



CITY OF MILWAUKIE

AGENDA

July 15, 2019

DESIGN AND LANDMARKS COMMITTEE

Milwaukie City Hall
10722 SE Main St
www.milwaukieoregon.gov

1.0 Call to Order — Procedural Matters

2.0 Meeting Notes – Motion Needed

2.1 June 3, 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: Comments on draft Urban Design policies for Comprehensive Plan
Staff Person: Brett Kelter, Associate Planner

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:

August 5, 2019 Regular meeting

Sept. 2019 (Date TBD)

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. Thank You.
2. **DESIGN AND LANDMARKS COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES.** Approved DLC Minutes can be found on the City website at www.milwaukieoregon.gov.
3. **CITY COUNCIL MINUTES** City Council Minutes can be found on the City website at 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:

Cynthia Schuster, Chair
Brett Laurila, Vice Chair
Mary Neustadter
(Position #1, vacant)
(Position #2, vacant)

Planning Department Staff:

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

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

Milwaukie City Hall
10722 SE Harrison St
Monday, June 3, 2019
6:30 PM

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT

Cynthia Schuster, Chair
Brett Laurila, Vice Chair
Mary Neustadter

STAFF PRESENT

Brett Kelter, Associate Planner (staff liaison)

OTHERS PRESENT

Joseph Edge, Planning Commissioner

MEMBERS ABSENT

None

1.0 Call to Order – Procedural Matters

Chair Cynthia Schuster called the meeting to order at 6:31 p.m.

2.0 Design and Landmarks Committee Notes

2.1 May 6, 2019

Chair Schuster called for revisions; there were none, and the notes were approved unanimously.

3.0 Information Items – None

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

Associate Planner Brett Kelter noted that the group had several options about where to begin the evening's discussion: comments on the draft Comprehensive Plan policies related to Historic Preservation, comments on the draft policies related to Housing, or continuation of the Downtown Design Review update. The members agreed to begin with comments on the Historic Preservation policies.

Committee Member Mary Neustadter distributed a sheet with some revisions and comments she had developed. She noted that the proposed policies did not mention a registry of historic properties or include anything about regulatory tools or about protecting historic buildings in infill development. **Mr. Kelter** agreed to forward the suggestions to the Planning Director and the planner working on the Comprehensive Plan update. He said he would update the group at the next meeting about how the comments were received and what opportunities there would be for additional edits before the policies were formally adopted into the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Kelter walked the group through the Housing policies and asked for comments. **Vice Chair Brett Laurila** reiterated his suggestion for allowing height bonuses for projects that provide affordable housing. This was something that had come up in the group's discussion of the Design Review process and the Building Massing element. **Mr. Kelter** affirmed that the affordability suggestion had been flagged for inclusion in that particular design element.

The discussion shifted to the Design Review update, beginning with a return to the Façade Transparency element. **Chair Schuster** shared some visual examples to illustrate various percentages of windows and glazing. She affirmed the proposal to require 50% transparency on the ground floor for properties on Main St and McLoughlin Blvd. She thought the City of Portland's requirements for both length (requiring a minimum of 70% of the frontage length to be glazing) and area (50% minimum for the ground floor) were worth considering. She noted that Portland does not count the bottom 3 ft of the façade in the calculation for the transparency calculation and recently lowered the percentage of required upper-floor glazing from 30% to 25% because too much glazing made it difficult to meet energy code requirements.

Chair Schuster thought the group should consider setting a minimum length standard, reduce the glazing requirement for upper floors to 25%, and count only the area between 3 ft and 12 ft above grade for purposes of the ground-floor glazing requirement. The justification for disregarding the lowest 3 ft of a building was that glazing that low did less to enhance the pedestrian environment than glazing above 3 ft.

Shifting gears to the Building Materials element, **Chair Schuster** had Mr. Kelter project a few PowerPoint slides that showed a spreadsheet she had compiled to organize various building materials and classify them as primary, secondary, or accent materials. There was some discussion about organizing the code to allow flexibility for the evolution of new building materials, rather than having a very specific list that only captured a current snapshot of known materials. The group wondered whether the code could be adjusted to empower the committee to advise the Planning Director about acceptable building materials, as part of a Type II review process established specifically for this design element.

Chair Schuster noted that she had taken spandrel glass off the list of accent materials and removed the specific line for copper, since it was a metal and could be grouped in the metal siding category. She also suggested removing prohibited items from the list because it was impossible to capture them all and would be clearer just to show what materials could be used. She explained that her spreadsheet's column heading for "street level" included the first story down to the sidewalk, for street-facing façades; the "non-primary faces/upper level" heading included façades that did not face the street as well as the upper level of any façade. After some discussion about whether to add a third column focused on the lowest 3 ft of the façade (bulkhead), the group agreed to stick with just the two categories—street-facing/street level and non-primary/upper level.

