

Ordinance No. 187 21 6

Improve land use and other City regulations through the Regulatory Improvement Code Amendment Package 7—Technical Amendments (Ordinance; amend Title 11 and Title 33)

The City of Portland Ordains:

Section 1. The Council finds:

General Findings

1. This project is part of the Regulatory Improvement Workplan, an ongoing program to improve City building and land use regulations and procedures. Each package of amendments is referred to as RICAP (Regulatory Improvement Code Amendment Package), followed by a number. This ordinance pertains to the amendment items contained in RICAP 7.
2. During the spring and summer of 2014, staff from the Bureau of Planning and Sustainability (BPS) and the Bureau of Development Services (BDS) worked together to develop a draft workplan for RICAP 7. Potential code amendments were drawn from a database that contains regulatory improvement requests.
3. On August 5, 2014, notice was sent to all neighborhood associations and coalitions, and business associations in the City of Portland, as well as other interested parties, to notify them of the Planning and Sustainability Commission hearing on the *RICAP 7 Proposed Workplan*.
4. On August 26, 2014 the Planning and Sustainability Commission held a hearing and adopted the RICAP 7 workplan. The adopted workplan included 45 potential code amendment items. Two items were added after August 26, 2014, for a total of 47 potential code amendment items.
5. During the summer and fall of 2014, BPS staff conducted research, met with neighborhood land use chairs, and worked with BDS staff and staff from other City agencies to develop a proposal for each of the 47 potential code amendments. Forty-two of the 47 workplan items were determined to warrant an amendment to City code; 5 of the workplan items were determined to be either not timely or did not warrant an amendment to City code.
6. On March 23, 2015 notice of the proposed action was mailed to the Department of Land Conservation and Development in compliance with the post-acknowledgement review process required by OAR 660-018-0020 and ORS 197.610.
7. On March 26, 2015 notice of the proposal and the April 28, 2015 Planning and Sustainability Commission RICAP 7 hearing was mailed to all neighborhood associations, neighborhood coalitions, and business associations in the city of Portland, as well as other interested persons, as required by ORS 227.186 and PCC 33.740.

8. On April 28, 2015 the Planning and Sustainability Commission held a hearing on the *RICAP 7 Proposed Draft*. The Planning and Sustainability Commission voted to make one minor amendment to the proposal, and then voted to recommend approval of the 42 RICAP 7 proposed code amendment items and to forward them to City Council for adoption.
9. On June 3, 2015 notice of the June 17, 2015 City Council hearing on RICAP 7 was mailed to those who presented testimony orally or in writing to the Planning and Sustainability Commission and provided a name and address, those who asked for notice, and other interested persons.

Findings on Statewide Planning Goals

State planning statutes require cities to adopt and amend comprehensive plans and land use regulations in compliance with state land use goals. Only the stated goals addressed below apply.

10. **Goal 1, Citizen Involvement**, requires provision of opportunities for citizens to be involved in all phases of the planning process. The preparation of these amendments has provided several opportunities for public involvement. The findings addressing Portland Comprehensive Plan Goal 9, Citizen Involvement, and its related policies and objectives also demonstrate consistency with this goal. The specific amendments and processes identified below implement this goal and the general process for adopting all of the RICAP 7 amendments complies with this goal in the following ways:
 - a) Amendment item #42 clarifies the requirement to contact neighbors within a one-year timeframe to ensure certain related building permit or land use applications are filed within a reasonable timeframe following meeting with neighbors. This will increase the quality and timeliness of citizen involvement opportunities.
 - b) Staff from the Bureau of Planning and Sustainability met with the Development Review Advisory Committee (DRAC) on June 19 and December 18, 2014 and the Historic Landmarks Commission on August 18, 2014 to review potential items for inclusion in the RICAP 7 workplan.
 - c) The *Regulatory Improvement Code Amendment Package 7 (RICAP 7): Proposed Workplan* was made available to the public on the City's regulatory improvement program website on August 5, 2014. A copy of the workplan report was mailed to those who requested it.
 - d) Notice of the August 26, 2014 Planning and Sustainability Commission hearing on the RICAP 7 proposed workplan was mailed on August 5, 2014 to all neighborhood associations, neighborhood coalitions, business associations, and other interested parties.
 - e) The Planning and Sustainability Commission held a public hearing on the RICAP 7 proposed workplan and took public testimony on August 26, 2014 on the proposed code amendment items. The Planning and Sustainability Commission voted to adopt the workplan.

