

NAHB | HB 0002 (Wyoming) | Bill Analysis

Wyoming House Bill 0002 ([HB0002](#)) creates mandatory deadlines for localities in the building permit application process.

BACKGROUND

As the nation seeks to increase its affordable housing stock, a growing number of states have enacted regulatory reforms dubbed “shot clock” laws. Put simply, the term describes signed legislation that creates approval time limits for residential construction.¹ As of this writing, Kansas, Oregon and Nebraska have similar requirements and four states are in the process of implementing their own.² Putting it broadly, these reforms are viewed as an attempt to decrease the time residential housing projects spend under permitting review.

THIS BILL

This bill applies to certain residential projects that are no more than three stories in height and no more than 3,000 square feet of finished floor area per dwelling unit or townhouse unit.

Completeness Review	Local governments must notify an applicant within 10 business days whether the application is complete or what information is missing.
Permit Decision Deadline	Once an application is complete, the local government must approve or deny it within 30 calendar days .
Review Pauses	The timeline can be suspended when additional information is requested or when state/federal approvals are required.
Extensions	Applicant and local government may mutually agree in writing to extend the deadline.
Denials	Written notice of denial and reasons must be provided within 7 days .

¹ [BOAT-Legislative-Bills-2023-Revisited.pdf](#)

² [Wyoming passes law to fast-track home building permits](#)



**National Association
of Home Builders**

| State and Local Government Affairs Department| Bill Analysis

Automatic Approval	If the local government misses the deadline, the permit is deemed approved, although code inspections are still required before occupancy.
Fee Penalty	If a locality adds requirements after initial review, permit fees may be reduced by 10% in certain circumstances.

ARGUMENTS in SUPPORT

An efficient and predictable building permitting process benefits home builders, buyers and municipalities. The “shot clock” approach will reduce the builder’s carrying costs while waiting for permit approval and can generate certainty needed to obtain financing.

A clear process will also improve housing attainability by reducing added costs passed on to prospective buyers or renters. Further, local government agencies will benefit from reducing time-consuming and stressful procedures, which could improve staff morale and retention.

Defined review deadlines can also improve transparency and accountability by giving applicants and local officials a shared schedule, reducing uncertainty about when decisions will be made and making it easier to identify where a permit is delayed.

The bill may encourage local governments to standardize application checklists and conduct a prompt completeness review. Earlier identification of missing information can reduce repeated submissions, limit avoidable redesign costs and allow qualified projects to move into substantive review sooner.

By limiting the covered projects to smaller residential buildings, the legislation targets housing types that may be suitable for streamlined review while retaining inspections and other code-compliance requirements before occupancy. The ability of applicants and local governments to agree to written extensions also provides flexibility for unusually complex applications.

ARGUMENTS in OPPOSITION

If enacted, this law may put a strain on smaller municipalities that are not fully staffed for reviews. If application submissions increase under the new law, current staff may struggle to adhere to the new time constraints, which in turn can jeopardize the completeness of new projects.

Automatic approval may be viewed as an overly consequential remedy for an administrative deadline. A permit could be deemed approved because of staffing shortages, a processing error or disagreement over whether an application was complete rather than because the locality affirmatively determined that the project satisfied all applicable requirements.

A uniform statewide deadline may not account for differences in local review procedures, seasonal workloads, available technical expertise or projects that require coordination among planning, engineering, fire, utility and building departments. Municipalities may need to hire additional staff or outside reviewers, potentially increasing administrative costs.

Compressed timelines could encourage reviewers to deny incomplete or complicated applications rather than continue working with applicants informally, particularly when the alternative is automatic approval. That response could increase resubmissions, appeals or disputes over whether a request for additional information properly paused the review period.

Opponents may also argue that the fee-reduction provision could constrain local permitting budgets precisely when agencies need additional resources to meet the new deadlines. Ambiguity about when a locality has added a new requirement could create inconsistent implementation and disputes between applicants and reviewers.

SIMILAR LEGISLATION

- [Kansas](#)
- [Oregon](#)
- [Nebraska](#)

SIMILAR COURT CASES:

- [Richmond Road Partners, LLC; Step Forward v. City of Warrensville Heights, et al.](#)
- [Rubicon Real Estate Holdings v. City of Pontiac, Michigan](#)

Important Legal Questions:

- [Does a Town's Delay in Issuing a Decision Mean the Zoning Permit is Deemed Approved?](#)



POTENTIAL SUPPORT

Housing Advocates; Property Rights Groups; Suppliers

POTENTIAL OPPOSITION

Local Governments; Local Planning Groups; Building/Permit Officials