Vice Chair Laurila advocated for allowing ceramic tile to be used as more than an accent material, citing a case where it had worked well to replace an historic tile used on a façade as a primary material. **Chair Schuster** noted that the table of materials was focused on new construction and suggested that a section might be needed to address the renovation or preservation of buildings. She commented that the "unified appearance" phrase in Guidance #6 was not very clear and needed improvement. The group also discussed the need to reexamine the trigger for requiring design review for projects affecting street-facing façades. One suggestion was that changing 25% or more of the façade (excluding glazing) should require full compliance with current standards for the full façade, unless the structure was designated as an historic resource. **Planning Commissioner Joseph Edge** suggested that the City Attorney might advise the group about any legal precedent supporting a certain percentage of façade change as the threshold for requiring compliance. **Chair Schuster** said she would do more research on how other cities handle this topic and would report back.

Vice Chair Laurila expressed concern about the suggestion to restrict material types for the bulkhead, as it could limit creativity. There was some discussion about whether the materials table should identify only primary and secondary materials (no accent materials), and what percentages would define each category.

Chair Schuster suggested that distinctions should be made among different thicknesses of fiber cement, as that affected durability, particularly where the material was used down at the ground level. She shared a slide showing different types of composite wall panels, noting that they were good as secondary materials. Another slide showed metal wall panels, which could be a good secondary material at the ground level. Returning to the earlier discussion about whether to list specific prohibited materials, **Mr. Edge** suggested that there was some merit to being clear about specific prohibitions, such as against the use of tropical hardwoods, due to the City's goals for sustainability as well as some ethical considerations. **Chair Schuster** added that redwoods might also be specifically called out as a prohibited material.

Chair Schuster said she thought the group needed to talk about the review process itself. She expressed the opinion that there should be more discretion and more involvement of the committee in the review. **Mr. Kelter** reminded the group that the revision effort was intended in part to ensure that the required clear and objective path of review included standards that would guarantee designs that met the community's preferences, with a discretionary path available for designs that might be uniquely creative. **Chair Schuster** said that large projects (20,000 sq ft or larger) should perhaps be forced to go through a discretionary review, because of the scale of impacts they would have on the community. **Mr. Edge** suggested that one tool for addressing the chair's concern would be to require a "design advice session" with the committee.

7.0 Other Business/Updates

Mr. Kelter reported that there were currently 3 potential candidates for the 2 open positions on the committee, and that interviews would be scheduled soon. He also noted that the draft Comprehensive Plan policies on Urban Design should be available around June 17 and that he would share them with the members for review and comment. A public open house was being scheduled as well, and the members would be encouraged to attend and participate. The group agreed to set aside time at the next meeting to discuss the draft urban design policies.

8.0 Design and Landmarks Committee Discussion Items

Ms. Neustadter announced that the Milwaukie Historical Society was holding its first tour of historic houses on Saturday, June 22. The tour would feature 4 historic homes in the Island Station neighborhood; tickets were limited but still available. She shared a flyer with the group.

9.0 Forecast for Future Meetings

Looking ahead at the forecast for upcoming meetings, **Chair Schuster** noted that she would be out from June 20 to July 13. **Mr. Edge** suggested that July 9 seemed too soon to hold a joint session with the Planning Commission, given that the group was still working through a number of unresolved questions on the draft document. The members agreed to postpone the July 9 joint session and to move the regularly scheduled first-Monday meeting in July (July 1) to July 15, so that the members could all attend.

July 15, 2019 Regular meeting (shifted from July 1)

August 5, 2019 Regular meeting

Chair Schuster adjourned the meeting at 8:44 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Brett Kelter, Associate Planner

Cynthia Schuster, Chair



CITY OF MILWAUKIE

To: Design and Landmarks Committee

Through: Dennis Egner, Planning Director

From: Brett Kelter, Associate Planner

Date: July 15, 2019

Subject: Draft Urban Design Policies Rev.

BACKGROUND: Draft Urban Design Policies - Revised 6/20/19

Draft Urban Design Policies – Revised 6/20/19

Goal 1 - Design: Use a design framework that considers location and development typology to guide urban design standards and procedures that are customized by zoning district.

1. Downtown Milwaukie Policies

- a) Allow for a variety of dense urban uses in multi-story buildings that can accommodate a mix of commercial, retail, office and higher density residential uses.
- b) Provide a high-quality pedestrian environment that supports excellent access to the area's multiple transportation modes.
- c) Capitalize on proximity to and views of the Willamette River.
- d) Ensure that buildings are designed with storefront windows and doors, weather protection, and details that contribute to an active, pedestrian oriented streetscape.
- e) Ensure that standards and guidelines implement a well-defined design vision for the downtown that has been vetted by the community.