- f) The *Regulatory Improvement Code Amendment Package 7 (RICAP 7): Discussion Draft* was made available to the public on January 6, 2015. The report was posted on the City's regulatory improvement program website and mailed to those who requested a copy.
 - g) Notice of the discussion draft was mailed to over 750 recipients, including neighborhood associations, neighborhood coalitions, business associations, and other interested parties. The notice also included the dates, times and locations of neighborhood meetings and an open house where the draft would be presented and staff would be available for discussion and questions.
 - h) Staff attended six neighborhood district coalition meetings, and several special interest group meetings between January 6 and February 22, 2015. The RICAP 7 discussion draft report was presented and discussed at these meetings.
 - i) Staff held a RICAP 7 project open house on February 10, 2015.
 - j) Notice of Planning and Sustainability Commission hearing on the RICAP 7 proposed draft was mailed to all neighborhood associations, neighborhood coalitions, business associations, and other interested parties on March 24, 2015.
 - k) The *Regulatory Improvement Code Amendment Package 7 (RICAP 7): Proposed Draft* was made available to the public on April 1, 2015. The report was posted on the City's regulatory improvement program website and mailed to those who requested it.
 - l) The Planning and Sustainability Commission held a public hearing and took testimony on the RICAP 7 proposed draft on April 28, 2015. The Planning and Sustainability Commission voted to make one minor amendment to the proposed draft as introduced by staff, and then voted to forward RICAP 7 proposed code amendment items to City Council for adoption.
 - m) The *Regulatory Improvement Code Amendment Package 7 (RICAP 7): Recommended Draft* was made available to the public on May 26, 2015. The report was posted on the City's regulatory improvement program website and mailed to those who requested a copy.
 - n) Notice of the June 17, 2015 City Council hearing on the RICAP 7 recommended draft was mailed on June 2, 2015 to all those who testified orally or in writing at the Planning and Sustainability Commission hearing, to other persons who requested said notice, and to other interested persons.
11. **Goal 2, Land Use Planning**, requires the development of a process and policy framework that acts as a basis for all land use decisions and assures that decisions and actions are based on an understanding of the facts relevant to the decision. The process for identifying and adopting the RICAP 7 amendments supports this goal because development of the recommendations followed established city procedures for legislative actions. Amendment item #2 specifies that pre-application conferences, when required, must occur prior to

submitting a land use application. This ensures that applicants are provided with relevant information regarding the process and policy structure for consideration of their requests and that their submittals properly incorporate the statewide land use planning framework when required. See also findings addressing Portland Comprehensive Plan Goal 1, Metropolitan Coordination, and its related policies and objectives.

