

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

**Milwaukie City Hall  
10722 SE Main St  
Tuesday, April 17, 2018  
6:30 PM**

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT**

Lauren Loosveldt, Chair  
Cynthia Schuster, Vice Chair  
Mary Neustadter

**MEMBERS ABSENT**

Kyle Simukka

**STAFF PRESENT**

Brett Kelter, Associate Planner (staff liaison)

**OTHERS PRESENT**

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

**1.0 Call to Order – Procedural Matters**

**Chair Lauren Loosveldt** called the meeting to order at 6:42 p.m.

**2.0 Design and Landmarks Committee Notes**

2.1 April 2, 2018

**Chair Loosveldt** called for any revisions to the notes from the April 2 meeting. **Associate Planner Brett Kelter** noted that the notes were still being drafted and were not ready for review. The draft would be available for consideration at the May 7 meeting.

**3.0 Information Items**

**Mr. Kelter** noted that a liaison from the Planning Commission was present tonight and suggested a quick round of introductions from the group. Attendees introduced themselves around the room, including a brief introduction from **Planning Commissioner Joseph Edge**. **Mr. Kelter** noted that Planning Commissioner Scott Jones (a former DLC member) had also volunteered to be a liaison for the Downtown Design Guidelines assessment project but was unable to attend tonight's meeting.

**4.0 Audience Participation – None**

**5.0 Public Meetings – None**

**6.0 Worksession Items**

6.1 Downtown Design Guidelines Assessment, Session 2  
Facilitators: Ben Weber and Matt Arnold, SERA Architects, and Elizabeth Decker, JET Planning

**Ben Weber** reviewed the agenda and recapped the timeline for the remaining May-June period of the project. He explained that the focus of tonight's meeting was to present and test the Design Element framework, with the goal being to have the framework ensure consistency and clarity in the design review process. He explained that the Vision or Purpose Statement would likely be derived from many of the current "Milwaukie Character" guidelines. The introduction would also include Principles—foundational statements that reflect the Vision in terms of specific topic areas—and a Land Use Framework to translate the Vision and Principles into a

broader concept. The overall idea was to “chop up” the current code and reconfigure it to be more workable and logical.

**Matt Arnold** used the topic of Windows as an example to illustrate how a particular Design Element could be fleshed out. He suggested that it seemed useful to start by considering the specific elements that a developer would deal with as components of the design. **Elizabeth Decker** noted that it could also be useful to start from the other end—developing the intent and guidance for a specific element and trying to translate that into clear and objective requirements. It was agreed there would likely be some back and forth in the process of crafting each specific Design Element.

**Mr. Weber** used the topic of Exterior Materials to demonstrate the work they had done to develop a particular element. He said they had looked at the current language in Milwaukie Municipal Code (MMC) Section 19.304 (Downtown zones), Section 19.508 (Downtown design standards), and Section 19.907 (Downtown design review), as well as the current Downtown Design Guidelines document, the Downtown and Riverfront Framework plan, and the Committee’s work to date on the guideline update. They anticipate making minor adjustments to MMC 19.304, a more thorough update to MMC 19.508, and minor changes to MMC 19.907. It was still uncertain what would become of the current design guidelines document—it could be discarded, or some of the language could be pulled into the new introduction.

**Mr. Arnold** suggested that one result of the group’s efforts would likely be to make the code both more robust (i.e., more complicated) and more clear and easier to implement and enforce.

**Ms. Decker** noted that the current Downtown development standards are numerically based and so require a variance to adjust. **Mr. Kelter** asked whether the revisions would make a distinction between new construction and improvements to existing buildings. **Ms. Decker** suggested that the fourth and final meeting in the assessment process (in June) would address this kind of question regarding process and applicability. **Mr. Weber** and **Mr. Arnold** gave examples of how certain standards might be combined with particular guidelines to establish Design Elements that would shape the building form and promote design that matched the overall vision—they discussed the frontage occupancy standard combined with guidelines for wall structure, as well as open space in front of buildings.

**Vice Chair Schuster** pointed to conflicts in the current code that appear to reduce the chances of getting open space and pocket parks. **Commissioner Edge** suggested “conditionalizing” open space, allowing it if focused on pedestrians. He noted another potential tool of offering incentives, such as allowing increased density and reduced parking requirements in exchange for providing pedestrian-focused space. **Mr. Arnold** suggested it was important to be aware of changes and trends in the market and to allow for flexibility and adaptability, such as seeing a move away from retail-focused ground floor activity and toward restaurant use.

**Mr. Weber** introduced what the team was calling the “Big Six Fixes” for the assessment project, showing a list of likely candidates for each of the fix types. The group asked questions and talked through examples of each:

- 1) Development Standard becomes Design Element

Most of the current development standards would remain as such. Candidates for development into Design Elements included Flexible Ground-floor Space, Frontage Occupancy, and Primary Entrances.

- 2) Combine Design Standard and Design Guideline into Design Element

There appear to be numerous standards and guidelines related to doors and windows that may be combined, though **Mr. Arnold** cautioned against trying to put too many different

intentions in a single Design Element. He also noted the difference between providing incentives versus guidance, especially in areas where there may not be many incentives to offer.

3) New Design Element derived from Design Standard

Where there is only a standard and no corresponding guideline, it will be necessary to develop some guidance language (e.g., Weather Protection, Open Space & Plazas).

4) New Design Element derived from Design Guideline

Green Architecture is one example where **Mr. Arnold** noted the complications involved with including a third-party certification entity as part of a standard, especially when there comes a need for guidance and discretion. **Commissioner Edge** indicated that Clackamas County has standards for green architecture that might be useful as a guide—he cited the County's Zoning & Development Ordinance (ZDO) Subsection 1005.06.

5) New Design Element created from scratch

There were very few items on this list—Landscaping and Planting, Mechanical Screening (including for street-level equipment), and Driveway and Parking Entrances.

6) Design Guideline becomes part of Introductory Vision/Purpose Statement

Several of the "Milwaukie Character" guidelines were noted as candidates. **Chair Loosveldt** asked whether it was worth keeping any such guidelines that did not make their way into a Design Element. **Ms. Decker** agreed that the Introduction should be kept tight and focused and should not become a dumping ground for miscellaneous items. She noted that the list of all those things that are discarded or not usable somewhere else could be considered a "shadow seventh fix."

Regarding the group's "homework" for the May 7 meeting, the consultant team committed to identify which items would go into each of the fix categories. Otherwise, there was no task assignment for the Committee.

**Chair Loosveldt** confirmed that no new update to the Planning Commission was needed. She asked for an electronic copy of the team's next materials by the Friday preceding the May 7 meeting, and for a physical copy of their presentation materials at the meeting itself.

**7.0 Other Business/Updates – None**

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

**9.0 Forecast for Future Meetings:**

May 7, 2018	DDG Assessment, Meeting #3 (at Pond House)
June 4, 2018	DDG Assessment, Meeting #4 (City Hall)

**Chair Loosveldt** adjourned the meeting at 8:38 p.m.



Lauren Loosveldt, Chair

Respectfully submitted,  
Brett Kelter, Associate Planner