Design and Landmarks Committee

Meeting Agenda

Conference Room at City Hall
10722 SE Main Street

Monday, April 30, 2007, 6:30 p.m.

1. **Call to order**
2. **DLC Workplan (2007-2008)**
3. **Past Meeting Minute Review**
4. **Other business**
5. **Adjourn**

To: Mayor and City Council

Through: Mike Swanson, City Manager
Kenny Asher, Community Development and Public Works Director

From: Katie Mangle, Planning Director

Subject: Design and Landmarks Committee Work Plan for 2007-8

Date: May 4, 2007, for May 15, 2007, Work Session

Action Requested
Review and discuss the 2007-8 Design and Landmarks Committee Work Program.

Background
The proposed work program is a plan for fulfilling the Committee's responsibilities for advising the Planning Commission and pursuing other projects with the available staff and budget resources.

The Planning Commission serves the City by advising the Planning Commission and City Council on urban design, architectural and historic preservation activities. They do this by reviewing development proposals in downtown and completing projects regarding historic landmarks, and education and outreach.

Accomplishments of 2006-7
During the 2006-7 fiscal year, the DLC met quarterly, and worked with Planning staff through the transition to a new Director. The DLC held one public hearing on a Design Review application in downtown; completed the last steps of reviewing design details of the North Main Village project; initiated a project to digitally document Milwaukie's Historic Properties; and participated in the revision of the Sign Code. Three committee members left the committee, but we gained a new member with experience and interest in urban design and history.

Priorities for 2007-8

The following is a summary of the DLC priorities for 2007-8. The Committee will be prepared to discuss this draft list and Council priorities at the work session:

1. Recruit new DLC members. The committee anticipates a slate of reviews that will be important to the community (see below), so it will be important to recruit and maintain a full five-member committee.

2. Conduct public design review hearings to advise the Planning Commission on development proposals in Downtown zones. Anticipated proposals for the coming year include:
   - Town Center mixed use development project
   - Riverfront Park

3. Conduct public design review hearings on development proposals when the Planning Commission has made design review a condition of approval. Anticipated proposals to be reviewed in the coming year include:
   - Immovable Foundation Church

4. Review of Historic Landmarks alteration or demolition. Advise the Planning Commission on applications when City approval is required by Code. Anticipated proposals for the coming year include:
   - Ardenwald Elementary School

5. Participate in and advise the Planning Commission on code revisions relating to community design. Anticipated code change proposals to be discussed in the coming year include:
   - Chapter 14 - Sign Code
   - 19.321 - Downtown Public Area Requirements

6. Create a digital slide show of Milwaukie's historic resources. The Committee is taking new photos of the listed properties and will create a powerpoint slide show for public education purposes.

7. Meet bi-monthly. Since becoming a committee, the DLC has met irregularly, primarily when the need for a public hearing arose. The plan for the coming year will be for the group to meet bi-monthly to allow them to develop a greater understanding of the Downtown Design Guidelines and Milwaukie's cultural heritage, and strengthen relationships within the committee.

<u>Concurrence</u>

The DLC, Planning Commission and Director of Community Development and Public Works have reviewed and concur with the draft work program.

Fiscal Impact
The work program will require a commitment of fiscal and staff resources. The proposed budget for FY 2007/2008 provides budget resources to support the work program. The Planning staff is proposed to be increased from four to five planners. Approximately $50,000 is currently proposed for the consulting services budget line item.

Work Load Impacts
Increasing the number of meetings from quarterly to bi-monthly will increase the amount of staff time dedicated to supporting the DLC. Meeting more frequently meeting, however, should not only improve the committee's capabilities but making the meetings more regular will help staff plan for and assist DLC projects and hearings.

Alternatives
None.

Attachments
None.

CITY OF MILWAUKIE
MILWAUKIE DESIGN AND LANDMARKS COMMISSION MINUTES
TUESDAY SEPTEMBER 29, 2004

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT
Brent Carter, Chair
Patty Wisner
Barbara Cartmill
Carlotta Collette
Nancy Jamieson

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT
None

STAFF PRESENT
John Gessner, Planning Director
Lindsey Nesbitt, Associate Planner
Keith Jones, Associate Planner

OTHERS PRESENT
Jeff Myhre
Melissa Stiles
Thomas Kemper
Mike McColloch

1.0 CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 6:39 p.m.

2.0 PROCEDURAL QUESTIONS -- None.

3.0 CONSENT AGENDA -- None

Patty Wisner moved to approve the minutes of August 25, 2004, as corrected. Barbara Cartmill seconded the motion. MOTION CARRIED 5-0.
Ayes: Cartmill, Collette, McNally, Wisner, Carter; Nays: None.

4.0 INFORMATION ITEMS -- City Council Minutes
City Council minutes can be found on the City web site at www.cityofmilwaukie.org

5.0 PUBLIC COMMENT -- None.

6.0 PUBLIC HEARINGS -- None.

7.0 WORKSESSION ITEMS

7.1 North Main Street Development Informal Review

Chair Carter opened the meeting to a presentation from the North Main Street Redevelopment Team. This portion of the project will cover selection of colors and exterior materials.

Jeff Myhre, Melissa Stiles, and Thomas Kemper made the presentation. Because the fluorescent lights were changing the colors on the boards significantly, the Commissioners were taken outside to take advantage of the natural light and view palette of materials and colors to be used in the project.

The masonry is all integral colors. The shingles will be architectural grade and there will be a contrast in shade and shadow as opposed to flat retab roofing. The proposed windows will be vinyl with aluminum storefronts; they will be placed on three of the buildings. The Code does not allow vinyl windows. These windows will be consistent in color and similar to the windows that most have in their homes.

The exterior of the buildings are all cementitious concrete siding products. Samples were passed around. This material is made to resist the weather, has a 50-year life span, and is virtually indestructible. Concrete and brick will be used for the ground floors, and concrete will be used for the rest of the building. It will be painted in the colors shown on the pallet. A board was presented of other urban projects in the area. The roofing comes in a traditional look and will look like natural cedar shakes. The cementitious siding products allow for a lot of flexibility and are pretty much the staple in exterior siding materials today for residential projects.

Keith Jones stated that it is implied in guidelines that cementitious siding is questionable because it has been used previously as an inexpensive product. Staff has encouraged this team to be careful with detailing so that it will hold up and be on a smaller scale than other projects. It is good and durable material and will last if detailed correctly. Staff recommends that the Commission consider this material, especially for this application.

Chair Carter asked why fiberglass roof shingles were not brought in versus the asphalt composite shingles; the cementitious walls will outlast the roof. A fiberglass or cement shingle will keep up with the level of maintenance on the building. Mr. Myhre stated that the roof can come in a 30-year, 40-year, or 50-year material; they can accommodate the same longevity of the siding. Cementitious roofing presents a larger structural load on the roof system and results in more cost associated with the trusses. In addition, putting that material up higher (imitation slate) will cost more money for the material and installation of this type of material brings a higher risk of breakage (10%). Going with traditional roofing keeps costs of the overall project in line. There will be the same durability and longevity for both the siding and roof materials; both rely on property maintenance.