2. Central Milwaukie Policies

- a) Ensure that new development supports better transportation connectivity through the Central Milwaukie district. Increased connectivity should include pedestrian improvements through the Milwaukie Marketplace shopping center.
- b) Enhance Highway 224 intersections to increase the safety and comfort for pedestrians and cyclists traveling on cross streets. Implement these safety improvements through the Transportation Systems Plan.
- c) Ensure buildings and sites are designed to support a pedestrian-friendly streetscape and establish a storefront environment along key streets as set out in the Central Milwaukie Land Use and Transportation Plan.
- d) Manage the bulk and form of buildings to provide a transition between Central Milwaukie and adjacent areas with a lower density residential comprehensive plan designation.
- e) Broaden the scope of the Central Milwaukie Land Use and Transportation Plan to include the Milwaukie Market Place, Providence Hospital, and the Hillside Development.

3. Neighborhood Mixed Use (NMU) Policies

- a) Provide opportunities for a mixture of neighborhood commercial services and housing which are well-connected to the surrounding neighborhoods by sidewalks and bikeways.
- b) Ensure that development is designed to minimize impacts to surrounding residential areas through appropriate setbacks, building placement, buffers, and landscaping.
- c) Require that new development connect to surrounding neighborhoods for pedestrians and others using active transportation modes to travel to and within the district.
- d) Ensure that new mixed use and commercial buildings provide a commercial storefront environment with sidewalks and amenities appropriate to create an active, pedestrian-focused streetscape.
- e) Ensure that new development is compatible with what has been historically permitted on adjoining residential properties in terms of height, bulk, and building form.

4. Neighborhood Hubs Policies (outside of NMU areas)

- a) Provide opportunities for the development of neighborhood commercial services and the provision of amenities and gathering places for residents of the surrounding area.

- b) Ensure that new development projects are at a scale that fits with the height, bulk and form of development that have been historically permitted in the neighborhood.
 - c) Ensure new development contributes to a pedestrian friendly environment along the property frontage, recognizing that a storefront environment is not mandatory in a neighborhood hub setting.
 - d) Encourage development of multi-season outdoor seating areas and pedestrian plazas.
 - e) Provide for a high level of flexibility in design and incentives to accommodate a variety of start-up uses and explore innovative techniques for waiving or deferring full site development and parking requirements.
 - f) Provide a process to allow start-up and temporary uses that take advantage of incentives and deferral programs to make a smooth transition to status as a permanent use.
5. **North Milwaukie Innovation Area Policies**
- a) Provide opportunities for a wide range of employment uses including manufacturing, office, and limited retail uses, as well as mixed-use residential in the area close to the Tacoma Station Area.
 - b) Ensure that the design of new development and redevelopment projects contribute to a pedestrian friendly environment within the Tacoma Station Area.
 - c) Provide for active transportation connections throughout the NMIA.
 - d) Implement provisions of the North Milwaukie Innovation Plan.
6. **International Way Business District Policies**
- a) Provide flexibility to allow a wide variety of employment uses including industrial, research, office, and limited commercial in the district.
 - b) Protect natural resources in the district including Minthorn Natural Area and the waterways that connect to it.
 - c) Require landscaping along street frontages in the district.
 - d) With redevelopment, provide pedestrian and active transportation improvements through the district.
 - e) Work to ensure that the district is well-served by transit or micro-transit and that transit stops and shelters are safe, comfortable, and easy to access.
7. **Corridors Policies**
- a) Provide opportunities for higher intensity development in areas within walking distance of frequent transit service.
 - b) Ensure that design standards require direct pedestrian connections to the closest transit line.
 - c) If new development includes a commercial component, require a storefront design.
 - d) Ensure that all new development contributes to a safe, well-connected, and attractive pedestrian environment.
 - e) Maintain development and design standards that provide for a transition in development intensity between the development site and adjoining areas designated or planned for lower density residential uses.

Goal 2 - Livability. Enhance livability by establishing urban design concepts and standards that help improve the form and function of the built environment.

