



# CITY OF MILWAUKIE

## AGENDA

January 7, 2019

### DESIGN AND LANDMARKS COMMITTEE

Milwaukie City Hall  
10722 SE Main St  
[www.milwaukieoregon.gov](http://www.milwaukieoregon.gov)

**1.0 Call to Order — Procedural Matters**

**2.0 Meeting Notes – Motion Needed**

2.1 December 12, 2018

**3.0 Information Items**

**4.0 Audience Participation —** This is an opportunity for the public to comment on any item not on the agenda

**5.0 Public Meetings —** None

**6.0 Worksession Items**

6.1 Summary: Downtown design review process (continued)  
Staff Person: Brett Kelter, Associate Planner

**7.0 Other Business/Updates**

7.1 Officer Elections

**8.0 Design and Landmarks Committee Discussion Items —** This is an opportunity for comment or discussion for items not on the agenda.

**9.0 Forecast for Future Meetings:**

Feb. 4, 2019 Regular meeting

### Milwaukie Design and Landmarks Committee Statement

The Design and Landmarks Committee is established to advise the Planning Commission on historic preservation activities, compliance with applicable design guidelines, and to review and recommend appropriate design guidelines and design review processes and procedures to the Planning Commission and City Council.

1. **PROCEDURAL MATTERS.** If you wish to speak at this meeting, please fill out a yellow card and give to planning staff. Please turn off all personal communication devices during meeting. For background information on agenda items, call the Planning Department at 503-786-7600 or email [planning@milwaukieoregon.gov](mailto:planning@milwaukieoregon.gov). Thank You.
2. **DESIGN AND LANDMARKS COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES.** Approved DLC Minutes can be found on the City website at [www.milwaukieoregon.gov](http://www.milwaukieoregon.gov).
3. **CITY COUNCIL MINUTES** City Council Minutes can be found on the City website at [www.milwaukieoregon.gov](http://www.milwaukieoregon.gov).
4. **FORECAST FOR FUTURE MEETING.** These items are tentatively scheduled, but may be rescheduled prior to the meeting date. Please contact staff with any questions you may have.

#### Public Meeting Procedure

Those who wish to testify should come to the front podium, state his or her name and address for the record, and remain at the podium until the Chairperson has asked if there are any questions from the Committee members.

1. **STAFF REPORT.** Each design review meeting starts with a brief review of the staff report by staff. The report lists the criteria for the land use action being considered, as well as a recommendation with reasons for that recommendation.
2. **CORRESPONDENCE.** Staff will report any verbal or written correspondence that has been received since the Committee was presented with its meeting packet.
3. **APPLICANT'S PRESENTATION.**
4. **PUBLIC TESTIMONY IN SUPPORT.** Testimony from those in favor of the application.
5. **NEUTRAL PUBLIC TESTIMONY.** Comments or questions from interested persons who are neither in favor of nor opposed to the application.
6. **PUBLIC TESTIMONY IN OPPOSITION.** Testimony from those in opposition to the application.
7. **QUESTIONS FROM COMMITTEE MEMBERS.** The committee members will have the opportunity to ask for clarification from staff, the applicant, or those who have already testified.
8. **REBUTTAL TESTIMONY FROM APPLICANT.** After all public testimony, the Committee will take rebuttal testimony from the applicant.
9. **CLOSING OF PUBLIC MEETING.** The Chairperson will close the public portion of the meeting. The Committee will then enter into deliberation. From this point in the meeting the Committee will not receive any additional testimony from the audience, but may ask questions of anyone who has testified.
10. **COMMITTEE DISCUSSION AND ACTION.** It is the Committee's intention to make a recommendation this evening on each issue on the agenda. Design and Landmarks Committee recommendations are not appealable.
11. **MEETING CONTINUANCE.** Prior to the close of the first public meeting, *any person* may request an opportunity to present additional information at another time. If there is such a request, the Design and Landmarks Committee will either continue the public meeting to a date certain, or leave the record open for at least seven days for additional written evidence, argument, or testimony.