Barbara Cartmill asked why vinyl windows were chosen for this project. Mr. Myhre stated that cost was a major concern; however, the most common windows used today are aluminum and vinyl rather than nail-planned windows (aluminum or vinyl). The traditional problem with aluminum windows is that they minimize the thermal transfer between the interior and exterior. Vinyl windows are good for thermal efficiency, have long-term durability, and require low maintenance. With the proposed colors and pallet, the vinyl windows give a better effect. Wood windows are very costly, require more maintenance and become stained with condensation over time. It should not be implied that vinyl windows are cheap.

Mr. Myhre displayed the rendering of the cornice on building A. The code requires that there be a 12-by-6-inch cornice on the top of any building that stands three stories or more. This requirement does not allow the architectural style that they are trying to present for approval. They are looking at a contemporary design in which the cornice will be a very clean line, clean edge. They are requesting support on not having that cornice on building A; it does not fit with contemporary design.

Mr. Myhre stated that they are trying to create a diversity of architectural styles. Ms. Wisner stated that she feels there is flexibility on design. She knows her community is looking for change and diversity in design. They have not expressed interest in contemporary or flat top buildings; they are looking more for something that is not a generic modern look. They would like to see some sort of coming together of modern buildings that show respect for traditional features of the age and history of the town. The proposed design for building A is not unique nor does it have a sense of Milwaukie—a riverfront community unique only to Milwaukie.

Mike McCullough stated that the cornice line and the façade of building A has been a focal point for design discussions. The difference between what the Commission saw before and now is that the cornice line is broken in the middle. He feels that this reaction is to the scale of this building; there is quite a jump from the middle building to the corner building. Because this cornice is continuous, it aggravates the scale. There are some design solutions that could break the scale down further.

Barbara Cartmill stated that she is pleased with the layout because it does not look like row houses or town houses. She feels the town houses are a common design; however, the blending of the different styles helps the diversity. Nancy Jamison stated that she too likes the diversity shown in the design concepts.

Ms. Wisner stated that some of the buildings in the downtown area have not really integrated well into the community. She would like to see buildings that show diversity such that 50-70 years from now people will still feel very positive about the design.

Carlotta Collette stated that the modern style will blend well with the library; it is very elegant. The design elements in the building are very similar to elements in the Masonic Lodge.

Mr. Myhre addressed the building projections along Main Street. The code allows 24" in the side yard and 36" in the front yard. This project proposes canopies that are projecting up to 5 feet beyond the building. They are seeking support for having the canopies project this far. On the Main Street right-of-way it will be a benefit because if will offer more pedestrian cover along the streetscape. The same benefit applies on the internal alleys. The sidewalk area is 12 feet and this will leave 7 feet of clear area.

John Gessner reported that there is a standard restriction in the residential zone that has been in effect since 1968. The allowance was to allow for ordinary architectural features such as cornices, eaves, uncovered porches, flews, etc. in side yards. He is not aware of a prohibition that there could not be projections into the right-of-way; current awnings project into the right-of-way.

Alice Rouyer reported that code amendments were presented to the Planning Commission last night to allow for projections of unenclosed balconies into the right-of-way up to 4 feet. It is hoped that this will be approved by Council at their October meeting.

Mr. Myhre presented a nighttime rendering of the project. Chair Carter asked why there was little focus on the sconces; it did not give a true idea of the evening lighting. Mr. Myhre stated that there are still details that need to be worked out with the lighting of the sconces and the blade signs.

Mr. Myhre stated that there are two issues to be addressed regarding the site plan. There is a code requirement that parking cannot be set back 50 feet. In an effort to mitigate that requirement, they are proposing making building A into an L-shaped building. In order to accommodate the needs of the residents, parking spaces are needed along Main Street. A large landscape island with a smaller wall is planned to mitigate this requirement.

The code also disallows garages to face Main Street. Building F (three row houses facing the park) has garages on the ground floor facing Main Street. Mr. Jones reported that the Planning Commission approved code amendments that would eliminate the provision of parking within 50 feet of the building. Staff will review the issue of garages facing Main Street.

Discussion followed on canopies and projections into the right-of-way. Mr. McColloch suggested going beyond 4 feet for canopies, but keeping the balconies within 5 feet. Balconies are creating habitable space that is in the required setback of the city; a projection into the public right-of-way. Balconies that are on the side are not in right-of-way; it is a moot point.

Chair Carter suggested that building A be more in line with the Masonic Lodge; he does not get a sense of completion there. He would like to see a little more punch of color along the first story line to break up and lift the building vertically and give it some weight. Possibly the corners of building A can carry the stepping out on corners similar to the Masonic Lodge. He likes the tensile cap effect, but the building continues through

above that and does not look complete. He would like a little bit further study to come up with more design elements. Mr. McCullough stated that they could incorporate a face on the back side of building A; they are going to look at that and show the Commission the design concepts that they come up with to reflect that position.

John Gessner reported that one of the next steps is the courtyard. Mr. Myhre stated that the courtyard is not yet designed but it will be some sort of gathering space common feature. They are working closely with landscape consultants and Metro to create a harvested rainwater features. He showed some design elements of a project in downtown Portland, rainwater coming off the roof through a series of different downspouts in an artistic way (glass, steel, concrete, etc). The benefits are the visual aspect and the rain noises (trickling, running water, etc.). Different alternatives are being considered to collect the water from the roof (downspouts, fountains, river rock, wading pool, pavers, planters, etc.). It will be a combination of landscape, harvesting of drain water, and hard steel. They are in the final stages of design; the courtyard is about 50 by 100 feet.

Alice Rouyer stated that the City is considering contributing $45,000 from the storm water budget and Metro is considering $50,000.

Chair Carter asked if there has been any consideration of an area for children to play or an element that would be interactive with children. Mr. Myhre stated that they would like to have a gathering space for small events, but they don't want to detract/replicate from the park next door. A fountain feature would invite people and children to come hang out and enjoy the water and spend time.

Mr. McCullough stated that the courtyard has been a central concern of design review because, when you look at the site plan, there is almost no green; the entire site is occupied by building or parking. The courtyard focal point and potential to make it into a rich courtyard with all these types of possibilities is important; so it is not just a parking lot with a drain in the middle. Scalewise, there has been concern about vehicles, circulation, and the amount of paving. Other projects have been done that incorporate courtyards, car courts, circulation driveways, etc. and the surfaces of the buildings are a part of the courtyards. There will be plantings in base planters and things like that. The concern is focused on the courtyard at this point because they have waived the traditional suburban setting of having 10-foot front yards.

Chair Carter suggested terracing with wisteria to get a nice, shaded green space trailing along the ground-floor units. Mr. McColloch stated that trellises will be placed all along the frontage of the ground-floor units.

