Design and Landmarks Committee
Meeting Minutes
Wednesday, May 27, 2009

Members Present
Becky Ives, Chair
Siri Bernard, Vice Chair
Greg Hemer
Sarah Knaup
Patty Wisner

Staff Present
Katie Mangle, Planning Director
Bill Monahan, City Attorney
Brett Kelver, Associate Planner (DLC Liaison)

Others Present
Ken Ackerman, Harper Houf Peterson Righellis Inc. (HHPR)
Keith Jones, HHPR
Michelle Healey, North Clackamas Parks and Recreation District (NCPRD)

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Becky Ives called the Design and Landmarks Committee (DLC) meeting to order at 6:15 p.m.

The Committee welcomed Patty Wisner back to the DLC for a 3-year appointment.

2. MEETING MINUTES

a. April 22, 2009

DLC Member Patty Wisner noted the following corrections:

- The footnote on the first page should be corrected to state, "…reappointment to the DLC beyond the two-~~year~~term limit."
- Line 107 should reference the Waldorf School only once and the words "Junior High School" should be struck from the minutes.
- Beginning at Line 160, each reference to "Grimes" should be changed to "Graham's."

She clarified that she had been agreeable to limiting the length of her next term on the Committee in Line 343, because she believed that might be a condition of her return. She was not indicating that she would not take a 3-year term. At the April 22, 2009, meeting, she had stated that she did not want another 3-year term; therefore, the minutes should remain unchanged.

Ms. Wisner moved to accept the April 22, 2009, minutes with the noted revisions. DLC Member Sarah Knaup seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

3. INFORMATION ITEMS

a. Volunteer Recognition Brunch (Saturday, May 30, 2009)

Brett Kelver, Associate Planner, encouraged the DLC members to attend and confirmed that children and spouses were also welcome.

4. WORKSESSION ITEM

a. Design Review for Trolley Trial (DR-08-02)

Brett Kelver, Associate Planner, explained that the DLC would first hold a worksession for the Trolley Trail and then conduct the actual review of the application where the DLC would vote on a recommendation to send to the Planning Commission. He reviewed the parameters of the worksession.

Keith Jones, HHPR; **Michelle Healey, NCPRD**; and **Ken Ackerman, HHPR**, introduced themselves as the Applicants.

The following items regarding the application were discussed and clarified, or noted for a response from the Applicant.

The Trolley Trail Project would connect to the existing paved pathways at Riverfront Park. Improvements made to McLoughlin Blvd included new sidewalks but, closer to the crossing where Kellogg Creek went under the road, an asphalt path existed that extended a little ways south and then just stopped. The proposal would start this portion of the Trolley Trail where that asphalt path ended and carry it farther south.

The specific area that fell within the DLC's Downtown Design Review was the portion from where Kellogg Creek crossed under the highway down to the railroad trestle. Beyond that was the Limited Commercial Zone and the residential R-5 and R-3 Zones. The downtown area ended at Eagle St where 22nd Ave intersected McLoughlin Blvd.

- The Downtown Open Space (DOS) Zone, indicated by the open space on the Zoning Map, went well beyond the train trestle and almost to the other side of Kellogg Lake. For the Trolley Trail application, two types of properties existed that were off limits or in their own category. One was public right-of-way, like McLoughlin Blvd, which was not a private tax lot. Projects done in the public right-of-way or in the railroad right-of-way would not have to go through the same permitting process as for private property. The DOS section that the Trolley Trail would pass through was in the railroad trestle area and considered public right-of-way, different from the private property owned by the NCPRD and Metro. Therefore the DOS section was not subject to land use review for this project.

  Riverfront Park was in a DOS area but was a private tax lot, albeit one owned by a public agency. Riverfront Park was subject to the land use policies and the Design Review.

No large groups of plantings were shown. There were some existing cherry trees on McLoughlin Blvd, but Attachment 11 did not indicate the trees existed. There was also a row of maple trees in between the path and the sewage treatment plant, and some evergreens along the fence of the treatment plant. On Attachment 9, some trees were removed and some were not. The trees being removed were the maple trees and one cherry tree. Attachment 11 included specific planting plans, and Attachment 9 included the color layouts.

- **Chair Becky Ives** suggested that all the cherry trees be removed because they were all old, diseased, and badly pruned. She asked if the DLC could require that all the cherry trees be removed.