12. **Goal 5, Open Space, Scenic and Historic Areas, and Natural Resources**, requires the conservation of open space and the protection of natural, historic and scenic resources. The RICAP 7 amendments are consistent with this goal because they do not substantially change policy related to open space, scenic, historic or natural resources, and several of the amendments clarify existing regulations and review procedures pertaining historic areas and natural resources. The following amendments specifically support this goal:
 - a) Amendments related to items #32 and 40 clarify terminology and applicable standards for development proposals in the environmental and Pleasant Valley natural resource overlay zones to help ensure consistent application and prevent unintended outcomes that may be detrimental to the resources.
 - b) Amendment item #44 corrects the reference to the applicable review criteria and guidelines for Historic Resource review in the Central City historic areas to ensure the correct set of criteria are applied.
 - c) Amendments items #35 and 36 reinforce and extend existing regulations pertaining to the scenic resources overlay, specifically related to scenic corridors identified in the scenic resources protection plan. These amendments extend the requirement to landscape and preserve trees in the right of way area adjacent to a development site, similar to the requirements in the setback area on sites to ensure the resource qualities are protected in a similar fashion.
13. **Goal 7, Areas Subject to Natural Hazards**, requires the protection of people and property from natural hazards. Amendment items #38 and #39 support and are generally consistent with this goal by amending Chapter 33.563, Northwest Hills Plan District, Linnton Hillside subarea to reinforce existing policies related to when primary structures may be permitted on substandard lots. Based on findings in the *Linnton Hillside Study, 2006*, which sought to restrict such development, these regulations are intended to reduce potential density where possible while ensuring that small lots in single ownership remain buildable. The current regulations already address historically platted lots and lots of record; however, more recent code added provisions to the base zones that address “lot remnants” and had not been incorporated into the Linnton regulations. These amendments specifically address lot remnants while remaining consistent with the Linnton Hillside study policies to protect areas subject to natural hazards, by restricting development on lot remnants unless they are combined with another lot or lot of record and are of a size and width to meet the standards already established in Chapter 33.563.
14. **Goal 8, Recreational Needs**, requires satisfaction of the recreational needs of both citizens and visitors to the state. Amendment item #13 supports this goal because it provides a clear and objective industry performance standard for the provision of playground equipment as an

amenity bonus in multi-dwelling development. This replaces a requirement that the equipment be approved by the Parks Bureau.

15. **Goal 9, Economic Development**, requires the provision of adequate opportunities for a variety of economic activities vital to public health, welfare and prosperity. The RICAP 7 amendments do not change existing policy related to economic development. All of the amendments are consistent with this goal because they improve the clarity of zoning code regulations in general. Improving land use regulations to make them clear and easily implemented helps to facilitate economic development by reducing costly delays and the amount of plan revisions to get through the entitlement process. The following amendments specifically support Goal 9:
 - a) The amendments associated with item #3 clarify and reinforce existing policies to restrict specific uses within zones to prevent or limit impacts to the other uses that are primarily intended for the zone. These limited uses are generally limited by their “floor area”. However, subgrade floors are excluded from the calculation of floor area. These amendments ensure that the full extent of these uses is counted in order to retain the zone’s development capacity and operations for their primary intended uses. This safeguards these zones from becoming dominated by inconsistent uses, which could displace the variety of desired businesses and industries.
 - b) The amendments associated with item #22 provide greater certainty regarding when non-conforming uses may expand by clarifying the figures that accompany the regulations in 33.258. This helps owners of non-conforming residential and commercial development businesses to better understand the applicable regulations and consequently make investments and expand their development holdings.
 - c) Item #43 clarifies the project value review procedure threshold for historic and design review alteration proposals. The project value for these reviews considers only the value of the exterior work, as the interior work is not subject to the particular review. This can reduce the application cost and time necessary for completing the review encouraging a greater variety of economic opportunities.
16. **Goal 10, Housing**, requires provision for the housing needs of citizens of the state. The RICAP 7 amendments are consistent with this goal because they improve the clarity of zoning code regulations in general. Making land use regulations more clear and easily implemented may reduce the time and cost associated with development review and permitting thereby reducing the cost of development. See also findings for Portland Comprehensive Plan Goal 4, Housing and Metro Title 1. Three specific examples include:
 - a) Item #20 deletes a number of duplicative and contradictory requirements for elderly housing units. These requirements, first established in the 1980 zoning code, have now been integrated into the state building code.
 - b) Item #26 removes the requirement for certifying mass shelters, which provide transitional housing for vulnerable populations. This certification process initially sought to ensure shelters met basic standards for health and safety, which is now specified by federal mandate and inspected on a semiannual basis by the Fire Bureau. Removing the

additional certification process allows shelters to be placed in operation more expeditiously.