*The City of Milwaukie will make reasonable accommodation for people with disabilities. Please notify us no less than five (5) business days prior to the meeting.*

#### **Milwaukie Design and Landmarks Committee:**

Lauren Loosveldt, Chair  
Cynthia Schuster, Vice Chair  
Mary Neustadter  
Kyle Simukka  
Brett Laurila

#### **Planning Department Staff:**

Denny Egner, Planning Director  
David Levitan, Senior Planner  
Brett Kelter, Associate Planner  
Vera Kolias, Associate Planner  
Mary Heberling, Assistant Planner  
Alicia Martin, Administrative Specialist II

**CITY OF MILWAUKIE  
DESIGN AND LANDMARKS COMMITTEE  
NOTES**

Milwaukie City Hall  
10722 SE Harrison St  
Wednesday, December 12, 2018  
6:30 PM

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT**

Lauren Loosveldt, Chair  
Cynthia Schuster, Vice Chair  
Mary Neustadter  
Kyle Simukka

**STAFF PRESENT**

Brett Kelter, Associate Planner (staff liaison)  
Denny Egner, Planning Director

**MEMBERS ABSENT**

Brett Laurila

**1.0 Call to Order – Procedural Matters**

**Chair Lauren Loosveldt** called the meeting to order at 6:41 p.m.

**2.0 Design and Landmarks Committee Notes**

2.1 December 3, 2018

**Chair Loosveldt** called for any revisions to the notes. No changes were suggested and the notes were approved unanimously.

**3.0 Information Items**

**Associate Planner Brett Kelter** explained the Code of Conduct form that had been distributed to the group prior to the meeting for the members to sign, noting that it was part of a first-time effort for all of the City's boards, commissions, and committees. He also provided a reminder about the Housing Forum debriefing session scheduled with City Council on Tuesday, December 18, with **Planning Director Denny Egner** giving more information about what to expect at that meeting.

**4.0 Audience Participation – None**

**5.0 Public Meetings – None**

**6.0 Worksession Items**

6.1 Downtown Design Review process (continued)  
Staff Person: Brett Kelter, Associate Planner

The group resumed its review of the draft Design Review document and made suggestions about the following elements:

**N. Private Open Spaces**

- After additional discussion, the group agreed to strike the credit for open space (50% reduction) proposed in Standard A-b. **Chair Loosveldt** and **Vice Chair Cynthia Schuster** suggested that the design standards require too little in the way of open space to offer the proposed credit.

## **O. Pedestrian-Oriented Open Spaces**

- Regarding the staff suggestion to consider allowing the meeting of this element's standards to contribute toward meeting the standards of the "Private Open Space" element (Element N), the group was not sure it agreed and wondered if the requirements for public and private open space should remain separate.
- It was noted that the Milwaukie Municipal Code (MMC) has standards related to this element in MMC Subsection 19.304.5.H (Open Space) and MMC Subsection 19.508.4.G (Open Space/Plazas).
- For Standard B, there was a suggestion to replace the current language with something to the effect of, "Where adjacent to building walls, each adjacent wall must have some transparency." [This will need more specificity to make it workable as a clear and objective standard.]
- In Standard C, clarify that the standard applies where "adjacent to the public sidewalk."
- Regarding Standard G, consider setting a height limit to maintain visual accessibility.
- Regarding Standard H, consider establishing a standard that lists allowed and/or prohibited materials, perhaps using a short matrix. In Standard H-a, strike the word "pavement" in the phrase "gravel ~~pavement~~." Standard H-c (prohibiting adjacent unscreened blank walls) may not be necessary, given some of the other standards and suggested changes.
- Consider combining Guidance B and D to accommodate some grade separations, while still generally discouraging significant changes of grade in pedestrian-oriented open spaces.
- In Guidance E, consider revising to read, "Outdoor spaces should be human-scaled, accessible, durable, and attractive, ~~easy to maintain, and "alive" — whether they are intimate and quiet spaces or more active and boisterous.~~"
- Revise Guidance F to read, "Trees, shrubs, and plants should ~~help define walkways, create appropriate transitions from the park to the street and provide visual interest~~ be provided in order to create visual interest." A corresponding standard should be created, perhaps noting the types of plantings required and/or establishing a minimum planting percentage.
- Revise Guidance G to delete the first sentence and modify the second sentence to read, "Public open spaces ~~They~~ ~~should also~~ be secure and feel safe during both day and evening hours." Modify this language to clarify that lighting should be provided to create secure and safe areas during evening (or active) hours, keeping in mind the Dark Skies provisions.
- In Guidance H, revise the introductory sentence to replace "pedestrian-oriented spaces" with "public open spaces."