The DLC should be clear about where they wanted to impact the trees, whether on tax lots or in the public right-of-way, because each would be addressed differently.

The Committee believed the new table format for the analysis of the Downtown Design Guidelines, beginning on page 3 of 7 of the staff report, was very easy to read and a good way to present the information. The table noted the responses from both the Applicant and staff about certain guidelines.

On the Design Review Checklist completed by the Applicant, Milwaukie's Horticultural Heritage was checked as "not applicable." Page 3, Table 2.b, indicated that staff disagreed and then elaborated on staff's conclusion that the application would meet the Design Guidelines as conditioned.

The format of the staff report and its relationship to the Planning Commission's approval were briefly reviewed for clarification. It was noted that the findings were subject to change and could be modified throughout the whole process. The language simply provided a starting point in considering how the staff report could be phrased.

Clarification was requested from the Applicant regarding the material to be used for the path in one particular section noted on Attachment 9, sheet 4.

The number of proposed plants and their spacing, as shown on Attachment 11, was a concern. The existing planting standards for city/state public works departments were an industrywide problem. Plant spacing was often too close together, which resulted in planting 60-70% more plants than necessary and costing taxpayers extra, not only to buy the additional plants but also the labor to plant and maintain the extra plants. The planting on the McLoughlin Blvd project was cited as an example of what could go wrong.

- Plants should have warranties in case they die, but one should not plant twice as many plants as needed just because some might die. Planting too many plants would almost guarantee some would die.

  The concerns were legitimate and raised a relevant issue for the overall project. For the Design Review, staff suggested identifying a specific Design Guideline that related to the planting concerns. Otherwise, the DLC, perhaps with the Applicant's help, could identify where else in the larger land use review a legitimate comment could be included, even if it did not fit in with the Design Review. Because the Trolley Trail was a public project in Milwaukie, the DLC could write a letter to the project, outside of the Design Review process, recommending that the planting issue was important to the project's success.

  The DLC could discuss whether the quality of the trail might be affected by the proposed plantings and, if so, how that might be related to a current Guideline. If it could be related to a Guideline, then the DLC could add it to the findings as an item to be addressed.

Plant selection is subjective, but should be based on the overall size of the mature plant. For example, the Trolley Trail called for one plant that would grow to be 6 to 12 ft in diameter to be planted every 3 ft. Guidelines/standards needed to be established on a governmental level in general for plant selection and spacing of those plants at an appropriate distance to prevent overplanting. Perhaps more comprehensive guidelines could be included in the Development and Design Standards for Landscaping (A.1.l). At this time, the Committee had to work within the current guidelines for Design Review.

The planting and landscaping plans did not show what was actually being planted.

- The Applicant clarified that the swales were planted based on City of Portland standards, which the City of Milwaukie uses. A planting plan was included for the entire length of the

Trolley Trial, sheets GN1 through GN6, although only a small portion was in Milwaukie. Most of those plants would not be seen in downtown Milwaukie.

The planting plan was not specific enough for the downtown area being reviewed by the DLC. Most trees were not marked as new or protected and did not indicate what type of tree would be planted. For example, Attachment 11, sheet GN7, had stamps of trees all along the trail but the only reference was to the lawn.

- The Applicant clarified that those were all existing trees and that no new trees were being planted in that section.

  Many trees along the edge would be removed to make room for the trail, which was not clear from the plans.

- **Chair Ives** noted that it did not seem that many new plants were being placed in the downtown area. Notes 7, 8, and 10 on sheet GN8 showed vine maples, currant, snowberry, and dogwoods, which looked like the only plantings.

  She was concerned about how the DLC would address overplanting, such as the 6- to 12-ft diameter Abelia grandiflora being planted only 3 ft apart, should such a situation fall within the DLC's jurisdiction in the future. The Applicant could not be faulted because these standards were set in other government documents, but the City needed a way to prevent wasting money by spacing plants too close together.

The DLC could recommend that the Planning Commission change the adopted practice of using the Portland Landscaping Code. The City of Milwaukie tree list referred to the City of Portland tree list. The dogwood is the City's symbol, yet so few existed, especially of the white-flowering variety. Incorporating dogwoods into the project would relate to the guideline about horticultural heritage.