17. **Goal 12, Transportation**, requires provision of a safe, convenient, and economic transportation system. In general, the RICAP 7 amendments are consistent with this goal because they do not change the policy or intent of any of the existing regulations pertaining to transportation. The following amendments support this goal:

- a) Amendment item #3 reinforces limitations on the size of certain land uses (e.g. retail uses in industrial zones) by counting areas located in below grade floors of buildings, as well as exterior eating areas. This prevents certain uses from overwhelming other intended primary uses in the zones, and limits their associated impacts to the transportation system.
- b) Amendment item #19 changes the reference point of where a drive through lane is measured. Instead of measuring at the curb, these amendments require that the drive through lane not encroach into the right-of-way. This helps ensure that the transportation system is not impeded by queued vehicles projecting into the sidewalk or roadway.
- c) Amendment item #45 ensures that quasi-judicial Comprehensive Plan Map amendments are consistent with Statewide Land Use Planning Goals, including Transportation.

The Oregon Transportation Planning Rule (TPR) was adopted in 1991 and amended in 1996 and 2005 to implement State Goal 12. The TPR requires certain findings if a proposed Comprehensive Plan Map amendment, Zone Change, or regulation will significantly affect an existing or planned transportation facility. This proposal will not have a significant effect on existing or planned transportation facilities because the amendments will not result in increases in housing units or additional jobs, change allowed land use types or densities, or change the classification of any existing or planned transportation facilities.

Findings on Metro Urban Growth Management Functional Plan

The following elements of the Metro Urban Growth Management Functional Plan are relevant and applicable to the RICAP 7 amendments.

- 18. **Title 1, Housing Capacity**, ensures that each jurisdiction contribute its fair share to meeting regional housing needs by requiring each city and county to maintain or increase its housing capacity. This requirement is to be generally implemented through city-wide analysis based on calculated capacities from land use designations. The amendments are consistent with this title because they do not alter the current housing capacity of the city. See also findings for Comprehensive Plan Goal 10, Housing.
- 19. **Title 4, Industrial and Other Employment Areas**, seeks to provide and protect a supply of sites for employment by limiting the types and scale of non-industrial uses in Industrial and Employment Areas and provides for the benefits of clustering industries. Title 4 also seeks to protect the capacity and efficiency of the region's transportation system for the movement of goods and services and encourage the location of other types of employment in Centers, Corridors, Main Streets and Station Communities. Amendment item #3 clarifies and

strengthens existing policies related to development and uses in the City's employment and industrial areas. This ensures that these regulations will be consistently applied and avoids potential misapplication of retail use size limits in these zones.

20. **Title 7, Housing Choice**, calls for establishment of voluntary affordable housing production goals and reporting on progress toward increasing the supply of affordable housing. Cities' implementing ordinances must include measures to maintain the existing supply of affordable housing. None of the amendments impact housing choice or reduce the supply of affordable housing. Amendment items #20 and #26 remove certification and other duplicative requirements from mass shelter and elderly housing projects to help facilitate their development by reducing unnecessary cost and time for reviews. Removal of these requirements supports this title to ensure a diverse range of housing types is provided within the city.
21. **Title 12, Protection of Residential Neighborhoods**, is intended to protect the region's existing residential neighborhoods from air and water pollution, noise and crime, and to provide adequate levels of public services. The amendments associated with items #16 and #17 clarify that landscape buffers associated with required setbacks around commercial development that abuts residential zones must be maintained and may not be encroached upon. This helps reduce impacts to residential development from noise and air pollution from associated commercial development.
22. **Title 13, Nature in Neighborhoods**, conserves, protects and restores continuous ecologically viable streamside corridor systems including their floodplains to control and prevent water pollution for the protection of the public health and safety. Several amendments in RICAP support this title by clarify the applicable procedures and criteria for proposed development in environmental and natural resource overlay zones. See also findings for Statewide Land Use Goal 5, Open Space, Scenic and Historic Areas, and Natural Resources,.

Findings on Portland's Comprehensive Plan Goals

The following goals, policies, and objectives of the Portland Comprehensive Plan are relevant and applicable to the RICAP 7 amendments.