## **P. Landscaping**

- Strike the requirement for a specific number of trees based on a certain square footage of open space. Consider establishing more specific requirements for landscaping when developers elect to provide it.
- Consider moving pieces of this element into the Private and Public Open Spaces elements instead of retaining a separate element for Landscaping.

- In Standard A-c, provide some clarification about “planted” groundcover (instead of “living” ground cover”).
- Regarding Standard A-d, consider making a distinction between bark dust and wood chips, as they have different environmental/ecological impacts.
- Revise Guidance A as follows: “Landscaping should be used to provide a canopy for open spaces and courtyards, ~~and to buffer the development from adjacent properties and to provide visual interest and texture.~~”
- There is some question as to whether Guidance B (regarding preservation of existing healthy trees) is very practical or applicable in the downtown context. Suggestion to delete the second sentence about handling tree preservation conflicts through the Design Review process.
- Revise Guidance D as follows: “Hardscapes shall be shaded with trees where possible, as a means of reducing ~~energy costs (heat island effect) and improving stormwater management.~~”

#### **Q. Outdoor and Exterior Building Lighting**

- In the Purpose/Intent, replace the final phrase, “negative light spillover effects” with “light pollution (both spill and glare).”
- Standard B is not necessary if the Building Code covers these clearance standards.
- The final phrase in Standard D (“to minimize excessive light spillover onto adjacent properties”) is too discretionary to be a standard. Change “minimize” to “eliminate”?
- Collapse Standards E, F, and G into K, making Standard K more robust. Clarify the sentiment of Standard E that the standards apply where lighting is installed, since lighting is not required everywhere. Where the language or spirit of Standard G is retained, clarify that lighting may be “ground- or building-mounted” and not “on site or building mounted.” For secondary building entrances, set a minimum illumination level of at least 1.0 foot-candles. Check with the Police Department [or CPTED recommendations (Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design)] for suggestions for this revised standard.
- The language of Standard L appears redundant of Standard D—incorporate the L language into D.
- The standard for façade lighting (Standard M) needs to be revisited to remove discretionary phrasing (e.g., “noteworthy architectural features”) and to emphasize accent lighting. The group noted 3 types of building lighting that need to be addressed: 1) sidewalk or street level, 2) architectural or accent, and 3) signage.
- Standard N seems potentially discretionary, in terms of how it would be verified.
- In Guidance A, remove the phrase, “especially any with residential uses” from the first sentence.
- Is Guidance B necessary, given that the code had specific standards for off-street parking lots?
- Guidance C, D, E, H, J, K, and N all seem like they could be deleted (either unnecessary or undesired).

With that, the group had completed its initial review of the draft. **Mr. Kelter** and **Mr. Egner** confirmed that staff would develop a revised draft to incorporate the suggestions and

outstanding questions and then determine how best to use the remaining consultant budget to help advance the project.

**7.0 Other Business/Updates – None**

**8.0 Design and Landmarks Committee Discussion Items -- None**

**9.0 Forecast for Future Meetings**

Dec. 18, 2018	Comprehensive Plan update (debrief from Housing Forum)
Jan. 7, 2019	Regular meeting
Feb. 4, 2019	Regular meeting

**Chair Loosveldt** adjourned the meeting at 9:09 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Brett Kelter, Associate Planner

---

Lauren Loosveldt, Chair