



# CITY OF MILWAUKIE

## AGENDA

March 4, 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 February 4, 2019

**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: Preliminary review of Coho Point design  
Staff Person: Leila Aman, Development Project Manager

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

**7.0 Other Business/Updates**

**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:**

April 1, 2019 Regular meeting

April 30, 2019 2019 Volunteer Appreciation Dinner (Milwaukie Center)

May 6, 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  
Monday, February 4, 2019  
6:30 PM

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT**

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

**STAFF PRESENT**

Brett Kelter, Associate Planner (staff liaison)

**OTHERS PRESENT**

(None)

**MEMBERS ABSENT**

(None)

**1.0 Call to Order – Procedural Matters**

**Chair Lauren Loosveldt** called the meeting to order at 6:31 p.m.

**2.0 Design and Landmarks Committee Notes**

2.1 January 7, 2019

**Chair Loosveldt** called for any revisions to the notes; there were none, and the notes were approved unanimously.

**3.0 Information Items**

**Associate Planner Brett Kelter** informed the group of the City's annual volunteer appreciation dinner scheduled for April 30 at the Milwaukie Center. He was unclear about the start time but expected that a formal invitation would be going out soon.

**Committee Member Mary Neustadter** noted that she would miss the March 4 meeting.

**Mr. Kelter** announced that the design team for the Coho Point project (a City-facilitated redevelopment of the site at Washington St and McLoughlin Blvd) would like to get the committee's feedback on the preliminary design at the regular meeting on April 1. Based on the group's experience with the Axletree project, **Chair Loosveldt** suggested making a clear disclaimer about that not being a formal review. She wondered whether the members should make any comments at all, or rather simply take in the information and ask clarifying questions. The group agreed that it should be ok to provide some comments as long as it was made clear that it was simply a preliminary review and not the more detailed, formal review that would come later as part of an official Downtown Design Review application. *[Note: The Coho Point item was subsequently moved up to the March 4 agenda, to align better with a public open house on the topic later that same week.]*

**4.0 Audience Participation – None**

**5.0 Public Meetings – None**

## 6.0 Worksession Items

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

Returning to the list of outstanding questions and discussion items on the Design Review draft, **Mr. Kever** handed out copies of a list of comments and notes from Planning Commissioner Joseph Edge for the group's reference. The group agreed to table discussion of Elements C through F (Exterior Building Materials, Façade Transparency, Doors & Entrance Locations, and Windows) until the March meeting, when Vice Chair Cynthia Schuster would bring images and make a visual presentation. Element H (Building Massing) should have its own focus on another date. The discussion returned to Element A (Site Frontage) and a look back at the figures showing locations for frontage occupancy requirements and build-to lines.

#### A. Site Frontage

- The group clarified that there should be no red line on Eagle St along the south side of the sewage treatment plant. There was a suggestion to figure out how to apply these design requirements to the treatment plant's frontage alongside the Trolley Trail, both for the build-to requirement and a 90% frontage occupancy. The group clarified that the frontage occupancy along McLoughlin Blvd should be 90%, with a 75% frontage occupancy requirement on the east-west streets downtown.
- **Vice Chair Schuster** asked whether there was a maximum block length downtown—would there ever be any new streets added downtown? There was a suggestion to set a 75% frontage occupancy requirement on Main St north of Scott St, and a 90% requirement on 21<sup>st</sup> Ave (instead of 75%). **Vice Chair Schuster** made a defense of the 75% requirement on 21<sup>st</sup> Ave since that street is more of a “back of house” location downtown. She also suggested an extension of the 75% requirement on 21<sup>st</sup> Ave north to include the City Hall block, with a 90% frontage occupancy requirement on Main St in front of City Hall.
- **Ms. Neustadter** noted that the Milwaukie Cleaners and Nautilus buildings (on Main St north of Scott St) could both be eligible for listing in the national historic register. The group was reminded that the current code still provided a process for demolition of historic properties, so it was important to think about potential redevelopment on most sites downtown. The members agreed that the frontage occupancy on Jackson St west of Main St should be 75%, that Jefferson St on both sides of Main St should be 75%, and that Scott St west of Main St should be left at 50%. **Vice Chair Schuster** suggested that the various diagrams should be marked up and shown to staff to see what they think; **Mr. Kever** agreed to try to do this in time for the next meeting.