23. **Goal 1, Metropolitan Coordination**, calls for the Comprehensive Plan to be coordinated with federal and state law and to support regional goals, objectives and plans. In general, the RICAP 7 amendments are consistent with this goal because they do not change policy or intent of existing regulations relating to metropolitan coordination and regional goals.
24. **Policy 1.4, Intergovernmental Coordination**, requires continuous participation in intergovernmental affairs with public agencies to coordinate metropolitan planning and project development and maximize the efficient use of public funds. The RICAP 7 process supports this policy because a number of other government agencies were notified of this proposal and given the opportunity to comment. No outside agency comments were received.
25. **Goal 2, Urban Development**, calls for maintaining Portland's role as the major regional employment and population center by expanding opportunities for housing and jobs, while

retaining the character of established residential neighborhoods and business centers. The amendments support this goal because they update and improve the City's land use regulations and procedures that hinder desirable development. By improving these regulations the City can better facilitate the development of housing and employment uses.

26. **Policy 2.6 Open Space**, calls for preserving Portland parks, golf courses, trails, parkways, and cemeteries for recreation and visual relief. The RICAP 7 amendments are consistent with this policy because they do not affect policies for the preservation of Portland open spaces for recreation and visual relief. Amendment items #8 and #9 provides greater clarity regarding the applicable development standards for proposed development in open space zones.
27. **Policy 2.14 Industrial Sanctuaries**, establishes areas to be preserved for primarily manufacturing purposes. Amendment item #3 is consistent with this policy by capturing the full area extent of uses that are allowed but limited in size, in order to better retain the overall primary purpose of the zone. See also findings for Metro Title 4, Industrial and Other Employment Areas.
28. **Goal 3, Neighborhoods**, calls for the preservation and reinforcement of the stability and diversity of the city's neighborhoods while allowing for increased density. The RICAP 7 amendments are consistent with this goal because they improve the clarity of zoning code regulations in general. Specifically, amendment item #10 clarifies the standards that apply to development on transition sites (residentially zoned sites abutting certain commercial zones) that allow additional density and diversity in housing types.
29. **Policy 3.5 Neighborhood Involvement**, seeks to actively involve neighborhood residents and businesses. In addition to the direct outreach efforts to district coalitions and directly affected neighborhood associations as part of the RICAP process, this policy is further advanced by amendment item #42 which limits the time allowed between an applicant's required contact with the neighborhood and the application submittal. If more than a year lapses, this amendment requires that the neighborhood be contacted again. This ensures that the neighborhood's input is timely and current.
30. **Goal 4, Housing**, calls for enhancing Portland's vitality as a community at the center of the region's housing market by providing housing of different types, density, sizes, costs and locations that accommodate the needs, preferences, and financial capabilities of current and future households. The RICAP 7 amendments are consistent with this goal because they improve the clarity of zoning code regulations in general making them more understandable to citizens and the development community. Making land use regulations more clear and easily implemented may reduce the time and cost associated with development thereby reducing the cost of development. Specifically, amendment items #20 and #26 remove duplicative requirements for elderly housing and mass shelters. Also see findings for Statewide Land Use Goal 10, Housing and Metro Title 1, Housing Community.
31. **Goal 5, Economic Development**, calls for fostering a strong and diverse economy which provides a full range of employment and economic choices for individuals and families in all parts of the city. In general, the amendments support this goal because they update and

improve the City's land use regulations and procedures that hinder desirable development. See findings under Statewide Land Use Goal 9, Economic Development.