Chair Carter asked if the elevators could be oversized to accommodate furniture moving and deliveries. Mr. Myhre stated that the hydraulic elevators will be standard plastic laminate. They will be 10 feet high, which is oversized compared to code.

The next step for the City is to convene the Design and Landmarks Committee to give formal comment to the Planning Commission regarding this proposal.

7.2 North Main Street Redevelopment Project – Proposed Code Revisions

John Gessner reported that Alice Rouyer had indicated that the developer needed certain changes to the code for various reasons relating to this project. The Planning Commission last night reviewed those changes and forwarded a recommendation to Council to approve. If the Design and Landmarks Commission has any comments, they can be forwarded to City Council for their hearing.

Alice Rouyer reviewed the proposed amendments to the Zoning Ordinance Section 19.312 and the Milwaukie Zoning Map as described in the ordinance.

1. Creation of the "Village Concept Area" and allowing town houses and multifamily housing in a limited portion of the Downtown Storefront (DS) Zone. Currently town houses and stand-alone multifamily and condo buildings are not permitted in the DS Zone. Tom Kemper's goal is to create a village out of this project. It was questioned whether to allow town houses outright or create a special area where they can be allowed. The original downtown plan code did not allow town houses in order to create density in the downtown area. Town houses would not meet that vision of the downtown plan. A village concept area was created for the north main site. An overlay was created where town houses and stand-alone multifamily housing is allowed.

   John Gessner stated that when the downtown plan was first adopted a transit center was planned for this site. All of the planning concepts attached to this site have changed. Council gave direction to staff to proceed with mixed-use development on the site; the policy rationale has been established to make this change. Ms. Rouyer stated that this is a unique site in that there is frontage on two streets. There are no other sites in the downtown that will be developed in this way (see page 4 of staff report on village area).

2. Proposed curb cuts and surface parking lots within 50 feet of Main Street. Criteria are proposed by which the Planning Commission could approve surface parking lots and curb cuts within 50 feet on Main Street. The intent of the code was to create a continuous building façade along Main Street. The fire code requires fire truck access to all sides of buildings that do not have frontage on a public street. The Planning Commission created a finding that the overall project meets the intent of providing a continuous building façade close to the street; the off-street parking area or curb cut is visually screened from view from the street, and the community need for the off-street parking area or curb cut benefit outweighs the need for façade in that area.

3. Allow upper-story balconies and projections into the right-of-way. Currently there is a provision that establishes minimum dimensions of 6 feet in depth by 8 feet in width for balconies. The reasoning for this requirement was to provide outdoor open space. This amendment will keep the standard intact but move it

from a development standard into a design standard. Development has to go through the variance process; design standards can be modified on the Design and Landmarks Commission's recommendation if it meets the intent of the code and is in compliance with design guidelines. This gives flexibility to the developer to show design sense to modify code and design intent of the building.

Ms. Collette asked why the depth went from 6 feet to no more than 4 feet. Ms. Rouyer stated that this amendment does not change the standard, it only changes the way the standard can be modified. The maximum of 4 feet is being proposed for the balconies in this project.

4. Modification to design standards. Alice Rouyer stated that the code stated that prohibited materials are prohibited and cannot be modified. The developer is proposing the use of a prohibited material and other modifications. This amendment sets up criteria by which prohibited materials can be considered by the Design and Landmarks Committee and the Planning Commission.

   John Gessner stated that the cementitious boards are allowed in the DR Zone; however, because of the way that housing is going to be managed in the downtown storefront versus downtown residential, the hardy materials cannot be used in the downtown storefront. This amendment would allow the products to be used subject to review. The precedent is established for the use of these materials in the DR Zone; the code amendment makes it available in the DS Zone.

   Ms. Rouyer stated that page 12 of the amendments sets up criteria that the burden is on the developer to prove that the prohibited material is substantially comparable to the allowed material in terms of quality, appearance, style, and architectural effect and durability. The use of the prohibited materials must be consistent with design considerations specified for the particular design element in the Milwaukie Downtown Design Guidelines.

Chair Carter voiced concern about making these amendments in such a rushed manner; he would prefer forecasting that would help be prepared and staff stays ahead of the game.

Ms. Collette stated that this project will give precedence to design in Milwaukie; she feels what has been done is very exciting.

Barbara Cartmill moved to forward a recommendation supporting the proposal and ordinance with modifications made by the Planning Commission to City Council. Carlotta Collette seconded the motion. MOTION CARRIED 5-0.
Ayes: Cartmill, Collette, McNally, Wisner, Carter; Nays: None.

8.0 DISCUSSION ITEMS

Chair Carter stated that when this commission becomes a committee, he will be stepping down from the office of chair because of the conflict of interest with also serving on the Planning Commission.

As far as a work program, John Gessner stated that the Design and Landmarks Committee will meet about every other month until a more permanent schedule is worked out.

9.0 OLD BUSINESS -- None.

10.0 OTHER BUSINESS / UPDATES
10.1 Matters from the Planning Director -- None.

11.0 NEXT MEEETING -- Will be announced

Barbara Cartmill moved to adjourn the meeting of September 29, 2004. **Patty Wisner** seconded the motion. MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

The meeting adjourned at 8:25 p.m.

_____ _____

Brent Carter, Chair Shirley Richardson, Hearings Reporter

CITY OF MILWAUKIE
DESIGN AND LANDMARKS COMMITTEE MINUTES
MONDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 2005

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT
Patty Wisner, Chair
Randall Welch
Barbara Cartmill

STAFF PRESENT
John Gessner, Planning Director
Lindsey Nesbitt, Associate Planner
Shirley Richardson, Hearings Reporter

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT
Nancy Jamieson

1.0 CALL TO ORDER

Chair Wisner called the meeting to order at 6:34 p.m. **John Gessner** reviewed the committee meeting process.

Barbara Cartmill moved to appoint Randall Welch to the position of Vice Chair. Chair Wisner seconded. Motion carried 2-0 with one abstention.
Ayes: Cartmill, Wisner; Nays: None; Abstention: Welch

2.0 PROCEDURAL QUESTIONS—None.

3.0 DESIGN AND LANDMARKS COMMITTEE MINUTES—None.

4.0 INFORMATION ITEMS—City Council Minutes

City Council minutes can be found on the City web site at www.cityofmilwaukie.org

5.0 PUBLIC COMMENT—None.

6.0 PUBLIC HEARINGS

John Gessner reviewed the hearing format with the Committee: staff report, applicant's presentation, public testimony, questions, testimony, questions from Committee, rebuttal, closing and discussion/action.

6.1	Type of Hearing:	Recommendation Hearing
	Applicant:	Chris Eberle
	Owner:	Brittany Chambers
	Location:	9717 SE Cambridge Lane
	Proposal:	The applicant is proposing to demolish the existing 3-stall garage and construct a 4,200-square-foot addition to the existing home.
	File Numbers:	HR-04-03 and HIE-04-01
	NDA:	Historic Milwaukie

Chair Wisner opened the recommendation hearing to consider renovations and improvements to an historic structure.

