

**CITY OF MILWAUKIE  
DESIGN AND LANDMARKS COMMITTEE  
NOTES  
Milwaukie City Hall  
10722 SE Main St  
Monday, July 2, 2018  
6:30 PM**

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT**

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

**MEMBERS ABSENT**

Kyle Simukka

**STAFF PRESENT**

Brett Kelter, Associate Planner (staff liaison)

**OTHERS PRESENT**

Joseph Edge, Milwaukie Planning Commission  
Matt Arnold, SERA Architects  
Elizabeth Decker, JET Planning

**1.0 Call to Order – Procedural Matters**

**Chair Lauren Loosveldt** called the meeting to order at 6:34 p.m.

**2.0 Design and Landmarks Committee Notes**

2.1 June 4, 2018

**Chair Loosveldt** called for any revisions to the notes from the June meeting. No changes were proposed and the notes were approved unanimously.

**3.0 Information Items**

**Associate Planner Director Brett Kelter** noted that the City Hall conference room would be remodeled to accommodate additional staff and would not be available for meetings after this month. He indicated that the Council chambers would be the preferred location whenever available, with the Pond House as a backup location.

**4.0 Audience Participation – None**

**5.0 Public Meetings – None**

**6.0 Worksession Items**

6.1 Downtown Design Guidelines (DDG) Assessment, Session 5  
Staff Person: Brett Kelter, Associate Planner

**Mr. Kelter** distributed hard copies of the latest version of the consultant team's working materials and asked how the group wanted to proceed with its review. Given that the materials had been updated in response to the discussion at the June meeting, the consensus was to work through the document from the beginning. Reviewing the latest language, the members agreed that the "Riverfront Vision" point added to the overall Purpose section was good.

The group discussed the first 5 design elements, focusing on revisions to the design standards for each. The following key points were discussed:

### **A. Site Frontage**

- For Item 3 on the "To Do" list, (Consider Averaging for frontage calculation), the group agreed that Averaging should not be used.
- Item 4 on the "To Do" list (Determine updates to illustrations) remains pending, based on additional work by SERA.
- The references to "Subsection Q" (Outdoor and Exterior Building Lighting?) on Page 7 under the Street Setback standard appear to be erroneous; they seem to relate more to Subsection O (Pedestrian-Oriented Open Space). [Staff Note: SERA later confirmed that "O" is in fact the correct reference.]
- On Page 9, Standard C-d (frontage occupancy requirement for multiple frontages) needs further discussion. The suggestion was to include additional distinctions in the requirement based on the number of frontages and adjacency to a transit street. This may warrant adjustments to Figure 19.304-5 (First-Floor Build-To Lines) shown on Page 8.

### **B. Wall Structure & Building Façade Details**

- Near the bottom of Page 11, in the requirements for the Middle, the language in Item 2-a should be adjusted to read, "A change in exterior cladding, and detailing and/or material color . . .", to support the deletion of text requiring differences in color to be clearly visible.
- On Page 12, the section on Rooftop Design can be amended to remove the duplicate language in sub-items 6-9. That section should begin with a reference to rooftop screening (Element J) and should be restructured to make the final 4 points on Page 13 be a subsection of requirements applicable to the various roof types listed earlier in the section.
- Also on Page 12, the Rooftop Design section should include a clarification between flat roofs (slope less than 1/12) and low-slope roofs (slope between 1/12 and 4/12 pitch). The requirement should specify that a parapet is not required for a flat or low-slope roof if there is no rooftop equipment (i.e., "clean and clear").
- The language on Page 14 for residential-only buildings should be clarified to extend the additional standards to multifamily residential-only structures, which are covered by the earlier standard presented on Page 11.

### **C. Exterior Building Materials**

- The group discussed the exterior materials listed as prohibited on Page 18 (under Item 2-A-b-v) and agreed that it was not necessary to maintain the specific prohibition on street-facing façades. The list of prohibited items could be deleted, with revisions to the table on Page 19 to incorporate those materials.
- The table on Page 19 should be revised in the following ways:
  - Consider setting a percentage limit on "Glass" as a Primary material.

