

# **AGENDA**

August 1, 2022

### **DESIGN AND LANDMARKS COMMITTEE**

Virtual Meeting (via Zoom) www.milwaukieoregon.gov

1.0	Call to Order — Procedural Matters — 6:30 PM
2.0	Meeting Minutes – Motion Needed
	2.1 June 6, 2022
3.0	Information Items
	3.1 Introduction of new members, orientation
4.0	<b>Audience Participation</b> — 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 — None
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:
  - TBD Discussion of proposed amendments to Downtown Design Review code (as needed)

### Meeting Accessibility Services and Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Notice

The city is committed to providing equal access to public meetings. To request listening and mobility assistance services contact the Office of the City Recorder at least 48 hours before the meeting by email at <a href="https://orc.org/nct/nct/2007/00/20

### Servicios de Accesibilidad para Reuniones y Aviso de la Ley de Estadounidenses con Discapacidades (ADA)

La ciudad se compromete a proporcionar igualdad de acceso para reuniones públicas. Para solicitar servicios de asistencia auditiva y de movilidad, favor de comunicarse a la Oficina del Registro de la Ciudad con un mínimo de 48 horas antes de la reunión por correo electrónico a ocr@milwaukieoregon.gov o llame al 503-786-7502. Para solicitar servicios de traducción al español, envíe un correo electrónico a espanol@milwaukieoregon.gov al menos 48 horas antes de la reunión. El personal hará todo lo posible para responder de manera oportuna y atender las solicitudes. La mayoría de las reuniones del Consejo de la Ciudad se transmiten en vivo en el canal de YouTube de la Ciudad y el Canal 30 de Comcast dentro de los límites de la ciudad.

#### 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 <a href="mailto:planning@milwaukieoregon.gov">planning@milwaukieoregon.gov</a>. Thank You.
- 2. **DESIGN AND LANDMARKS COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES.** Approved DLC Minutes can be found on the City website at <a href="https://www.milwaukieoregon.gov">www.milwaukieoregon.gov</a>.
- 3. CITY COUNCIL MINUTES City Council Minutes can be found on the City website at <a href="www.milwaukieoregon.gov">www.milwaukieoregon.gov</a>.
- **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 their 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.** Testimony in support, opposition, and comments or questions from interested persons who are neither in favor of nor opposed to the application.
- **5. 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.
- **6. REBUTTAL TESTIMONY FROM APPLICANT.** After all public testimony, the Committee will take rebuttal testimony from the applicant.
- 7. 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.
- **8. 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.
- 9. **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.

### Milwaukie Design and Landmarks Committee:

Cynthia Schuster, Chair Tracy Orvis, Vice Chair Mary Neustadter Juli Garvey Ryan Lowther

# Planning Department Staff:

Laura Weigel, Planning Manager Vera Kolias, Senior Planner Brett Kelver, Senior Planner Adam Heroux, Associate Planner Ryan Dyar, Assistant Planner Will First, Administrative Specialist II

# CITY OF MILWAUKIE DESIGN AND LANDMARKS COMMITTEE MINUTES

(virtual meeting via Zoom) Monday, June 6, 2022 6:30 PM

### **COMMITTEE MEMBERS PARTICIPATING**

Cynthia Schuster, Chair Tracy Orvis, Vice Chair

# STAFF PARTICIPATING

Brett Kelver, Senior Planner (staff liaison)

# **MEMBERS ABSENT**

Mary Neustadter Evan Smiley Dylan Geske

### OTHERS PARTICIPATING

Elizabeth Decker, JET Planning

### 1.0 Call to Order – Procedural Matters

**Chair Cynthia Schuster** called the meeting to order at 6:33 p.m.

# 2.0 Design and Landmarks Committee Minutes

2.1 May 2, 2022

**Chair Schuster** called for any comments on or corrections to the May meeting minutes. There were none, and the minutes were approved unanimously.

### 3.0 Information Items

**Senior Planner Brett Kelver**, staff liaison, reminded the group of the annual volunteer appreciation dinner on July 14 outside the Milwaukie Center in North Clackamas Park. Members should be receiving invitations soon if they have not already.

- **4.0** Audience Participation None
- 5.0 Public Meetings None

# 6.0 Worksession Items

6.1 Updates to Downtown Design Review code
Staff: Brett Kelver, Senior Planner; Elizabeth Decker, JET Planning

Consultant **Elizabeth Decker of JET Planning** opened with an appreciation of the members' continued efforts on this project. She then shared a power point presentation that touched on a few questions related to particular design elements, draft graphics, and review procedures.

Minimum Frontage Occupancy – **Decker** shared the revised map graphic showing minimum frontage occupancy requirements and asked for feedback. **Vice Chair Tracy Orvis** liked the new graphic better, especially the replacement of the "no line means 50% occupancy" approach with an actual marking. **Chair Schuster** asked whether there was a map of downtown green spaces; **Kelver** pointed to the zoning map showing the Downtown Open Space zoning designation (along with Downtown Mixed Use) as the closest thing to such a map. **Decker** confirmed that the downtown zoning map would remain in Section 19.304, though she was not sure if the four maps in that section would be updated in the same way as the maps in Section 19.508.

<u>Active Ground Floor Space</u> – **Chair Schuster** had one suggestion, to shift the vertical line away from the B label.

<u>Façade Articulation</u> – **Decker** noted that the new graphics separated the vertical from the horizontal for greater clarity. **Chair Schuster** liked the shading better. **Vice Chair Orvis** agreed that the new graphics showed better relief, though she noted that the Base/Middle/Top aspect seemed very spare and light. **Chair Schuster** suggested that the delineation of the Base (A) should only go as high as the imagined ceiling height, to somewhere below the bottom of the second-story window. **Kelver** wondered if adding some shading or texture to emphasize the base would help; **Chair Schuster** agreed and marked an example on the slide.