Chair Wisner asked if there were any conflicts of interest or ex parte contacts to declare. All the members have visited the site. They were all present at a tour by the contractor for the application and asked questions, walked through the proposed restoration and addition, and got a good comprehensive overview of what was planned. No one in the audience challenged the impartiality of any Committee member or the jurisdiction of the Planning Commission to hear this matter.

STAFF REPORT

Lindsey Nesbitt reported that the applicant is looking for a recommendation of approval to be passed on to the Planning Commission for exterior alterations to the existing residence, demolition of a garage, and construction of new 3-stall garage. The home is ranked "significant" for its association with Richard Sudeleaf, who designed the residence in 1938. It's an excellent example of Tudor style and staff noted the masonry work and windows. The property was owned by Clarence Francis, who formed the first used car dealership in Oregon.

Staff is recommending that the Committee forward a recommendation of approval to the Planning Commission, based on the following conditions:

1. Compliance with Historic Preservation criteria
2. Reuse of brick from demolished garage
3. Lab testing of mortar samples
4. New brick to match existing brick walls
5. Maintenance of existing rooflines and steep pitches
6. Custom-built windows
7. Compliance with residential R-10 Zone

QUESTIONS FROM COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Chair Wisner noted that large homes are sometimes turned into bed and breakfast establishments and wondered if this one would qualify. **Ms. Wagner** reported that the Zoning Ordinance does not permit bed and breakfasts; however, the Historic Preservation Overlay Zone does permit historic buildings to be turned into bed and breakfasts. **John**

Gessner stated that it could be done under a conditional use application, which would require a Planning Commission decision.

CORRESPONDENCE—None.

APPLICANT'S PRESENTATION

Speaking: Chris Eberle, Graham Eberle Architects, 1410 SW Morrison, Portland 97205

Mr. Eberle stated that they conducted a tour of the home to familiarize the Committee with the project. He reported that a computer model describes the addition and the Committee has reviewed that model. The addition is approximately 4,200 square feet and the existing residence is 5,000 square feet (not including the basement and 1,000-square-foot garage).

In approaching this remodel, they were well aware of the structure's designation as historically "significant." They were sensitive to the design and stature of house. It was important to them to preserve the primary features. Even though this addition is substantial in size, it was added to the back southeast side of the site so it recedes from the main facade of the house and breaks down in size so it appears smaller in scale in comparison to the existing house. The addition was built so as not to diminish the main body of the house.

The landscaping proposed is effective in framing and screening to the back. The owner and original builder of the house was an automobile dealer. It is a historic house and they felt it was important to be sensitive to the nature of the house.

The difficulty with the garage was how it was organized. The new addition will function as a master bedroom, family room, and utility area. It will be attached to the southeast corner (current garage) of the structure. Looking at options for using this space, it was found that it was not suited for a garage. It was decided to demolish the existing garage. The brick from the existing garage will be used for new construction (the garage will become a "brick quarry" for the addition). They are currently in the design process, replicating significant aspects of the garage. Previously the Committee has seen the original building model indicating the original intent for design of the garage. These elements have been incorporated into the new design, paying homage to the architect's intent and house.

It was very important to maintain materials, window configurations and sizes, roof slopes, roof forms in relation to one another, and masking. As part of the addition, one of three masonry chimneys will be removed and moved to an extension on the ridge of the house. There is a masonry chimney in the existing home that will be moved to the extension.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY IN SUPPORT—None. (No public present.)

COMMENTS OR QUESTIONS—None.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY IN OPPOSITION—None. (No public present.)

QUESTIONS FROM COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Committee Member Welch asked about the construction of the new chimney. Mr. Eberle stated that, since the large chimney needed to be an anchor to the extended structure, it was decided to pull the chimney out and replace it with stucco and chimney pots similar to the style of that type of home.

Chair Wisner asked if all of the chimneys are functional. Mr. Eberle stated that the chimneys service 4 fireplaces; the newly constructed chimney will service 2 fireplaces. The new chimney will provide ducting for chimneys. The big chimney on the front is a duct chimney for the furnace. All chimneys are functional.

Chair Wisner asked if there will be records of the original design of the garage, measurements, and materials. Mr. Eberle said yes, they will document that. They have not done it yet but it will be documented; they have a complete drawing record for the existing house.

Chair Wisner suggested attaching a recommendation that the applicant attach an accurate and comprehensive record of the original garage as a part of the application. In the future, when significant homes are being reviewed, there will be a complete record of the structure.

Chair Wisner asked the applicant if they had objections to this request. They had none.

STAFF COMMENTS—None.

APPLICANT'S CLOSING COMMENTS

Mr. Eberle thanked the Committee for their review of this project, saying it is good to see the City is aware and concerned.

COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/ACTION

Chair Wisner closed the public testimony portion of the hearing and moved on to discussion among Committee members.

Chair Wisner stated that the intention is to make a recommendation to the Planning Commission.

Committee Member Cartmill stated that she thinks this is a good project. She appreciated the tour and is delighted someone is taking care of this house.

Committee Member Welch stated that he feels this represents a part of Milwaukie and that this was done right, from the tour to this presentation. Thoroughness is very important and he wishes more people would do this. Seeing the original model from the '30s tells him that at some point this design was the vision of its owner and the house deserves to maintain that vision. This is a good project. He is glad it is being restored and is not just an add-on. The add-on is a restoration project itself.

Chair Wisner stated that this is a beautiful project, a beautiful home. It is a gem and a piece of artwork that needs to be preserved and taken care of for years to come. She is excited that the authenticity is being brought into the addition. Very good job done on architectural planning; it will be a knockout when done.

Committee Member Cartmill moved to make a recommendation to the Planning Commission for approval of the renovations and improvements to a historic structure that includes demolition of a 3-stall garage and construction of a 4,200-square-foot addition. Further, complete documentation of the original structure and renovation plans is submitted as part of the application submittal. Committee Member Welch seconded the motion. MOTION CARRIED 3-0.
Ayes: Cartmill, Welch, Wisner; Nays: None.

Committee Member Cartmill thanked the applicant for doing such a wonderful job on the tour and informing the Committee of the restoration.

7.0 WORKSESSION ITEMS—None.

8.0 DISCUSSION ITEMS—None.

9.0 OLD BUSINESS—None.

10.0 OTHER BUSINESS/UPDATES

10.1 Matters from the Planning Director

John Gessner stated that there is a need for a future meeting to discuss the Committee's work plan. The Planning Commission is having a casual get-together to talk about planning matters, update the new commissioners, and begin discussion of their work plan.

Lindsey Nesbitt suggested four dates for the Committee to choose from for a future meeting: April 6, 11, 12, or 13. The Committee will be informed when the exact meeting date is selected.