#### G. Corners

- Is Standard B-d specific enough? **Vice Chair Schuster** noted that the width of the sidewalk was a factor. **Chair Loosveldt** suggested zooming in on the corner of the graphic to provide more detail and expressed the opinion that special paving or scoring was not necessary. After some discussion, the group agreed that Standard B-d should be deleted. With Standard B-a already being deleted from the earlier review, that leaves just two standards as choices, so it may make sense to require an applicant to do only one of the two. **Vice Chair Schuster** suggested adding a third option of a providing a canopy and/or signage visible from two sides.
- Standard B-c should be adjusted to reflect the options of 45-degree angle, rounded/radius, stepped/notched, or faceted/scalloped. **Vice Chair Schuster** suggested

that the graphic could perhaps be enhanced to show these options for what could be done at a corner.

#### H. Building Massing

- For Standards C-c and C-d, **Mr. Kelter** noted that he would need to take a closer look, including at the issue of solar access and how it affects residential zones. **Vice Chair Schuster** agreed to look for more information about solar access as well. Someone remembered that Commissioner Edge had suggested that some kind of trade-off might be necessary to increase density.
- The question remains as to whether “Height” should be added to the title of this element.

#### I. Weather Protection

- For Guidance D, the group suggested that “high quality” might be understood to mean durable or low-maintenance. For example, canvas and treated wood could both be considered high quality materials.
- Regarding the specificity of Standard C, **Vice Chair Schuster** thought it needed more detail, including separate details for awnings versus canopies. Through some discussion, the group worked out the following 2 distinct sets of standards:
  - a) Awnings
    - can be canvas or sheet metal
    - shall not be backlit or vinyl
    - tenant signage is permitted only on the front face of the awning and is restricted on all sloped or horizontal elements
  - b) Canopies
    - can be metal, glass, or polycarbonate material
    - tenant signage is permitted only on top of or hung from the canopy
    - a guidance point would be that canopy lighting is allowed, if it highlights the building or illuminates the sidewalk

A note was made to follow up on whether a reference to the sign code is necessary.

The discussion wrapped up at this point, to be continued at the next meeting.

#### 7.0 Other Business/Updates

**Ms. Neustadter** reported on her recent involvement with the Milwaukie Museum’s effort to conduct a survey of historic properties in Milwaukie. She asked whether the committee was supposed to be coordinating with the museum on this; **Chair Loosveldt** confirmed there was no such requirement. **Ms. Neustadter** indicated that she would stay involved with the museum’s effort and had offered to provide them with information on the federal, state, and local designation processes and could talk to them about the concept of historic conservation districts as well. She said she would send her draft of the local info to Mr. Kelter for his review prior to the museum’s next meeting on February 11. She thought it would be important for the committee to stay tuned as the museum moved forward, including perhaps with an invitation to representatives from the State Historic Preservation Office to participate with the museum and also share some information with the committee.

## 8.0 Design and Landmarks Committee Discussion Items

**Chair Loosveldt** returned to an issue raised at the end of the January meeting about whether Committee Member Kyle Simukka was still willing and able to serve actively on the committee, understanding that his new baby at home likely presented new challenges. **Mr. Simukka** responded that he was in fact still wanting to be more involved with the group and that he would know more within the next couple of months about whether other things might be changing for him. **Mr. Kelter** suggested that Mr. Simukka would be a good resource for helping to curate an interactive online discussion among group members when the next active draft of the Design Review document is ready for review.

**Chair Loosveldt** announced to the group that it was with very mixed feelings that she had accepted a position on the Planning Commission. The mayor had recruited her to the Commission to help support and finalize the Comprehensive Plan update process currently underway, though she felt torn to leave the ongoing work of the Design Review update. She was intent on being a strong advocate for the Design Review changes that the committee would be proposing in the coming months. She also announced that she was expecting, with a new baby due sometime in July—congratulations were shared. **Mr. Kelter** indicated that Chair Loosveldt's first meeting as a new commissioner would not be until April 9, so it should be ok for her to make the April 1 committee meeting her last one and officially resign at the end.

**Vice Chair Schuster** asked whether it would be a conflict to have Chair Loosveldt participate in the Coho Point discussion at the April meeting. **Mr. Kelter** responded that it might be clearest if Chair Loosveldt recused herself from that discussion, or if she asked only informational questions and did not make comments. She also might be fine to participate and then disclose her participation when the item comes before the Planning Commission for an official hearing. **Mr. Kelter** agreed to talk with the Planning Director to provide the best advice and line out the options.

## 9.0 Forecast for Future Meetings

March 4, 2019	Regular meeting, with preliminary review of Coho Point project
April 1, 2019	Regular meeting
May 6, 2019	Regular meeting

**Chair Loosveldt** adjourned the meeting at 8:39 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Brett Kelter, Associate Planner

---

Lauren Loosveldt, Chair