- **Katie Mangle, Planning Director,** clarified that the City's tree design for downtown was done by the same people who wrote the Design Guidelines and that no dogwoods were included. The City of Milwaukie had adopted the City of Portland's stormwater management manual, which talked about swales and how to plant them. The Public Works Standards were another place where standards could be added to address City projects in the right-of-way. She was uncertain whether the Public Works Standards included anything about landscaping.

  For the Trolley Trail project, the DLC could focus on the downtown areas and ask the Applicant to explain the planting for those areas. The Committee could also state that when the design was finalized, the Applicant would need to meet a certain type of standard.

The Applicant was asked to address note 26 in Attachment 9, sheet 3, which stated that the sidewalk on McLoughlin Blvd at Jefferson St would be destroyed where improvements had just been made. The existing sidewalk was in front of the sewage treatment plant and fed into the Riverfront Park sidewalk.

A bike lane was also present on McLoughlin Blvd that DLC Member Greg Hemer felt was extremely dangerous. Staff was working with the Applicant to ensure that what was built met City standards. The standards included adjusting the curb to make the bike lane wider and would ensure that any path that would be built was wide enough. The Applicant was also asked to address this issue.

- The DLC could consider the pedestrian element of the Design Guidelines to address this concern, which would keep it within Design Review parameters.

Mr. Kelver clarified which elements of the Design Review Checklist would be addressed by the DLC and Planning Commission. The DLC could review each Design Guideline or address particular items of concern. Table 2 (page 3 of 7) would be part of the finding that went to the Planning Commission and was where the Committee could make changes or craft language to address their concerns. For example, the Pedestrian Emphasis Guidelines language could be tweaked if questions still existed. That language would then be considered by the Planning Commission. Most Design Guidelines had been met. The DLC was free to discuss other items, but staff recommended that the Committee focus their attention on any Guidelines that staff did not believe had been met.

In completing the Design Review Checklist, Mr. Kelver had originally marked “no” for B.1.c Horticultural Heritage. However, when making the finding, he established a condition of approval (Attachment 2) that would make the project approvable. Therefore, Table 2, “Milwaukie Character c.” stated that, as conditioned, the proposal would meet the guideline.

If something did not quite meet the Design Guidelines, it was staff's and the DLC’s collective responsibility to find out how it could be made to meet the Guidelines and to propose conditions so that the application might obtain approval.

The DLC took a brief recess.

5. APPLICATION REVIEW ITEM

a. Design Review for Trolley Trial (DR-08-02)

Applicant: North Clackamas Parks and Recreation District (NCPRD)
Owner: NCPRD
Address: NA
File: DR-08-02

Bill Monahan, City Attorney, reviewed the Design Review process, stating that this was not a formal public hearing but a meeting that was part of the overall review of the quasi-judicial land use application. He described the meeting procedure, noting that ideally the Committee would work to come to a consensus instead of a specific vote.

He laid the groundwork for future expectations in a quasi-judicial setting by stating that it was necessary to address ex parte contact, bias, and conflict of interest. The hope was that the DLC’s recommendation would be so solid and convincing that the Planning Commission would use the recommendation to guide its decision. Therefore, the DLC needed to be careful because the issues of ex parte contact and conflict of interest could return to the DLC as well.

All Committee members except Ms. Wisner declared that they had visited the site. However, no Committee member declared a conflict of interest, bias, or conclusion from a site visit. No Committee member declared an ex parte contact related to the application.

Chair Ives called the review session to order at approximately 7:12 p.m.

Mr. Kelver presented the staff report via PowerPoint.

Ms. Healey expressed appreciation to staff and the DLC for the time taken to review the Trolley Trail application. She explained that the Trolley Trail Master Plan started about eight years ago and was adopted in 2004, having been approved through Metro and Clackamas County. An extensive public process was involved. NCPRD had worked to obtain federal grants and now had $4.5 million to build the trail, which included all the design work and

permitting. Being federally funded, the project was subject to substantially more requirements by various agencies than normally expected for a land use application. The project's design documents were about 60% complete. NCPRD was seeking to complete the Trolley Trail in the spring of 2010.

She stated that none of the cherry trees along McLoughlin Blvd would be removed. The trees were in the Oregon Department of Transportation's (ODOT's) right-of-way, not on the Applicant's property. She recalled there being some urban legend about the cherry trees and why they could not be cut down. However, NCPRD was happy to work with the DLC to figure out a condition to address the horticultural heritage question.