11.0 NEXT MEETING—April 2005

Barbara Cartmill moved to adjourn the meeting of February 7, 2005. **Randall Welch** seconded the motion. MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

The meeting adjourned at 7:19 p.m.

_____ _____

Patty Wisner, Chair Shirley Richardson, Hearings Reporter

CITY OF MILWAUKIE
DESIGN AND LANDMARKS COMMITTEE MINUTES
April 14, 2005

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT
Patty Wisner, Chair
Randall Welch, Vice Chair
Barbara Cartmill
Nancy Jamieson (was she there?)

STAFF PRESENT
John Gessner, Planning Director
Lindsey Nesbitt, Associate Planner
Shirley Richardson, Hearings Reporter

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT

1.0 CALL TO ORDER

Chair Wisner called the meeting to order at 6:37 p.m.

2.0 PROCEDURAL QUESTIONS—None.

3.0 DESIGN AND LANDMARKS COMMITTEE MINUTES—None.

4.0 INFORMATION ITEMS—City Council Minutes

City Council minutes can be found on the City web site at www.cityofmilwaukie.org.

5.0 PUBLIC COMMENT—None.

6.0 PUBLIC HEARINGS

6.1

Applicant:	Main Street Partners LLC
Owner:	Main Street Partners LLC
Location:	10554 SE Main St
Proposal:	Determine if applicant has satisfied Planning Commission conditions of approval, which require applicant to demonstrate compliance with the Downtown Design Guidelines regarding wall materials, public artwork, lighting, signage, open spaces, and architecture (rooftop equipment, windows, and doors).
File Numbers:	DR-04-01, S-04-03, TPR-04-08, VR-04-10
NDA:	Historic Milwaukie

STAFF REPORT

Lindsey Nesbitt reported that on December 14, 2004, the Planning Commission approved the North Main Project. As a condition of approval, the applicant was directed to provide wall materials, trim, doors, windows, lighting, outdoor spaces, and mechanical units for Design and Landmark Committee review. She explained that the applicant had an exhibit of wall materials outside and invited the Committee to go outside and view those materials.

Ms. Nesbitt asked the Committee members to take into consideration that the materials to be reviewed are not prohibited in the current code. In the Downtown Storefront Zone, cement-based siding (Hardi brand products) is prohibited on buildings; however, the code does allow for modifications to those prohibited materials. Page 2 of the staff report outlines the three criteria that the applicant must demonstrate compliance with in order to get approval of the prohibited materials as directed by the Planning Commission.

APPLICANT'S PRESENTATION

Outside, the applicant presented a mock-up of a series of different conditions. Examples of materials were shown for:

- Trim details (Hardi Plank) for corners of buildings
- Flashings
- Drain screen system to help keep moisture from getting through to the interior walls
- Colors to be used on the buildings
- Drain screen system showing the top band (cement siding) integrating with the horizontal lap siding and vertical reveal joints
- Nail flange windows
- Storefront windows
- Shingles
- Weeps

It was asked how well the cement siding absorbed street dirt and debris from the air. **Jeff Myhre** stated that this was more of a question not of the Hardi materials, but the surface application of the paint. The buildings will all have an application of exterior acrylic latex paint and be pressure-washed on a regular basis. The cement material is meant to last for 50 years; it can be painted, pressure-washed, and repainted and holds up extremely well. It is extremely durable and that's why they use it often.

It was asked if the buildings will be spray-painted. **Jeff Myhre** stated that all of the buildings will be sprayed with one coat of primer and two coats of paint.

Back inside, **Chair Wisner** opened the hearing to discussion by the Committee of the materials just reviewed. **Lindsey Nesbitt** stated that staff believes the applicant has demonstrated that the cement material is a long-lasting product, a good product, and is

acceptable as to how it will be applied. If applied, it would be compatible with the Downtown standards.

Committee Member Cartmill noted that the reason this product was prohibited was not quality but that it was prohibited in the Downtown Storefront Zone. Because this particular design, more of a residential look rather than commercial (storefront frontage) there was concern that the cement would be commercial looking. She has not seen anything that gives her concern.

Lindsey Nesbitt resumed her staff report, saying that there were several issues the Planning Commission requested the Committee to address: wall material, site lighting, rooftop mechanical equipment, windows and doors, public open space, public artwork, and signage.

SITE LIGHTING

Jeff Myhre referred to the light standard information he previously submitted. Staff's concerns were how the nighttime lighting would be light enough to provide pedestrian safety and not too bright to impact residential units; and that the parking lot lighting should be similar to the required street lighting for the public area requirements.

Light pollution is of significant concern; they want to create an environment that is communal and of high-quality. The foot-candles proposed comply with code requirements.

Chair Wisner asked what a foot-candle looks like. **Jeff Myhre** stated that one foot-candle per foot is an average. A foot-candle refers to the spread of light that radiates from the fixture. Retail shopping center average is 5 foot-candles or more; that is too much for residential. When it comes to the style of the fixture, one of the important criteria is spillover; they want to have shielded fixtures with heads that are focused. Residents don't want light shining into their blinds.

The other important aspect is security; people want to be comfortable walking around at night without fear of someone around the corner. This is critically important at the main entry of the buildings and in the center square. They feel that the proposed lighting scheme (light quality and light level) is "on the money."

They recognize that the standards proposed are not the same as on the street; this was done intentionally. The street standards are representative of a public way/street and look great. A picture was shown of the proposed lighting. Although there is connectivity, this is not a public place; they want it to feel unique, like a residential community that is separated from Main and Harrison Streets. The aesthetics of buildings, landscaping, and lighting are used to make these spaces feel different and that is why they have proposed a separate set of lighting standards from the street lighting standards.

Chair Wisner stated that she understands the objective; however, is there another hooded or shaded lamp style that would be more attractive than the SA1. **Jeff Myhre** stated that there are a variety of options that would achieve the same results. Other box options are available in this line that have heads with different looks and still meet all the requirements. He will get back to the Committee with other options for the lighting fixtures.

Jeff Myhre stated that the overall theme for the lighting is a traditional craftsman look, yet contemporary in feel. There is a series of different fixtures that help in the overall aesthetic contrast of the buildings. The design of the buildings (traditional, contemporary, etc.) was to have different features, so it would look like a village built over time. The fixtures are the jewelry on the building to help add the finishing touch to the architectural aesthetics.

ROOFTOP MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT

Lindsey Nesbitt reported that the Planning Commission asked the Committee to determine if the applicant has satisfied the condition of approval to provide plans and drawings for the roof-mounted mechanical equipment and proposed screening methods. The applicants have provided a drawing showing that they are not proposing to screen the mechanical units but that, by placing the units on top of the buildings in the right area, they will be screened from view. The units cannot be viewed until a person is approximately 143 to 480 feet away.

