



Development Review Board-Panel B

Meeting Minutes

February 23, 2026

Wilsonville City Hall & Remote Video Conferencing

<https://www.ci.wilsonville.or.us/meetings/DRB-B>

Approved

April 27, 2026

CALL TO ORDER - ROLL CALL

Chair Barrett called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

Present: Rachelle Barrett, John Andrews, Dana Crocker, George Dunn, Kamran Mesbah

Staff Present: Kimberly Rybold, Amanda Guile-Hinman, Miranda Bateschell, Shelley White

CHAIR'S REMARKS

There were none.

CITIZEN INPUT

There was none.

Shelley White, Administrative Assistant, noted Janis Sanford from Panel A was attending via Zoom to hear the presentations as she could not attend Panel A's training.

ELECTION OF 2026 CHAIR AND VICE-CHAIR

City Attorney Guile-Hinman read the rules for election of Board Chair and Vice-Chair.

1. Chair

Kamran Mesbah nominated Rachelle Barrett for Chair.

John Andrews nominated Kamran Mesbah for Chair.

Mr. Mesbah and Ms. Barrett declined their respective nominations.

Rachelle Barrett nominated Dana Crocker for 2026 Development Review Board Chair.

Following a roll call vote, Dana Crocker was unanimously elected 2026 Development Review Board Panel B Chair.

Ayes: Andrews, Barrett, Crocker, Dunn, Mesbah

Nays: None.

2. Vice-Chair

Kamran Mesbah nominated Rachelle Barrett for 2026 Development Review Board Panel B Vice-Chair.

There were no other nominations

Following a roll call vote, Rachelle Barrett was unanimously elected 2026 Development Review Board Panel B Vice-Chair.

Ayes: Andrews, Barrett, Crocker, Dunn, Mesbah

Nays: None

CONSENT AGENDA

3. Approval of the July 28, 2025 DRB Panel B Minutes

Kamran Mesbah moved to approve the July 28, 2025 DRB Panel B meeting minutes as presented. Dana Crocker seconded the motion, which passed 5 to 0. (Ayes: Andrews, Barrett, Crocker, Dunn, Mesbah. Nays: None.)

PUBLIC HEARINGS

BOARD MEMBER COMMUNICATIONS

4. Results of the October 13, 2025 DRB Panel A meeting

5. Results of the February 9, 2026 DRB Panel A meeting

6. Recent City Council Action Minutes

Board members briefly introduced themselves and welcomed new member George Dunn.

STAFF COMMUNICATIONS

7. Housing Statutory Compliance Project

Senior Planner Rybold introduced Heather Austin of 3J Consulting and presented the Housing Statutory Compliance Project via PowerPoint, describing the background and regulatory requirements leading to the project and the proposed changes to the City's application review process, which included consolidating the DRB-A and DRB-B panels. Staff sought feedback about the project, including the impact of DRB meeting cancellations, the time spent preparing for meetings, Board members' capacity for a second DRB meeting per month, and potential changes to DRB meeting dates and times.

Staff clarified that any changes regarding the Board would not take effect this calendar year, so nothing was being rushed. The City was simply preparing for when changes are needed. The intention was to track with the timing of the Board appointment process, and if the DRBs are consolidated, Council would provide direction on how members would be selected for that Board. Feedback from the DRBs would be presented for direction during Planning Commission and City Council work sessions in March/April, then Staff would discuss ideas for a recommendation on how best to move forward.

George Dunn stated that being new to the Board, he could not speak to experience but understood how infrequent meetings could create challenges. He believed public servants should serve the community's purpose. If moving to one Board would better fulfill that

purpose, he saw no reason not to support it. He had no preference on meeting days or times, but noted Monday worked well for him.

John Andrews confirmed that one, 7-member Board, would provide more flexibility with achieving a quorum than with 5-member Boards, which require four members for a quorum.

Dana Crocker agreed about serving the community and wanting to learn. She would like to continue serving if the City moved to one Board. The inconsistency of meetings had been challenging because it felt like starting over each time. She spent about one hour preparing for the last meeting, and Monday nights work well in her schedule.

