

## Commissioner Saltzman - Amendment 5 – p. 115

*Grey highlighting indicates areas of change to language contained in the Recommended Draft*

### **33.930.025 Measuring Development Standards**

Unless otherwise stated below or elsewhere in this Title, all measurements involving development standards are based on the property lines and area of the site after dedication of public rights-of-way and/or designation of private rights-of-way. Standards include, but are not limited to, building coverage, floor area ratio, setbacks, and landscaping requirements. When site area is being dedicated to widen an existing public right-of-way, calculation of floor area ratio is based on the site area at the time of building permit application.

## Commissioner Eudaly (introduced by Mayor Wheeler) – Amendment 6

*Strikethrough/underline indicates areas of change. This amendment is not included in the Recommended Draft.*

### Correction to Title 33 Table 825-1 RICAP 8 hearing February 15, 2017

Problem statement: In a previous RICAP project, a list of Design Review procedures was consolidated into a simpler table format. This proposal corrects that omission.

Talking points:

- The previous language said if a project was in a Design Overlay Zone that is not located in a Design District, a Type III Design Review is required for projects over \$2.1 million and a Type II Design Review is required for projects under that dollar threshold.
- The table today leaves out the distinction that projects under \$2.1 million are processed as Type II Design Review.
- A project recently submitted for an Early Assistance appointment that should have qualified as a Type II. This correction will allow the project to proceed with the intended level of review.
- The corrected portion of the Table 825-1 is below. The full table follows.

“d” Design overlay	Development proposals	Not identified as <del>Type Ix</del> or <del>Type II</del> procedure elsewhere in this table and value >\$2,188,650	Type III
		Not identified elsewhere in this table and value ≤ \$2,188,650	Type II

Table 825-1

Table 825-1 Procedure Type for Design Review Proposals			
Design Districts	Proposal	Threshold	Procedure
Downtown Design District	New floor area	> 1,000 s.f.	Type III
		≤ 1,000 s.f.	Type II
	Exterior alteration	Value >\$437,750	Type III
		Value ≤ \$437,750	Type II
River District Design District		>1,000 s.f. <u>and</u> value >\$437,750	Type III

	New floor area or Exterior alteration in CX or OS zone	≤ 1,000 s.f. <u>or</u> value ≤ \$437,750	Type II
Gateway Design District	Development proposals	Value >\$2,188,650 or included in a Gateway Master Plan Review	Type III
		Value ≤ \$2,188,650 and not part of Gateway Master Plan Review	Type II
Marquam Hill Design District	Development proposals	In design overlay zones	Type II
Sellwood-Moreland Design District			
Terwilliger Parkway Design District	Proposals that are visible from Terwilliger Boulevard	Non single-dwelling development	Type III
		Single-dwelling development	Type II
Central Eastside	Development proposals	Value >\$2,188,650	Type III
Goose Hollow			
Lloyd District			
Macadam		Value ≤ \$2,188,650	Type II
River District			
South Waterfront			
<b>Community Plans</b>			
Albina Community Plan area, including Lower Albina	Development proposals	In design overlay zones	Type II
Outer Southeast Community Plan area, excluding Gateway Design District			
Southwest Community Plan Area, excluding Macadam & Terwilliger Design Districts			

<b>Table 825-1 Procedure Type for Design Review Proposals</b>			
<b>Plan Districts</b>	<b>Proposal</b>	<b>Threshold</b>	<b>Procedure</b>
Central City Plan District, excluding Lower Albina	Development proposals	In design overlay zones and value >\$2,188,650	Type III
Northwest Plan District		In design overlay zones and value ≤ \$2,188,650	Type II
South Auditorium Plan District			
Albina Plan District	Development proposals	In design overlay zones	Type II
Hollywood Plan District			
North Interstate Plan District			
St. Johns Plan District			
<b>Overlay Zones</b>			
“a” Alternative Density overlay	Additional density in R3, R2, R1 zone	Using bonus density provisions in 33.405.050	Type III
	Using other provisions in 33.405	Not subject to 33.405.050	Type II
“d” Design overlay	Development proposals	Not identified as Type Ix or Type II procedure elsewhere in this table	Type III
“j” Main Street Node overlay	Development proposals	In design overlay zones	Type II
“m” Main Street Corridor overlay			
<b>Base Zones</b>			
All zones	Signs	In design overlay zones	Type II
	Exterior mechanical equipment		
	New or replacement awnings		
C, E, I, RX zones	Facade alteration	≤ 500 square feet in design overlay zones	Type II
RF - R2.5 zones	Subject to section 33.110.213, Additional Development Standards	Requests to modify standards	Type II
IR zone site with an approved Impact Mitigation Plan (IMP)	Proposals that are identified in IMP	IMP design guidelines are qualitative	Type II
	Proposals that are identified in IMP	IMP design guidelines are objective or quantitative	Type Ix

## Commissioner Fritz - Amendment 7 – p. 105

*Grey highlighting indicates areas of change to language contained in the Recommended Draft*

### 33.710.030 Commissioner, Committees, and Boards Generally

- A. **Length of terms.** Members of commissions, committees, and boards provided under this chapter may be appointed to terms of not more than 4 years. In the event of an unexpected vacancy and a new member is unable to be appointed prior to the expiration of an existing member's term, the term of the existing member may be extended by up to four months ~~one year~~. Initial appointments for newly formed commissions, committees, and boards must include a sufficient number of appointments for less than the maximum 4 year term of office to provide overlap and a continuity of membership. Members of commissions are limited to a maximum of two full terms. Vacancies which may occur must be filled for the unexpired terms.

**B. – J. [No Change]**