Jeff Myhre explained that the mechanical units are very small; they cannot be seen from the center courtyard. The residents of the development would not be able to see the mechanical units. The only way to see the units is to be on the roof or in a helicopter above.

WINDOWS AND DOORS

Ms. Nesbitt reported that the Commission directed the applicant to provide additional details on the proposed windows and doors. **Mr. Myhre** stated that the examples shown outside covered the materials to be used on proposed windows and doors.

Commercial Windows and Doors is glass retail storefront; they wanted as much glass as they could get. It is very important to retailers. The buildings have quite a bit of vertical and horizontal articulation built into the design. The entire first floor of building B and the partial first floor of building A are retail spots. The idea is to have storefront commercial systems with accent lighting and signs that break up the spaces. To date there are no committed tenants; the design is flexible for whatever use goes in.

It was intentionally designed to have an entry porch on every ground-floor unit. The main door going in is perpendicular to the steps. This was done so the inside

of the unit could not be seen from the parking lot. It is important to bring the outside in to make the units look bigger. The windows and French doors provide light.

Chair Wisner asked if having glass doors is a security issue. **Joe _____** stated that the doors are tempered glass. If someone wants in, with any door or window, they can get in. They are no more vulnerable than the windows that are on the ground-floor units. If someone is uncomfortable, they will rent a unit on the second floor. Blinds will be included for the units on the first floor.

PUBLIC OPEN SPACE

Lindsey Nesbitt explained that part of the open space requirement is assuring that the spaces are well defined, friendly, accommodating, and secure. The applicant has indicated that the common square will include an amphitheater, bio-swale adjacent to parking area, recessed square located two feet lower than adjacent residential units, vegetation that provides a screen from the parking area, and water running throughout the site.

Chair Wisner asked how the bio-swale and rainwater runoff works. **Jeff Myhre** explained that the downspouts coming off the buildings flow into a pool. That pool then feeds into the stream. The idea is to create an internal square that uses recycled rainwater. When there is heavy rain, it will fill up into the pool; when it dries out, the pool will be dry. It will function at all times of the year.

PUBLIC ARTWORK

John _____ proposed to come back to the Committee with the intended artwork. They have started working with a group of artists to put some concepts on the table. They are in the process of brainstorming ideas and when they are comfortable with their decisions, they will come back to the Committee. These will be the last items that go in so there is time; the artwork is a critical element of the square and it must be well integrated.

John Gessner explained that the design guidelines are specific and recommend artwork that is integrated into the building design with professionally designed, durable, and low-maintenance materials. He asked Tom Kemper what would the Committee's expectations be for their participation in reviewing the art that is presented. **Mr. Kemper** stated that the two key elements to consider are the two places where the water falls and on the ends of building B. He has instructed the artists to provide something that looks good, something that makes noise with the water (something fun) and something that is visual with the water (lighting). On building B, they will run water down one side and have a water event there on Main Street.

SIGNAGE

Ms. Nesbitt asked if the Committee is agreeable to staff reviewing signs at the time of the building permit based on the zoning ordinance, sign ordinance, and sign guidelines. **Chair Wisner** stated that she understands that there will be no signs on this project because it is driven by the individual commercial businesses that take the spaces; however, if there are applicants, it would be wise to submit a color PDF of the design that could be mailed to the Committee for review and comment. The Committee should be reviewing signs and giving input to make sure they are in compliance.

John Gessner explained that the State constitutional law does not allow the City to review signs for content. In the sign guidelines are criteria for dimension, location, and type. He suggested that this issue be discussed at the next meeting. **Tom Kemper** showed an example of their sign criteria; they control every element of the sign. The design has to be approved by them because it must blend in with the building design.

CORRESPONDENCE—None.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

There was no audience for testimony, comments, questions, or opposition.

APPLICANT'S CLOSING COMMENTS—None.

COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/ACTION

Chair Wisner closed the public testimony portion of the hearing and moved on to discussion by Committee members.

It was the consensus of the Committee to recommend to the Planning Commission the proposed:

- Wall materials
- Site lighting—would like to see additional design options for the downward-pointing, 15-foot lighting that is a little more pleasing to the development.
- Rooftop mechanical equipment
- Commercial windows and doors
- Residential doors and windows
- Public open space
- Public artwork—would like to see designs in progress at a later date
- Signage—to be determined by Committee upon receipt of applications

7.0 WORKSESSION ITEMS—None.

8.0 DISCUSSION ITEMS—None.

9.0 OLD BUSINESS—None.

10.0 OTHER BUSINESS/UPDATES

10.1 Matters from the Planning Director

John Gessner stated that the next meeting will be scheduled for the end of May. He will notify the Committee members of the exact date.

11.0 NEXT MEETING—May 2005

Barbara Cartmill moved to adjourn the meeting of April 14, 2005. **Randall Welch** seconded the motion. MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

The meeting adjourned at 8:20 p.m.

_____ _____

Patty Wisner, Chair Shirley Richardson, Hearings Reporter

Design and Landmarks Committee
DRAFT Minutes
Tuesday, June 21, 2006

Members Present
Patty Wisner, Chair
Barbara Cartmill
Charmaine Coleman

Staff Present
Katie Mangle, Planning Director
Brett Kelver, Assistant Planner

1. Call To Order

Chair Wisner called the meeting to order at approximately 6:35 p.m.

2. Discussion of Amendments to the Sign Code

Director Mangle outlined the need and purpose of the current project to revise the City's Sign Code, Title 14. She explained that while the Planning Commission will review the entire proposal in detail, the DLC needs to discuss some of the problems and solutions that relate to the Downtown Design Guidelines.

Director Mangle explained that a recent Oregon Supreme Court decision expanded the definition of "content-based regulation" of signs, and that the City's current code would be subject to challenge because of the amount of content-based language in the code. In addition, the City attorney has identified a number of other areas in which the City may be susceptible to legal challenge and we want to address these things too. She explained that staff have identified three key issues for which the Planning Commission and DLC need to give staff guidance. These are problems created by the need to make the code defensible, but there are several possible solutions and the community will need to decide what to do.

The first issue is how long temporary window signs should be allowed to stay up. The current code places a strict time limit on when they can be displayed, but links their suitability to being "associated with holidays." A content-neutral code cannot consider the purpose of the sign (i.e, if it is associated with holidays or a sale), so the question is: how long should temporary painted or printed window signs be allowed to stay up without a permit?

The group discussed the City's ability to focus on the design of a sign, and wondered how big a problem this is. Is there a need to focus on traditional holidays? What about sales? What about the ads in the windows at Mike's Drive In? The group concluded that

there is not a need to be over-regulatory, and maybe the code could include a reasonable window of time.

Director Mangle introduced the second topic of discussion, internally illuminated cabinet signs in downtown. The problem to solve is that, though the code "discourages" internally illuminated cabinet signs and requires approval by the DLC and planning commission, there are no criteria for approval. Without criteria or direction on when these types of signs are appropriate, the process is unclear for applicants and the decision-making process may be difficult to defend. So the question is, should the City create criteria for approval or prohibit the signs altogether?