<u>Glazing Requirements</u> – **Decker** noted that there could probably be some clarification of where the B area (upper floors) starts. **Vice Chair Orvis** agreed, noting that the bottom band (A) was very clear. **Kelver** suggested using some shading or texture to distinguish the B area.

<u>Step Back Standards</u> – confirming that this aspect had moved into the Building Massing element, **Decker** looked to the group for some clarification and confirmation of intent. Do the proposed standards work in actuality? **Chair Schuster** agreed it was a good question—she thought the requirement for step back modulation along 50% of the façade might be very busy and wondered if the modulation should be kept together and made contiguous (for example, in groups of 25% and 25% of façade length). She noted that the big problem for developers has been losing square footage and wondered if we should look for some examples to clarify things.

**Kelver** asked for clarification about how exactly to measure balconies on one or both stories across the façade—the language may need some adjustment. **Chair Schuster** suggested checking with the current Planning Commission to see if opinions had changed, as she was uncomfortable with requiring the step back for two full stories. She also clarified that the balconies are to be recessed and not projected.

Decker asked how the step back would affect the tripartite design. Chair Schuster explained that the top two stories could have their own articulated top, as could the base-height story. Vice Chair Orvis noted, however, that the step back area would still be visible, that it would not completely disappear from view at the street level. Decker wondered whether we should open this issue for discussion with the Planning Commission. Chair Schuster suggested perhaps offering two alternatives for the Planning Commission to consider, one for step backs and another for balconies and/or recesses. She screen-shared a diagram as an example of the step back option. Decker wondered whether the imminent Climate Friendly and Equitable Communities rules would impose a minimum height different from the Milwaukie code—Kelver agreed to look into that.

**Decker** wondered about having an option to provide 100% balconies (recessed) on the top floor. **Vice Chair Orvis** considered the example of the Sellwood Library, with multiple step backs and recessed balconies, which provides a nice rhythm across the façade. She was not sure how to put that kind of requirement in the code without it being overbearing.

**Decker** liked the idea of presenting two options to the Planning Commission (i.e., step backs or balconies/recesses). She noted the need to clarify the code language and confirm the intent, perhaps not giving balconies as a specific option but with a more general note about being able to use the recessed space for balconies or patios. **Vice Chair Orvis** suggested that it might be helpful to look back at recent projects and confirm how they used the step back.

<u>Applicability</u> – **Decker** explained that she may incorporate a table to show different processes for renovations and expansions, replacement of materials, etc. She reported that **Kelver** had confirmed with the City Attorney that it was allowable to require stand-alone multifamily buildings to be subject only to Section 19.508 as long as there remains a clear and objective review option. Townhouses and live/work units will be left with their own separate standards.

Additional Code Updates – The slide that **Decker** shared summarized the key changes for Sections 19.304 and 19.907. In Section 19.304, the most substantive updates were removing the development standards that have been incorporated into the design standards. The items remaining as development standards were primarily dimensional ones (i.e., floor-area ratio, height, setbacks, etc.). In Section 19.907, the main changes were to remove references to the stand-alone Design Guidelines document and to note that stand-alone multifamily buildings would lose the option to address the multifamily design standards in Subsection 19.505.3 and would instead be subject solely to the downtown design standards of Section 19.508.

Review Procedures – **Decker** noted the outstanding question of whether non-multifamily projects that meet the design standards should be able to use the Type I administrative review process. **Chair Schuster** reiterated her opinion that a minimum of Type II review should be required for new buildings along Main Street. **Vice Chair Orvis** agreed that it seemed important that neighbors at least receive a mailed notice of the new development. **Kelver** suggested that he should probably check again with the City Attorney to confirm whether Type II review can be considered a clear and objective review process. **Decker** noted that Milwaukie might be taking a more conservative approach by not considering Type II review to be non-discretionary. **Kelver** agreed to look more into the issue and suggested again that adding a public notice component to Type I review for new buildings could perhaps be an option.

**Decker** closed by asking the committee members if they felt comfortable making a recommendation to proceed with the draft amendments. **Vice Chair Orvis** felt good about the proposal as discussed, including the adjustments discussed tonight about the massing and step back issues. **Chair Schuster** agreed and was supportive of moving the proposal forward. **Kelver** reviewed the tentative schedule of going to the Planning Commission in August for work sessions (Aug 9 and 23) and then a hearing on September 27 (with a backup date of October 25 if needed); then on to Council for work sessions in November (Nov 1 and 15) with a hearing on December 20. He noted that it might be necessary to revisit specific issues with the committee along the way. He may try to have a couple of targeted focus-group-type of conversations in July with some of the development teams that worked on recent projects downtown. Finally, he reminded the group that it was a local election year with several Council seats coming open and that the overall timeline might shift in response to election results.

### 7.0 Other Business/Updates

7.1 Membership/Recruitment update

In the context of having three open positions to fill, **Kelver** reported that he and Chair Schuster had participated in interviews with two candidates and had a third to go. He expected to be bringing at least one new member on board the next time the group meets.

# 8.0 Design and Landmarks Committee Discussion Items – None

# 9.0 Forecast for Future Meetings

TBD New member introductions and/or check in on downtown design review amendments as needed (most likely Aug/Sept)

Chair Schuster adjourned the meeting at 8:16 p.m.
Respectfully submitted,
Brett Kelver, Senior Planner