Chair Barrett also preferred Monday nights, adding if two monthly meetings were necessary that the days of the month be consistent for easier scheduling.

Janis Sanford agreed being able to participate on a regular basis would be more encouraging and beneficial, adding that a 7-member Board would be more efficient for having a quorum and if a second monthly meeting is needed, it should also be on a Monday, which works well for her. She spent about an hour preparing for meetings, depending on whether a site visit was needed, and wanted to continue to participate on the DRB. She was glad City Council and Planning Commission want the DRB to continue as a part of the process.

Kamran Mesbah indicated Monday was fine, adding any day was acceptable, except Thursday and Friday nights. Twice monthly meetings worked and special meetings were fine. His preparation time for meetings varied depending on project's complexity, and he hoped to not have back-to-back complex projects that required site visits and extensive research. He concurred with other Board members' comments.

Chair Barrett stated the maximum time she had spent was about 4 hours on one complex project, but most were simple, taking about 1 to 1.5 hours, not including site visits. She recommended any volatile plans, such as projects that highly impacted traffic, be reviewed by the DRB.

Senior Planner Rybold noted that would depend if an application was involved, adding that even residential development applications going through Administrative Review would still require the same traffic impact analysis and findings as before, and the review work involved would be much more substantial than typical Class II reviews. Staff was exploring ways to provide information on applications similar to public hearing notifications, yet within the limits of State statutes.

Heather Austin, 3J Consulting explained it was about notifying the community that something is happening rather than requesting input from the community, which was where clear and objective standards factored in, and Wilsonville was positioned well given the Coffee Creek work and doing clear and objective residential design review.

Mr. Andrews inquired if Staff received feedback from citizens who were unhappy about the opportunities to provide input.

Senior Planner Rybold replied Staff has discussed getting input from the community about how citizens currently get information and how they would like to receive information, such as posting signs on sites involving hearings, which was the City's practice although such postings were only required for annexations. Were people finding information via the Projects Around the City webpage, newspaper postings, or other methods? What is the best way for the City to communicate such information.

- The best place for public input to make a difference was during the creation and development of development plans and standards, so projects before the Planning Commission and City Council to establish new policies and new Code were key opportunities.

Ms. Crocker hoped Board members could have first right of refusal for opportunities to serve on other Boards if serving on the DRB was no longer available, as she wanted to continue serving the community.

Mr. Mesbah observed that educating the citizenry was an important element of the Planning Commission, Planning Staff, and DRB. Because public hearings did not accomplish that, he suggested having open house, educational meetings when regular DRB meetings were canceled. Many controversies arise because people are not cognizant about what was at stake and what goes into design and planning. He had hoped some education would have been done as outreach by the Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Committee.

- As a former Planning Commissioner, he observed that Commissioners with former DRB experience wanted to consider how plan language could be written for proper interpretation by the DRBs. His experience is that he brings the vision from the Planning Commission to DRB decisions, and suggested a more circular movement between Planning Commissioners and DRB members, rather than a one-way progression, so Commissioners with the vision could interpret the policies/Code and DRB members on Planning Commission would know how difficult it is to turn vision into implementation and action when waivers are requested by those with special circumstances, for example. He did not see enough of the Planning Commission's vision and plan reflected during DRB discussions. DRB discussed the size of a sign due to the City's standards, rather than understanding why or how a standard was interpreted. While the DRB's decision might not be different, it would make a difference in the DRB's recommendation for the City to review standards that do not work well or are not easy to implement. The breakdown and tension with citizens comes because Staff knows how to interpret policy and standards and use their own language, while voluntary Board members and other citizens who do not know the language try to convince each other.

Senior Planner Rybold appreciated the feedback provided, noting DRB Panel A also welcomed training opportunities as well, adding the City would continue looking for ways to keep Board members engaged. She reviewed the ways that the City communicates DRB hearings with citizens. She noted that recent legislation might further restrict mailing radius requirements.

8. DRB Motion Training

Senior Planner Rybold conducted a brief training and role-playing session on making motions in various public hearing scenarios and addressed questions from the Board with additional comments and direction provided by City Attorney Guile-Hinman.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 7:42 p.m.