32. **Goal 6, Transportation**, calls for developing a balanced, equitable, and efficient transportation system that provides a range of transportation choices; reinforces the livability of neighborhoods; supports a strong and diverse economy; reduces air, noise, and water pollution; and lessens reliance on the automobile while maintaining accessibility. In general the amendments support this goal because they don't change policy or intent of any existing regulations pertaining to transportation. See also findings under Statewide Land Use Goal 12, Transportation.
33. **Goal 7, Energy**, calls for promotion of a sustainable energy future by increasing energy efficiency in all sectors of the city. Amendment item #30 specifically supports this goal by adding an exemption from design review to facilitate solar energy installations on flat roofs within design districts. This reduces the cost and time normally required for design review for these types of solar installations. Amendment item #23 supports this goal by removing qualifying energy efficiency upgrades from the project value used to determine whether non-conforming upgrades to a site are required. This reduces potential cost exposure for applicants and ensures that energy efficiency investments remain more cost effective. Amendment item #29 supports policy 7.7 which seeks to increase telecommunications opportunities by clarifying and expanding an exemption from design review for certain radio frequency transmission facilities located on rooftops within design districts. Amendment item #12 supports policy 7.9, waste reduction and recycling, by incorporating references to the recycling requirements in the Zoning Code to better inform applicants so that they integrate these areas into development proposals.
34. **Goal 8, Environment**, calls for maintaining and improving the quality of Portland's air, water, and land resources, as well as protecting neighborhoods and business centers from noise pollution. Amendment items #16 and #17 clarify that landscape buffers associated with required setbacks around commercial development that abuts residential zones must be maintained and may not be encroached upon. This helps reduce impacts to residential development from noise and air pollution from associated commercial and industrial development.
35. **Policy 8.13, Natural Hazards**, seeks to control density in areas of natural hazards. See the findings under Statewide Land Use Goal 7, Areas Subject to Natural Hazards
36. **Policy 8.25 Visual Impacts**, seeks to limit the visual impact of radio and television broadcast facilities in close proximity to residential areas. Amendment item #29 supports the city policy by clarifying and expanding an exemption from design review for certain radio frequency transmission facilities located on rooftops within design districts. While the exemption may allow additional equipment to be placed on a rooftop, the exemption continues to limit the visual impact of these facilities by requiring a compatible architectural screen be placed around rooftop equipment.
37. **Goal 9, Citizen Involvement**, calls for improved methods and ongoing opportunities for citizen involvement in the land use decision-making process, and the implementation, review, and amendment of the Comprehensive Plan. This project supports the goal because

it followed the process and requirements specified in Chapter 33.740, Legislative Procedure. Also, amendment item #42 supports this goal by placing limits on the time that may pass between an applicant's required contact with the neighborhoods, and submitting an application. See Statewide Planning Goal 1, Citizen Involvement, for additional detailed findings that demonstrate compliance with this goal.

38. **Goal 10, Plan Review and Administration**, calls for periodic review of the Comprehensive Plan and implementation of the Plan, as well as addresses amendments to the Plan, to the Plan Map, and to the Zoning Code and Zoning Map. Policy 10.10, Amendments to the Zoning and Subdivision Regulations, requires amendments to the zoning and subdivision regulations to be clear, concise, and applicable to the broad range of development situations faced by a growing urban city. The amendments in RICAP 7 support this policy because they clarify and streamline many of the regulations in the zoning code. They also respond to identified current and anticipated problems, including barriers to desirable development, and will help ensure that Portland remains competitive with other jurisdictions as a location in which to live, invest, and do business. Policy 10.13, Design Review, seeks design review standards for design areas. Amendment items #28-31 refine exemptions from design review and clarify thresholds for when community design standards may be used to ensure that the standards for design review are applied appropriately and in the correct cases.
39. **Goal 12, Urban Design**, calls for enhancing Portland as a livable city, attractive in its setting and dynamic in its urban character by preserving its history and building a substantial legacy of quality private developments and public improvements for future generations. Policy 12.6, Preserve Neighborhoods, seeks for ways to respect and strengthen neighborhood values in development projects. Amendment item #5 clarifies the height measurement methodology for less conventional "shed" style roofs to help ensure that these roofs don't overwhelm other traditional gable style roofs and limits the potential impacts of large wall planes which could be inconsistent with established neighborhood character.
40. **Policy 12.7, Design Quality**, calls for encouraging the built environment to meet standards of excellence while fostering creativity. There are several amendments that are supportive of this goal:
 - a) The amendments associated with item #1 allow for minor and discrete changes to approved design review approvals through a streamlined staff level review. This saves time for the Design Commission to focus on ensuring that other major projects meet standards of excellence, while also allowing applicants some degree of flexibility to foster creativity.
 - b) Amendment items #28, #29, and #30 refine and clarify exemptions from design review for changes of building color, placing radio frequency facilities on rooftops, and constructing solar energy systems on flat roofs. These exemptions permit review staff to focus on issues pertaining to overall design significance, and allows greater flexibility and creativity for property owners while limiting potential detrimental aesthetic impact.
 - c) The amendments associated with item #31 consistently apply the thresholds for Community Design Standards in design and other overlay zones. Providing more clarity

for projects located in design overlays ensures that design goals are applied consistently for similarly situated projects.