Chair Ives stated cherry trees should not be planted because cherry trees already existed in Milwaukie and were not looking well. Milwaukie is called the "City of Dogwoods" and she wanted the replacement trees changed to a dogwood variety. As a horticulturalist, she would suggest not planting cherry trees.

Mr. Ackerman confirmed that no additional tree planting had been proposed, but the Applicant did not have any problem with the 1:1 replacement condition. He did not foresee replacing the trees with dogwoods being an issue either, though they had not talked to the project's landscaper.

Chair Ives asked how wide the ODOT right-of-way was on McLoughlin and whether replacement trees could be between McLoughlin and the path, which would help make that trail section a little more pedestrian-scale than to have the trees on the other side of the path.

Mr. Ackerman explained that the trail started at the asphalt path, noted in Attachment 9, sheet 3, note 13, because they were trying to avoid Kellogg Creek. Many other projects were associated with Kellogg Creek, such as the dam removal, a park entrance, etc., and the Applicant did not want to create something that would have to be removed later. The Applicant could tie into the existing asphalt path, providing a connection to what was already in place, which was how it was decided where to start the path heading south. They had originally planned to use asphalt through the downtown area, but the Downtown Plan required the trail to be 12-ft-wide concrete with a scoring pattern.

The offset from McLoughlin was determined by the requirements of the McLoughlin Corridor Plan, which was why the maple trees had to be removed. The original trail route went between the cherry and maple trees and hadn't impacted any trees.

He clarified that the blue dashed line represented the ODOT right-of-way boundary and confirmed that the ODOT right-of-way was east, and NCPRD trail property was west, of that line.

Room would be available for McLoughlin Blvd to expand. The median south of the Jefferson St intersection would be removed. It was set up so that, in theory, the roadway under the bridge could be widened in the future to allow for a center turn lane and bike lanes. The trail was set up to meet the standards of the City's Transportation System Plan (TSP), so the path would have to be straight in that section.

Ms. Healey added that bicycle safety standards and federal requirements had to be met throughout the Trolley Trail, which meant that a meandering path was not possible.

Chair Ives commented that the NCPRD web site had even more photographs and interesting things to see about the Trolley Trail Project.

Mr. Ackerman explained that there was a 4½-ft sidewalk that had existed for a long time that NCPRD would be removing, where the Trolley Trail started down to the railroad trestle. That

old section of sidewalk was being removed because it was not in good condition and it was a nonimpervious surface, which did not meet environmental requirements. The sidewalk was not really used and did not provide a connection since it ended at the railroad trestle. It could easily be removed, while providing an environmental benefit, and ODOT was agreeable to it being removed.

Ms. Healey clarified that NCPRD was not planning to remove any of the new improvements further down.

Vice Chair Siri Bernard confirmed that, working westward from McLoughlin Blvd, the sidewalk was being removed, all the cherry trees would be staying, and then there was some grass and then the path. She questioned what would replace the sidewalk that was being removed.

Mr. Ackerman replied that the curb would stay but the 4½-ft sidewalk would be replaced with grass. Referring to sheet 4, he said the concrete sidewalk would go as far north as possible towards the overpass. It would then be converted to asphalt because the trail curved around under the railroad bridge and was really at the edge of the Downtown Zone.

The rest of the trail south would be 12 ft wide and all asphalt. The concrete portion of the trail would not have a shoulder because that would not comply with the Downtown Plan. Asphalt portions of the trail would have a 2-ft gravel shoulder to meet national safety standards.

The scoring pattern used in the Downtown Zone would meet that used in Riverfront Park just north of the trail's starting point.

Ms. Healey commented that it would be nice to have a buffer of trees, but it was possible that any trees planted would be removed due to the McLoughlin Corridor Plan.

Vice Chair Bernard questioned if the McLoughlin Corridor Plan was already completed.

Mr. Ackerman replied that it had only been completed at the north end. Sheet 4 showed that the centerline actually tapered down. The other issue with planting trees would be the power lines which actually ran right along the ODOT right-of-way line. It was unclear if the dogwoods would get tall enough to interfere with the power lines.

Chair Ives replied that some varieties of dogwoods would remain below the power lines.