1. Policies to promote a great **Pedestrian Environment**:

- a) Prioritize enhancement of the environment for pedestrians and people using other active transportation modes when expending public funds on street improvements.
 - b) Require new development and public improvements to be designed in a manner that contributes to a comfortable and safe environment for everyone, including pedestrians and other non-motorized users in the public right-of-way.
 - c) Enhance pedestrian spaces through adequate landscaping, trees, and amenities such as benches and lighting.
 - d) Encourage small-scale storefront retail to be developed along street frontages in commercial and mixed-use districts.
 - e) Provide for pedestrian connectivity and access by other active transportation modes.
 - f) Use urban design features to slow traffic through NMU districts and neighborhood hub areas.
 - g) To enhance the pedestrian experience, explore opportunities for woonerf and living street designs in areas with appropriate traffic volumes.
2. Policies for **Parking**-related design:
- a) Reduce the amount of off-street automobile parking required for new development and place a greater emphasis on active transportation.
 - b) As opportunities arise, encourage redevelopment of existing parking lots or conversion of lots for recreational activities.
 - c) Buffer parking lots from the pedestrian environment with landscaping and with public art or decorative walls along streets in the town center.
 - d) Provide on-street parking on frontages that have commercial storefronts.
 - e) Limit off-street parking between the public sidewalk and the front of any new commercial retail or mixed-use building.
 - f) Anticipate and plan for the conversion of parking spaces into pick-up/drop-off areas as use of shared modes of transportation (Uber, Lyft, micro-transit) grows in the community.
 - g) Require canopy trees in parking lots to reduce stormwater runoff and better manage urban temperatures.
3. Policies to enhance integration of the Urban and Natural Environment:
- a) Maintain landscaping design standards that require landscape plan approval as part of the development review process.
 - b) Use the landscape planning process to ensure that new development provides tree canopy cover consistent with city objectives.
 - c) Allow for vertical landscaping or green roofs to substitute for ground landscaping in situations where sites are constrained and there is a public benefit associated with the project.
 - d) Require street trees consistent with urban forestry goals.
 - e) Utilize green infrastructure (bioswales, rain gardens, pervious pavement, and green roofs) to minimize pervious surfaces and to capture and treat stormwater on site.
 - f) Where appropriate, integrate natural features into the site planning process while also ensuring that designated natural resources are protected and conserved.
4. **Policies for the design of Public Spaces:**
- a) Provide clear standards for the design and improvement of public spaces and streets as set forth in design objectives of adopted project plans or special area plans.

- b) Provide multi-season seating in public spaces where people are intended to gather. Areas of public seating should have access to direct sunlight and shade.
- 5. Policies to promote Community Character:
 - a) Limit the size and display characteristics of commercial signage, especially along Highway 224 and Highway 99E.
 - b) Where feasible, design of buildings should include views and orientation toward the Willamette river or other waterways.
 - c) Encourage green buildings through a program that allows extra building height with the development of a green building.
 - d) Ensure that policies and codes related to urban design are consistently and regularly enforced.

Goal 3 - Process. Provide a clear and straight forward design review process for development in Milwaukie along with incentives to achieve desired outcomes.

- 1. Use a two-track **Design Review** process to ensure that new development and redevelopment projects are well designed. Provide a clear and objective set of standards as well as an optional, discretionary track that allows for greater design flexibility provided design objectives are satisfied.
- 2. Ensure that a **clear and objective process** is available for all needed housing types that is well designed, provides adequate open space, and fits into the community, while offering an alternatives discretionary path for projects that cannot meet these standards.
- 3. Expand **incentives** and refine development standards that help to:
 - a) Provide flexibility for commercial use of existing residential structures within Neighborhood Hubs and Neighborhood Mixed Use districts.
 - b) Provide flexibility for the types of uses permitted as home occupations where it can be demonstrated that the home occupation will help meet the daily needs of residents in the surrounding neighborhood.
 - c) Consider the use of vertical housing tax abatements and other financial tools to encourage development in Neighborhood Hubs
- 4. Require that **comprehensive plan amendment applications** address the following guidelines when the amendment would increase the intensity and/or density of a commercial or mixed-use area:
 - a) High density districts should be:
 - i. Served by collector or arterial streets
 - ii. Within ¼ mile of a park
 - iii. Within ¼ mile of commercial services
 - b) Medium density districts should be:
 - i. Served by collector or arterial streets
 - ii. Within ½ mile of a park
 - iii. Within ½ mile of commercial services
 - c) Low density districts should be:
 - i. Served by local, collector, or arterial streets
 - ii. Within ½ mile of a park

- iii. Within ½ mile of commercial services
- d) Mixed use districts should be:
 - i. Served by collector or arterial streets
 - ii. Within ¼ mile of a park
 - iii. Located to serve residents in the surrounding ¼ mile area

Geographic Designations

- **Downtown Milwaukie** is part of the Milwaukie Town Center, which is a regional destination in the Metro 2040 Growth Concept.
- **Central Milwaukie** is part of the Milwaukie Town Center that serves the larger Milwaukie community with goods and services and seeks to provide opportunities for a dense combination of commercial retail, office, services, and housing uses.
- **Neighborhood Mixed Use** areas are located primarily along collector or arterial roads
- **Neighborhood Hubs** are dispersed throughout Milwaukie
- The **North Milwaukie Innovation Area** is one of the City's main employment areas that has identified redevelopment opportunities.
- The **International Way Business District** is a major employment area off of International Way and Highway 224
- **Corridors** are located along frequent transit lines.