The group discussed the recent Wunderland sign application, and whether it mattered that the sign was moved from another location. Should the code prohibit signs being moved from another location? Vice Chair Welch made the point that the most important thing is the design of the sign, not whether it was moved from another location. Ms. Coleman stated that the signs should be prohibited, but allow for adjustments for special circumstances. Can we add criteria for this? The group discussed the importance of avoiding uncomfortable discussions in which the DLC is addressing unique situations without criteria to guide them.

Ms. Cartmill reminded the group that the design guidelines were created with the design of a whole building in mind, and it makes her uncomfortable to be over-emphasizing one small piece of a building (the sign), and using the design guidelines out of context. It is hard to apply the guidelines when you are just looking at one sign. The guidelines were meant to be flexible – considering one element in isolation doesn't work.

Director Mangle discussed the use of the sign code as an implementation tool, and the potential for using the Adjustment section to make the regulations more flexible.

Ms. Coleman stated that it needs to be clear that the "undue hardship" listed under adjustments doesn't mean the applicant doesn't want to pay more for a better sign. The adjustment process should allow for flexibility if someone wants to make a sign better, not to get out of a requirement. The group discussed making the adjustment section more clear. Need to better define what "hardship" means.

Director Mangle stated that another example of the content-based language problem is that the current code exempts murals from the permit process, but if the code is content-neutral, then murals need to be permitted as wall signs and subject to related standards. This would require murals to comply with existing standards for wall signs. In downtown, a wall sign can only be 16 square feet, which is small for a mural. The question for the community is whether the wall sign standards should be relaxed to better accommodate murals?

Chair Wisner asked about how the new code will treat the existing murals in downtown. Director Mangle said the changed regulations would only apply to new murals, though the existing murals will become nonconforming. Chair Wisner said the murals are great,

and should be encouraged, so it's unfortunate that the code will discourage them. She would like more time to consider this issue.

Director Mangle stated that staff would work on both the sign regulations and the adjustment process to incorporate the committee's thoughts, and would send a preliminary draft via mail to the committee. The Planning Commission will be discussing these same issues over the course of a few worksessions.

3. Other Business

Director Mangle informed the group that staff had recently met with the school district representatives regarding proposed changes to the Ardenwald School. Since it is an historic building, changes such as complete or partial demolition would require Planning Commission approval. Chair Wisner asked for future clarification of the specific role of the DLC with historic buildings.

4. Adjourn

There were no further items. Chair Wisner adjourned the meeting at approximately 8:15 p.m.

_____ _____

Patty Wisner, Chair Katie Mangle, Scribe

Design and Landmarks Committee
DRAFT Minutes
Tuesday, August 29, 2006

Members Present
Patty Wisner, Chair
Randall Welch, Vice Chair
Charmaine Coleman

Staff Present
Katie Mangle, Planning Director
Brett Kelver, Assistant Planner

Visitors Present
Tom Kemper (North Main Village Development)
Ron Skov (North Main Village Development)

1. Call To Order

Chair Wisner called the meeting to order at approximately 6:35 p.m. The minutes from the last meeting on June 21, 2006, are not yet complete and will be presented for review at a future meeting.

2. Review of Design Elements for North Main Village

Tom Kemper introduced himself as the developer for the North Main Village mixed-use development in downtown Milwaukie. (Ron Skov was acknowledged as a partner in the North Main project but remained in the audience rather than at the Committee table.) Mr. Kemper noted that he had last appeared before the Design and Landmarks Committee (DLC) in April 2005 to present preliminary design elements for the North Main Village project. The DLC gave its approval and then the Planning Commission approved the related land use applications, with the understanding that Mr. Kemper would report back to the DLC when the design elements were close to being finalized.

Mr. Kemper explained the "public art" component of the project, noting that the proposed features are actually on private property. He referred to a packet of drawings and information that were distributed to the DLC prior to the meeting and explained that the proposed features are tied in to managing stormwater runoff on the property. The feature attached to Building A consists of a set of aqueducts that funnel stormwater down over metal sculptures in large planters. From there, the water goes underground before daylighting into open swales, then underground again before collecting in the open amphitheater area. From there, the water will filter into additional drainage swales and drain into the public stormwater system. The open swales will be rock-based and vegetated.

In response to various questions from Committee members, Mr. Kemper noted that this water feature will handle approximately half of the runoff from Building A as well as most of the runoff from the central parking lot. The metal sculptures are designed to have parts that remain as shiny metal and other parts that rust to give a more organic look. Committee Member Coleman asked about safety issues with the metal sculptures, which are shown to have sharp points. Mr. Kemper responded that he is aware of this potential liability and will take care of it because of associated liability issues.

The water feature on Building B consists of wall-mounted grates on either end of the building that will produce a waterfall effect as stormwater runs across them into the drain below. Mr. Kemper noted that there is a passage through the development that connects Main Street to the library on one side of Building B.

With regard to lighting, Mr. Kemper explained that all fixtures will be arranged to focus light downward. Fixtures in the northern parking lot are more modern in design while those in the southern lot have a more historic character, similar in style to those proscribed in the City's Downtown Design Guidelines. These historic-character fixtures include a 30-inch high base that is larger and more fluted than what is shown in the drawings. The project design utilizes building lighting to help illuminate the parking lots, which reduces the overall number of fixtures in the parking lots.

Chair Wisner asked what the DLC's role in the process is at this point. Who will see the final design? Planning Director Mangle indicated that she will, according to the conditions of approval for the Design Review application for this project, and she would like to see the final actual representations of the proposed lighting fixtures. Director Mangle noted that from her review of the file, the Planning Commission was concerned with the scale of the lighting fixtures. Both Chair Wisner and Committee Member Coleman agreed that they do not want the fixtures in the southern lot to be too historic, that they should have some modern element and that attention should not be drawn to the base. Vice-Chair Welch indicated his belief that the design of the southern-lot fixtures is a good period design.

Mr. Kemper asked for clarification on this question of southern-lot fixture design and promised to provide Director Mangle with a cut sheet showing the final design. Mr. Skov drew a distinction between "historic" and "traditional" design that provided some clarity.

Chair Wisner asked about the location of the patio lights. Mr. Kemper and Mr. Skov explained that the patio lights are primarily on Building A—they are like porch or deck lights and will be "switched" so that individual tenants have control of their own lights. There are different specific styles for the various building lights, which will tend to be located at ground level and will not be "switched" but rather automatically controlled.

There was a question about what aspects of building signage need to be reviewed and whether individual tenants will have to come to the DLC for sign approval. New signs will require the standard City permit and accompanying review according to the Sign Code, but they will not have to be approved by the DLC. It was noted that the

Downtown Design Guidelines provide some direction, and Mr. Kemper said that the project has its own guidelines and criteria for signs that are more strict that those of the City. He agreed to send a copy of these guidelines to Director Mangle. As long as proposed signs meet the criteria outlined for signs in downtown zones, staff should be able to review them. Director Mangle indicated that any request for a variance should be brought before the DLC for review.