Mr. Ackerman explained that the power lines ran the full length of the project, so tree heights were an issue all along the trail. If NCPRD did not plant the correct type of trees, PGE would come through and top them off, which would not look good and would cause problems with the trees later.

Ms. Healey agreed with the plant density being too thick and wanted to know about other plant options. The number of plants could be reduced. Some were just buffer planting for areas where other material was being taken out. She appreciated the information provided by the DLC, which she would take back to review further.

Mr. Ackerman explained that part of the problem was that certain landscaping standards had already been adopted and others depended on who the bid was going through. The Trolley Trail had to be bid through ODOT, which did not allow more than a 1-year warranty for plantings. Therefore, contractors might provide inferior plants since they only had to take care of the plants for one year compared to a 5-year warranty plan.

Mr. Jones commented that he was a planner working on the private side, so he had worked with a lot of zoning ordinances and landscape architects. Many codes were written to get

instant growth or to screen something right away. Zone ordinances should be written to allow for plants to grow where they need to grow.

He added that the condition was a bit vague at this point. It seemed staff was trying to get the DLC's input on what type of trees should be planted and the Applicant wanted to go to Planning Commission with more specific recommendations such as planting dogwoods where the DLC would like to see them planted, how big they should be, what color they should be, etc.

Chair Ives recommended that 2-in caliper trees be planted because that was standard. The Applicant would not need to spend money on anything bigger. "Eddie's White Wonder" was Milwaukie's historic dogwood tree. The acceptable varieties of *Cornus* were *kousa* or *rutgers* because they were disease-resistant. The varieties within the different species were different colors. She was unsure if "Eddie's White Wonder" was a *kousa* or a *rutgers*. If *nuttallii* or *florida*, the DLC would not want them to be planted.

Ms. Mangle suggested identifying the qualities the DLC wanted in a dogwood, such as being disease-resistant, having a white flower, not maturing past a certain height, etc.

DLC Member Patty Wisner explained that, historically, Milwaukie had big white blooms on the historic tree that was the largest dogwood in the world but no longer existed. Varieties existed that have smaller, more clustered flowers and provide more flower coverage in the tree when it blooms.

Chair Ives confirmed that 2-in caliper dogwoods could be easily found. Dogwoods didn't grow much slower than maples but topped out shorter. She would make sure that 2-in caliper dogwoods were available and, if not, she would e-mail the Applicant.

Mr. Ackerman suggested limiting the condition to state, "No trees smaller than 1½ in would be allowed."

Ms. Healey wanted to ensure that enough of the preferred tree variety was available because 15 trees would need to be planted.

Chair Ives commented, in reference to the power lines, that one variety of dogwood called "Milky Way" would top out at 20 ft. Another variety called "Constellation," which was one of the *rutgers*, would grow straight up and not get very wide. She asked if a cylinder-type tree was preferred or if a wider tree might be better for the path as it would have more of an umbrella that people could walk under.

Mr. Ackerman suggested putting the "Constellation" variety back toward the treatment plant and the shorter "Milky Way" variety closer to the path.

Ms. Healey noted that the photinia and fir trees along the sewage treatment plant would not be removed.

Mr. Ackerman indicated on a photo an obviously open area where a gate for the treatment plant was located, so no trees or landscaping could be planted there.

Vice Chair Bernard questioned if one or two of Milwaukie's medallions could be placed on the path so people would know they were in Milwaukie, similar to the tiled seal that was recently installed outside City Hall.

- **Ms. Healey** clarified that federal funds would not pay for art, but NCPRD might be able to find a way to budget for the medallions.

- **Vice Chair Bernard** suggested that the citizens of Milwaukie could raise money for the medallions.
- **Chair Ives** proposed placing the emblem in the Riverfront Park section of the Trolley Trail.
- **Ms. Mangle** noted that the emblems had proven to be slippery.
- **Ms. Wisner** suggested laser cutting the emblem into a boulder, which would be more affordable.

There were no further questions for the Applicant.

Mr. Monahan advised the DLC about quasi-judicial procedure regarding public testimony and further questions for the Applicant.

There was no public comment.

Chair Ives questioned whether the condition in Attachment 2 needed to be reworded.

