

*May 21, 2008 Commission Advisory Team meeting  
Executive Summary*

**Members present:** Carolyn Barkley, Alexander Craghead, Karen Fishel, Elise Shearer (alternate)

**Staff present:** Sean Farrelly

**Agenda Item 1: Welcome/Introductions**

No introductions were necessary.

**Agenda Item 2: Review Executive Summary of April 23 Meeting**

Reviewed the April 23 summary.

**Agenda Item 3: Open House Discussion**

It was decided to shoot for Wednesday, July 30 as the date of the Open House.

- The Open House would be a “listening post.”
- There will be a power point presentation outlining the highlights of the draft code followed by Q and A.
- Invite all UR property and business owners, interested parties, community members, decision makers by letter. The letter will include the link to a draft on the web ahead of time and be available to review. Also a press release will be sent to the Times and Oregonian.
- Copies of the draft will be available to take and review. There will be comment forms to mail back and an online comment system.
- There will be some visuals from the U of O project, but this won't be the focus.

Suggestions-

Personal contact will get more people to show up.

Vet the content of the Open House with the CCAC.

Ask for specific comment on potentially problematic sections- non-conforming use/structures. Also ask for comments on other issues- like residential open space requirement.

**Agenda Item 4: Review Code Changes**

Reviewed Draft dated May 15, 2008.

**Recommendations:**

- Allow rather than require active uses along the festival street. Past consultants have said that retail will not work all the way down Burnham St. and there would not be good visibility for businesses on the festival street. (p. 15)
- Require active uses adjacent to the plaza. Show what is meant by “adjacent” via a map.
- Clarify the tree preservation citation (p.6.)

### **Agenda Item 5: Thresholds and Types of Review**

#### **Recommendations:**

- Option 4 was recommended. This states that standards apply to any remodeling, building expansion, or site improvement project on a partially developed or developed site, except that standards apply only to the structure or to that portion of a structure or site that is being constructed, modified, remodeled, or built upon.
- This would be beneficial in that existing structures could have renovation projects, but only the renovation (rather than the whole structure) would be subject to design review.
- Type I (Design Compliance Letter) for renovation projects subject to one standard.
- Type II -Clear and Objective Track for new buildings and renovations (subject to multiple standards.)
- Type III- Discretionary track for applications that cannot meet a standard, or for applicants who choose this route. Do not have additional requirement that large projects go thru discretionary review.

### **Agenda Item 6: Design Review Body Options**

#### **Recommendation:**

- A Design Review Board made up of 5 volunteer members (a majority of whom would have design/architecture backgrounds.) The Board could also potentially review Tigard Triangle/ Washington Square projects- in case there are not many Downtown projects initially.

### **Agenda Item 7: Signs**

Due to time constraints, this item was deferred to the next meeting

Adjourned: 9:25 PM