Committee Member Coleman (who had excused herself from a portion of this discussion and later returned) expressed her dislike for the proposed design of the northern-lot fixtures, saying they look too contemporary and have the appearance of the lighting found along freeways or common apartments or big parking lots. Chair Wisner stated her belief that the information presented to the DLC in the pre-meeting packet was inadequate and does not provide any choice or other options for consideration. Mr. Skov reminded the group of the earlier round of discussions with the DLC about lighting options and pointed out that this presentation is a response to those earlier extensive discussions and DLC comments. He said that the developers have done an extensive, five-foot square photometric study to verify that the lighting will be adequate without being a nuisance or polluting. Mr. Kemper reported that the developers have dedicated a considerable amount of money to designing the courtyard lighting and have been through 10-12 rounds of revisions with their lighting contractor.

Vice-Chair Welch stated that he thinks the developers have done what the DLC has asked. Chair Wisner and Committee Member Coleman indicated their acceptance of these explanations. The three DLC members present agreed that the proposed design elements are satisfactory, pending Director Mangle's review of the additional lighting information to be provided by Mr. Kemper.

3. Other Business

Director Mangle updated the group on the status of the Sign Code revision project, and asked if anyone wanted to discuss the August 8 memo, in which she updated the committee on policy changes related to the Downtown Design Guidelines.

Vice-Chair Welch noted that the Wunderland arcade has illuminated their sign (previously denied permission for internal illumination) with gooseneck lights. He expressed his frustration that the City's standards and guidelines do not provide more effective tools for preventing what he sees as an inappropriate design. He asked if the City could regulate sign materials more stringently, and stated that he would prefer that the Sign Code be revised to prohibit hanging cabinet signs, whether illuminated or not. Director Mangle responded that she would discuss this with Planning Commission for inclusion in the Sign Code revision.

Chair Wisner noted that she did not receive the packet with revised Sign Code materials. She and Director Mangle talked about remedying this for the future. (Staff later confirmed that the packet was mailed to the correct address, and sent a replacement copy of the packet.)

Chair Wisner stated that she was disappointed in the quality of the materials submitted for review at this meeting. There was some discussion about setting more clear standards for submission materials and then making sure they are distributed with adequate time for review.

4. Adjourn

There were no further items. Chair Wisner adjourned the meeting at approximately 8:15 p.m.

Patty Wisner, Chair	Brett Kelver, Scribe

DRAFT

Design and Landmarks Committee
Minutes
Wednesday, January 31, 2007

Members Present
Patty Wisner, Chair
Barb Cartmill
Charmaine Coleman
Andrew Tull

Staff Present
Katie Mangle, Planning Director
Brett Kelver, Assistant Planner

1. Call To Order

Chair Wisner called the meeting to order at approximately 6:30 p.m. Unadopted minutes from several recent meetings (June 2006 and August 2006) will be presented for review at a future meeting.

2. Historic Properties Photo Project

Assistant Planner Kelver explained the basic idea behind the photo project. Staff has been unable to locate the old set of existing slides of the properties on the City's historic resources list. A photo collection of these resources would be a useful educational tool for new DLC members as well as for the larger community, and an electronic format would be easier to store and work with. For these reasons it makes sense to re-shoot the historic resources. This task will be more easily done if shared by all DLC members.

Mr. Kelver handed out a packet of information including a Historic Resources map, a list of the Historic Resources, and a proposed division of the list into smaller groups for assignment to various DLC members. Chair Wisner explained more about the project idea, proposing a deadline of May 15th and offering to create a PowerPoint presentation with the photos by late August 2007. She reviewed a handout that outlined some directions for DLC members to follow in collecting the photos. (Chair Wisner asked for a copy of the entire list of the City's historic resources – Mr. Kelver promised to provide her a copy as soon as possible.)

There was a suggestion to put an article in The Pilot to explain the photo project, but after some discussion it was agreed that a Pilot article could wait until the presentation is closer to being final. Another suggestion was to send a simple postcard to all the owners of historic properties on the list by no later than the end of next week, in order to inform them of the project and give some warning that DLC members will be coming to take photos. Mr. Kelver agreed to do this and will send the postcard to DLC members as well. Mr. Kelver will send existing electronic photos of historic properties to Chair Wisner.

Mr. Kelver had prepared a sheet with suggested groupings of the historic properties based on geography and Committee members assigned themselves to each grouping. Chair Wisner took the Waverly group, Ms. Cartmill took the Ardenwald and Railroad Avenue groups, Ms. Coleman took the Downtown-2 group, and Mr. Tull took the Lake Road and Island Station groups. In his absence, Vice-Chair Welch was assigned the Downtown-1 group. Mr. Kelver distributed copies of the Cultural Resource information available for each property and agreed to provide missing information for two of the properties (property numbers 45 and 38 on the list).

3. Evaluating the "unrankable" resources

Director Mangle described a small project to have the six "unrankable" properties evaluated by a historic preservation expert. Since the City is finishing the designation process for one of the unranked properties (11022 SE 37th Ave., #44 on the list), she has decided to have the expert evaluate all of the unrankable properties. She made it clear that there is no plan to finish the designation process for any of the other properties, just that the information would be available for the future if any of the other owners should decide to act on it.

4. Other Business

Director Mangle reported that the Immovable Foundation Church project (on the ESD site) still has no definitive timeline, though the DLC will be reviewing design elements for it once the project moves forward. She also noted that the Planning Commission is interested in expanding the downtown design guidelines beyond the downtown area (especially as relates to signs), though there is no set timeline for this project.

Director Mangle reminded the group of an earlier discussion about the DLC meeting with the Planning Commission one to two times per year. Ms. Cartmill noted interest in sitting in on the Commission's next workplan session.

Chair Wisner wondered about how art could be more integrated into some of the new developments happening in Milwaukie, especially the waterfront/riverfront project. Citing her frustration with the Broken Arrow and Wunderland design review cases of 2006, Ms. Cartmill expressed concern that the City's sign guidelines need to be more site-specific and not so generalized. Chair Wisner suggested that more visual examples of preferred signage might help. Director Mangle explained that this will be a big project needing significant research and photos.

There was a general question about the status of the Southgate Cinema site and a timeline for getting buses out of the downtown area. Director Mangle reported that the City's decision to approve the TriMet Park & Ride facility was upheld by the Land Use Board of Appeals. However, TriMet does not have funding in its budget to do the project until the next fiscal year. Community Development Director Kenny Asher is continuing to work on the larger project of siting a transit center.

5. Adjourn

There were no further items. Chair Wisner adjourned the meeting at approximately 8:00 p.m.

Patty Wisner, Chair

Brett Kelver, Scribe