the statute and Administrative Rules, it was unclear why the non-verbal gestures clarification was added to the definition.
- There were no questions. She informed Board members that they were required to attend the Oregon Government Ethics Commission Public Meeting Law training.

7. Waiver Training

Daniel Pauly, Planning Manager, noted waiver guide included in the packet which was created to help guide the applicants to provide better application materials up front. Waiver criteria were not clearly delineated in the code in one consolidated location, so the guide was a good resource for applicants and for staff.

Alice Galloway asked if there was a case example where a waiver was involved.

Daniel Pauly referenced height waivers as a common waiver that was requested. An applicant would need to make a case for how the waiver would make the project better or more functional than what the code would allow. Reduced side-yard setbacks were often requested in new developments. Applicants would need to explain how a reduced setback would make the space better.

Kimberly Rybold, Senior Planner, mentioned setback waivers in industrial zones mentioned that tree preservation might be a reasonable reason for a reduced setback waiver. There should be a compelling reason that would result in a better layout.

Daniel Pauly said that setback, height, and parking waivers were some of the more common waivers requested, but that more recently height waivers and industrial setback waivers were the more frequently requested waivers.

Kimberly Rybold said that Coffee Creek code has language that anticipated that waivers could happen and gave a little more guidance. Certain areas of the code provided more specific criteria, such as sign waivers.

Daniel Pauly agreed and said that there was no way to cover every scenario in code. Waivers allowed flexibility for variation.

Alice Galloway asked if it was possible to ask for a waiver after DRB approval.

Daniel Pauly said it didn't happen very often and was not recommended. He encouraged the Board to get familiar with Frog Pond East and South Development Code as there may be waivers in future applications.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 6:56 p.m.