

**CITY OF MILWAUKIE
DESIGN AND LANDMARKS COMMITTEE**

NOTES

Milwaukie City Hall

10722 SE Main St

Monday, October 17, 2019

6:30 PM

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT

Cynthia Schuster, Chair

Brett Laurila, Vice Chair

Mary Neustadter

Tracy Orvis

STAFF PRESENT

Brett Kelter, Associate Planner (staff liaison)

OTHERS PRESENT

(none)

MEMBERS ABSENT

Evan Smiley

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 September 3, 2019

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

3.0 Information Items

3.1 Introduction of new committee members

Staff Person: Brett Kelter, Associate Planner

Associate Planner Brett Kelter noted that he had hoped that new committee member Evan Smiley would be on hand for introductions but that this item would be continued for the next meeting she is able to attend. He reported that she had informed him of a scheduling conflict with an evening class she has on Monday nights during the fall term (September to December), which prevents her from attending committee meetings until after the first of the year. She had offered to resign her new position if deemed necessary, but **Mr. Kelter** confirmed an internal decision to keep her on the committee and work to bring her up to speed for participation in the new year.

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 discussion resumed with Design Element F (Windows). **Chair Schuster** handed out hard copies of her notes on windows from an August 2018 email. The group discussed the 20% limit on window signage in Standard 1-B and agreed 1) that it should be deleted and left to the sign code for regulation and 2) that the maximum allowance for window signs should be 10% of window area. **Mr. Kelter** pointed out that Milwaukie Municipal Code (MMC) Subsection

14.12.010.J exempts window signs from needing a permit if they are 20% or less of the window area, so this is one code section that would need adjustment; however, an amendment may also be needed to clarify that window signs over a certain size are not allowed, even with a permit. The prohibitions section of the sign code (MMC Section 14.12.020) may be the place to make that clarification.

Noting potential conflicts with the building code, the members suggested removing the specific 0.6 visible transmittance (VT) figure from Standard 2-A and revise the language to simply clarify that transparent glass was required. It was noted that the numbers in Standard 2-B (12 in and 30 in) should be consistent with those in Design Element D (Façade Transparency). And the group agreed that Standard 2-C was more of a development standard (or a performance standard) and should be deleted.

Chair Schuster expressed a desire to establish a requirement for consistency when windows were being restored or replaced in an existing building. There was some discussion about how to handle restoration versus new development and a suggestion to refer back to any earlier language the group had drafted regarding this new versus restoration threshold. **Chair Schuster** suggested a new Standard 2-C that required replacement windows to be consistent with existing windows. She also suggested adding a Standard 2-D that listed approved materials for new windows, including anodized or painted aluminum, frameless window systems, and fiberglass. There was a question about where there should be standards for upper-floor windows or more points related to ground-floor windows.

The group agreed to delete Standard 3-C (prohibiting unpainted metal window frames) because it was not clear such a prohibition was needed. Regarding Standard 3-A, the suggestions were to move the prohibition on tinting into its own point and to re-phrase it as something like, "tinting beyond energy code requirements . . ." The prohibition on reflective and mirrored glass could stay in Standard 3-A.

Regarding the Guidance section for Windows, the group agreed to delete Point 4, as it is more of a development standard or performance issue. **Committee Member Mary Neustadter** noted that Points 3 and 6 seemed to be connected; the group agreed to move them closer together within the document but keep them separate, removing the word "large" from Point 6 and replacing it with "full-height." After some discussion, the group agreed on revised language for Point 1: ". . . provide windows at the street level, inviting pedestrians in and providing views both in and out, maintaining transparency and visibility regardless of the time of day." It was clear that Point 2 was effectively covered by Point 1 and could be deleted.

There was some discussion about whether Point 5 should be moved to Element D (Façade Transparency), but the group agreed it should be amended and **Chair Schuster** and **Committee Member Tracy Orvis** worked out the following language: ". . . should be used to add architectural interest to the overall building composition."

Moving on to Element G (Corners), the group reviewed the sketches of eroded corners provided by **Committee Member Brett Laurila** and agreed that a column could be used in any of them to support upper floors and provide cover over the eroded corner area. Within Standard 1-D, the group found the language to be too limiting and suggested inserting the "eroded corner" term and referring to a diagram of the sketches provided by Mr. Laurila. For Standard 1-B, there was some discussion about what was meant by "active spaces or uses" and suggestions to specify "active interior uses" and provide some examples such as lobbies, restaurants, and other high-traffic uses. The group wondered whether there should be a separate item providing guidance for "active exterior uses," such as providing site furnishings (e.g., benches, tables, etc.) or space for outdoor use. There was also a suggestion to somehow codify the term "active spaces," for greater clarity. Within Standard 1-A, the suggestion was to specify that the primary entry should be located within 5 ft of the corner "of the building."

Within the Guidance section, there was a suggestion to revise the language of Point 1 to read, “. . . chamfered or eroded corner, . . .”. Another suggestion was to break up Point 1 and relate it more directly to the Standards for this element. The group agreed to consider options for this for the next meeting and to wrap up discussion for the evening with an eye toward diving in next time on the next elements.

7.0 Other Business/Updates

7.1 Discuss 2019-20 Work Program draft Staff Person: Brett Kever, Associate Planner

Mr. Kever referred to the draft 2019-20 work program included in the packet and asked for any comments or suggestions, suggesting that the group should plan to finalize the draft at the November meeting. He noted that it might be useful to add an item related to the group's role in the various code amendment projects that will follow adoption of the updated comprehensive plan. A larger workplan is being developed, and he agreed to share more information about that as it became available.

There was a suggestion to add or flesh out an item about updating the historic preservation code. **Mr. Kever** noted that the workplan includes lines for updating both the historic resource inventory and the code itself. **Chair Schuster** suggested that the group aim to start making a plan for its role in any historic preservation updates, perhaps in the second half of 2020. **Mr. Kever** agreed to adjust the draft accordingly and to provide more information about staff's evolving sense of the larger amendment workplan as it develops.

Mr. Laurila described the boundary of the urban renewal district along Harrison St and wondered why it had excluded some of the commercial buildings between the light rail line near the Portland Waldorf School and the intersection with Highway 224. He wondered whether the committee could make any kind of recommendation about adjusting the boundary. **Mr. Kever** agreed to get more information about the topic.

8.0 Design and Landmarks Committee Discussion Items – None

9.0 Forecast for Future Meetings

Mr. Kever looked ahead to the upcoming meeting schedule, noting the regular November and December meeting dates as well as the group's joint meeting with the City Council on December 3 (scheduled to begin around 7:00 p.m.). He confirmed that the members were willing to have meetings on consecutive nights in December, which would preserve the opportunity to work more on the design review update on December 2.

November 4, 2019 Regular meeting

December 2, 2019 Regular meeting

December 3, 2019 Annual joint meeting with City Council (approx. 7:05 p.m.)

Chair Schuster adjourned the meeting at 8:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Brett Kever, Associate Planner


Cynthia Schuster, Chair