NOW, THEREFORE, the Council directs:

- a. Adopt Exhibit A, *Regulatory Improvement Code Amendment package 7 (RICAP 7): Planning and Sustainability Commission Recommended Draft*, dated May 2015.
- b. Amend Title 11, Trees, and Title 33, Planning and Zoning, as shown in Exhibit A, *Regulatory Improvement Code Amendment package 7 (RICAP 7): Planning and Sustainability Commission Recommended Draft*, dated May 2015.
- c. Adopt the commentary and discussion in Exhibit A, *Regulatory Improvement Code Amendment package 7 (RICAP 7): Planning and Sustainability Commission Recommended Draft*, dated May 2015; as further findings and legislative intent.

Section 2. If any section, subsection, sentence, clause, phrase, diagram, designation, or drawing contained in this Ordinance, or the plan, map or code it adopts or amends, is held to be deficient, invalid or unconstitutional, that shall not affect the validity of the remaining portions. The Council declares that it would have adopted the plan, map, or code and each section, subsection, sentence, clause, phrase, diagram, designation, and drawing thereof, regardless of the fact that any one or more sections, subsections, sentences, clauses, phrases, diagrams, designations, or drawings contained in this Ordinance, may be found to be deficient, invalid or unconstitutional.

Passed by the Council:

JUN 24 2015

Mayor Charlie Hales

Prepared by: Morgan Tracy

Date Prepared: May 28, 2015

Mary Hull Caballero

Auditor of the City of Portland

By



Deputy

~~640~~ = 676 =

Agenda No.
ORDINANCE NO. 187 21 6
Title

Improve land use and other City regulations through the Regulatory Improvement Code Amendment Package 7—Technical Amendments (Ordinance; Amend Title 11 and Title 33)

INTRODUCED BY Commissioner/Auditor: Charlie Hales	CLERK USE: DATE FILED <u>JUN 12 2015</u>
COMMISSIONER APPROVAL	Mary Hull Caballero Auditor of the City of Portland
Mayor—Finance and Administration - Hales	By: <u>[Signature]</u>
Position 1/Utilities - Fritz	Deputy
Position 2/Works - Fish	
Position 3/Affairs - Saltzman	
Position 4/Safety - Novick	
BUREAU APPROVAL	ACTION TAKEN:
Bureau: BPS	JUN 17 2015 PASSED TO SECOND READING JUN 24 2015 9:30 A.M.
Bureau Head: Susan Anderson	
Prepared by: Morgan Tracy	
Date Prepared: May 27, 2015	
Impact Statement	
Completed <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Amends Budget <input type="checkbox"/>	
Portland Policy Document	
If "Yes" requires City Policy paragraph stated in document.	
Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
City Auditor Office Approval: <u>Tohi</u>	
City Attorney Approval: <u>KS/Bernmont</u>	
Council Meeting Date June 17, 2015	

AGENDA
TIME CERTAIN <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Start time: 2:00 pm
Total amount of time needed: _____ (for presentation, testimony and discussion)
CONSENT <input type="checkbox"/>
REGULAR <input type="checkbox"/>
Total amount of time needed: _____ (for presentation, testimony and discussion)

FOUR-FIFTHS AGENDA	COMMISSIONERS VOTED AS FOLLOWS:		
		YEAS	NAYS
1. Fritz	1. Fritz	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
2. Fish	2. Fish	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
3. Saltzman	3. Saltzman	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
4. Novick	4. Novick	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Hales	Hales	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	