- **Mr. Kelver** believed the first sentence was fine but the second sentence was too general. The tree size, type, and other qualities could be inserted.
- **Ms. Wisner** suggested allowing the applicant's design team some discretion to choose the dogwood variety based on where the trees would be located in relation to power lines.
- **Ms. Mangle** proposed that the second sentence should state, “In keeping with the horticultural heritage of Milwaukie, the replacement trees shall have the following qualities: white-blooming dogwoods, disease-resistant, no smaller than 1½-in caliper at time of planting.”
- **Chair Ives** was uncertain how to add the exclusionary aspects of the DLC’s request. She was concerned about varieties that claimed to be disease-resistant, but were not. She suggested adding that the DLC’s preference would be to see neither *Cornus florida* nor *Cornus nuttallii*.
- **Mr. Monahan** replied it would be okay to include a caveat as long as it would not be too limiting and cause the Applicant to have to spend more money to obtain the approved trees. The DLC would be giving some direction to the Applicant who would have a few weeks to do some research. The Planning Commission would have the minutes from the DLC meeting, would know that a preference for trees was expressed, and could make sure the Applicant was honoring that preference.
- **Chair Ives** suggested changing the wording to state the DLC’s recommendation to avoid *Cornus florida* and *Cornus nuttallii*. She would e-mail staff the appropriate names of the dogwoods.

Mr. Kelver explained that staff was aware that the adopted Downtown Plan showed other trees and questioned if there would now be a problem regarding why other trees were not being planted. He questioned how staff would consider and address the Downtown Plan.

- **Ms. Mangle** replied that the trees were not in a right-of-way, but on private property. The Downtown Plan was included in the DLC reference binders. Page 19 included a street trees diagram which showed sequoias would be planted, but those guidelines were for trees in the public right-of-way.
- **Chair Ives** noted that sequoias were historic trees along with red oaks.

Mr. Kelver asked if the Committee had any further questions or if the DLC was comfortable enough with the adjustment to the recommended condition to move forward with recommending approval with the rest of the findings remaining as they were.

- **Vice Chair Bernard** stated that it was important that Milwaukie have its character and having the same sidewalk type and the dogwoods were things that would let people know that they were in Milwaukie. She believed that the recommendations as amended were acceptable.
- **Mr. Kelver** stated that he would not change the Design Guidelines Table as the process moved forward to the Planning Commission if the DLC was comfortable with how it was set up to show the Applicant's information with staff's response.

Ms. Wisner suggested that Ms. Mangle read the final amended condition and then have the DLC vote on the wording with a final motion to approve the application with the condition.

Ms. Mangle read the final amended condition as follows, "The trees to be removed in the Downtown Office (DO) Zone shall be replaced on a one-to-one basis along the western edge of the new trail. In keeping with the horticultural heritage of Milwaukie, the replacement trees shall have the following qualities: dogwood trees that are white-blooming, disease-resistant, no smaller than 1½-in caliper at time of planting, and excluding *Cornus florida* and *Cornus nuttallii*."

Ms. Wisner asked if the DLC should include information that said the condition met Downtown Design Guidelines because the trees were allowed on private property. The Planning Commission might notice dogwoods were not the trees outlined in the Design Guidelines, which could cause some conflict.

Mr. Kelver replied that such a statement would not be placed in the condition but the DLC could tweak Table 2, Milwaukie Character Guidelines, item c to include this explanation.

Ms. Wisner directed staff to include a sentence in the Findings regarding why the DLC did not recommend the sequoia trees from the Downtown Plan.

DLC Member Sarah Knaup recommended that Chair Ives represent the DLC at the Planning Commission meeting on June 23, 2009, because of her knowledge of horticulture.

DLC Member Greg Hemer asked what trees were planted up above Riverfront Park amid all the new landscaping. He wanted to make sure the row of red oaks was not intended to continue all the way down the right-of-way because now dogwoods would be planted there as well. He questioned if this conflicted with the DLC condition.

Ms. Mangle stated that the red oak and chanticleer pear trees of the McLoughlin Project were in the right-of-way. If the Trolley Trail was developed with the DLC's proposed condition and McLoughlin Blvd was finished as the plan envisioned, moving east from the river there would be the Kellogg Treatment Plant, then the dogwood trees on the tax lot, then the Trolley Trail, then red oaks in the right-of-way, and then McLoughlin Blvd. The red oaks would be in a different place and in addition to the dogwoods, not replaced by them.

Chair Ives added that, when not flowering, the upright columnar dogwoods that might be included in the trail area would look similar to the columnar pears that were there.