- Make "Finished metal panels" a Primary material, and remove "copper" from the description.
- Create a new row for "Copper" as an allowable Accent material.
- Adjust "Concrete (poured in place or precast)" to be "Architectural Concrete (poured in place or precast)."
- Discuss whether to include some specification about thickness for "Fiber-reinforced cement siding and panels." It was suggested that thicker panels would be acceptable as a Primary material, while thinner panels should be relegated to Secondary or Accent status.
- Change "Vegetated wall panels or trellises" to be a Secondary material for residential uses, which will result in both columns being the same ("Nonresidential/mixed use" and "Residential") and allow those columns to be consolidated into one.
- Add "Sheet pressboard" and "T-111 Plywood" to the row for "Plywood paneling."
- After some discussion, it was agreed to maintain EIFS as a Prohibited material.
- Revise "Chain-link fencing" to simply read "Fencing material."
- Add a row for "Spandrel glass" as an Accent material.
- Add rows for "Corrugated galvanized iron" and "Plain concrete or concrete block" as Prohibited materials.
- On Page 18, under Item 2-A-c, the "Building base materials" language should be revised to be "First-floor materials." There was discussion about the minimum wrap-around distance on the non-primary face and whether it should be adjusted to be either 10 ft or the edge of the abutting building.
- On Page 18, Item 2-B (Existing Development) is missing the "following standards," which are referenced but do not follow. The group agreed that the basic concept should be that any existing nonconforming development is brought closer to compliance when improvements are made.

#### **D. Façade Transparency**

- Under Item 2-A on Page 21, the group agreed that block faces on McLoughlin Blvd should remain subject to the standard to provide 50% openings for non-residential ground floor uses. There was a strong feeling that McLoughlin Blvd was an important window into the community and therefore should not present blank walls. Accordingly, the 30% standard for McLoughlin Blvd listed in Item 2-B-b should be struck.
- Within Item 2-D-b, the phrase "intensive landscaping" needs further clarification. In addition, green walls (vegetated wall panels) and public artwork should also be included as options to avoid blank walls. There was a question about how to ensure plant survival and whether irrigation should be required.

#### **E. Doors & Entrance Locations**

- On Page 23 under Item 2-B, there was some discussion about establishing a hierarchy of streets for the preferred location of the primary entrance. There were suggestions to include or specify Main St in the hierarchy as well as to define "transit street" and "primary entrance."
- After some discussion, the group agreed to keep "3 ft" as the maximum distance doors could be elevated above grade, with the specification that the standard applies to residential doors.
- On Page 24, in the Guidance for Entryway Locations, there were several suggestions:
  - Strike the first sentence in Item A, as the group agreed (after some discussion) that it was not necessary to encourage corner doors and that primary building doors at or near Main St or a transit street were preferred instead of at building corners.
  - The group agreed that Item C could be struck, to remove the guidance not to raise doorways more than several feet above the sidewalk.

With that, the group suspended its review for the evening and agreed to pick up in the same spot at the next meeting. **Mr. Kelter** suggested that the members also look at the Guidance section for each of the elements discussed tonight, to see if the language matched the Purpose and Design Standard. The goal for the next meeting will be to get through another third of the Design Elements.

#### **7.0 Other Business/Updates – None**

#### **8.0 Design and Landmarks Committee Discussion Items – None**

#### **9.0 Forecast for Future Meetings:**

August 6, 2018	DDG Assessment, Session #6
Sept. 4, 2018	DDG Assessment, Session #7 (at Pond House)

**Chair Loosveldt** adjourned the meeting at 8:45 p.m.



Lauren Loosveldt, Chair

Respectfully submitted,  
Brett Kelter, Associate Planner