Ms. Wisner moved to accept the staff recommendation to approve DR-08-02 with the condition as written by Ms. Mangle. Vice Chair Bernard seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

Ms. Mangle said the DLC would receive the final wording of the condition.

6. OTHER BUSINESS

a. Upcoming Jackson Street bus shelter project review

Katie Mangle, Planning Director, announced that Milwaukie was awarded federal stimulus funding to improve the bus stops on Jackson St between Dark Horse Comics and City Hall. She reviewed specifics about the project as follows:

- The project was the result of many years of complaints from community members about the transit center. In the TSP update process a few years ago, the Transit Working Group decided that building a transit center would be a high priority due to the impact it would have on parking and the quality of life for businesses downtown.

  Over the last few years, City Council had been working not to get rid of transit service, but to separate the different parts of the transit center, to move the bus stops away from the bus layover where the buses just sat and made the greatest impact.

- The plan was to have only two high-quality bus stops: the existing bus stop at the corner of City Hall and another on the corner of the Key Bank parking lot. The bus stops on 21st Ave and the one on the backside of City Hall would be removed. The new bus stops would have 25-ft-long shelters, trees, street lights, benches, and public information. The bus stops would serve customers better, be well lit and safer, and would meet the City standards for sidewalk improvements.

  With the new system, there would be only one bus layover by the intersection of Harrison and 21st Ave. There would be no bus activity along the frontage of the Waldorf School, which had been a concern.

- The federal stimulus package provided several million dollars for the City to use for the bus stop and to rebuild the entire street. Additionally, TriMet received approval to spend about $400,000—originally designated for the Southgate Park and Ride—on this project.

- 21st Ave would not be closed to traffic, but it was a low-traffic area most of the time and the sidewalks would be widened. Buses would still need to travel on 21st Ave to get to Jackson St but buses would no longer stop on 21st Ave. Each bus stop would have enough room for two buses to pull up to load, but buses would not be able to layover at the bus stops.

  Brand new sidewalks and curb extensions would be installed, matching the one done as part of North Main Village. Public parking would be regained. Four parallel parking spaces currently existed in front of City Hall but would be replaced by angled spaces.

- The bus shelters would come to the DLC for Design Review because they were being developed in the right-of-way. The shelters would be large and would make a significant statement downtown; therefore, Mr. Asher and Ms. Mangle felt it important for the DLC to conduct a Design Review of the shelters—not to advise the Planning Commission but staff.

  Staff would present the project to the DLC in June and discussion could be concluded in July if the DLC needed more time. A decision was needed by the end of July to meet the stimulus funding timeline. Three or four feasible shelters would be presented that met both the budget and the functional requirements for the project. These would be high-quality $250,000 shelters.

- An open house was held on the project last spring. Public feedback had been positive and was used to narrow the bus shelter choices.

- Removing the bus layover area would help mitigate vandalism, as would installing better lighting and incorporating artistic features or etching. When community members take pride in such project areas, vandalism also decreases.

  DLC Member Patty Wisner questioned if the Arts Committee would get involved or if the DLC would need to work with the Regional Arts and Culture Council (RACC) to do a public art project to help cut down on vandalism, such as adding etched artwork to plain glass surfaces.

  Ms. Mangle said some shelters did not have any glass or had only minimal materials available to be vandalized. Other shelters already have preetched glass.

  TriMet has considered maintenance, which was an important concern for them. Someone from TriMet would be at the DLC meeting in June and would be able to explain any technical requirements.

- Nothing was included in the Design Guidelines about bus stops, shelters, etc., because it was assumed that the transit center would be on the old Safeway site.

- Bus drivers on layover on 21st Ave would still use the City Hall restrooms. Some layovers had been diverted to other places, such as Oregon City, which had a restroom facility. The Southgate Park and Ride would not be used as a layover spot because the bathrooms had been removed by the time TriMet bought the property.

- **Chair Becky Ives** recalled that TriMet had agreed to widen sidewalks or something to help facilitate the farmers' market.

- **Ms. Mangle** did not recall any current offers. She clarified that no additional right-of-way was required for the Jackson Street Project because the property that would be used for the bus stops was all public right-of-way and the streets were already wide enough.

7. ADJOURN

The meeting adjourned at 8:30 p.m.

R S Ives

Becky Ives, Chair