

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

**Milwaukie City Hall  
10722 SE Main St  
Thursday, September 20, 2018  
6:30 PM**

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT**

Cynthia Schuster, Vice Chair  
Mary Neustadter  
Brett Laurila  
Kyle Simukka

**STAFF PRESENT**

Brett Kelter, Associate Planner (staff liaison)  
Denny Egner, Planning Director

**OTHERS PRESENT**

None

**MEMBERS ABSENT**

Lauren Loosveldt, Chair

**1.0 Call to Order – Procedural Matters**

**Vice Chair Cynthia Schuster** called the meeting to order at 6:41 p.m.

**2.0 Design and Landmarks Committee Notes**

2.1 September 4, 2018

**Vice Chair Schuster** asked whether there were any corrections to the September meeting notes. There were no changes and the notes were approved unanimously.

**3.0 Information Items**

**Associate Planner Brett Kelter** noted that the group's next meeting on October 1 would include an Historic Resource Review related to proposed improvements at Milwaukie City Hall. This was another case where the Committee would hold a review meeting and provide a recommendation for the Planning Commission to consider at its public hearing on October 23. The packet materials for the October 1 meeting will include a staff report with more information about the project. **Committee Member Mary Neustadter** asked whether the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) had been informed of the project and whether any of the SHPO procedures had been followed. **Mr. Kelter** said they had not contacted SHPO; she suggested that staff check in to see what, if any, procedure should be followed. **Planning Director Denny Egner** noted that staff should look into amending the code to incorporate or at least better reflect the SHPO process.

**Mr. Kelter** reminded the group of the annual update to City Council scheduled for October 16. He had intended to bring copies of the current bylaws and work program for the members to review but left them at the office, so he promised to send them electronically in advance of the next meeting. He encouraged the members to look them over in preparation for a conversation on October 1.

**Mr. Kelter** also noted that he still needed to follow up on the group's previous questions about the status of the Milwaukie High School historic archiving and the question of whether audio files from past meetings could be made available online.

**4.0 Audience Participation – None**

**5.0 Public Meetings – None**

## 6.0 Worksession Items

### 6.1 Downtown Design Guidelines (DDG) Assessment, Session 8 Staff Person: Brett Kever, Associate Planner

**Mr. Kever** reopened the work session on the DDG assessment, asking whether there were any further thoughts or comments about the Building Massing section where the group left off last time. **Vice Chair Schuster** mentioned the issue with massing and maintaining solar access, and she provided a copy of some of the state rules for solar easements.

**Mr. Kever** asked if there was any follow-up discussion about the documentation issue raised at the last meeting. **Mr. Egner** explained a little more about the conversations that staff was having about the DDG project and how staff was thinking about the next version of the “product.” He indicated that they would find a way to reflect the Committee’s comments and suggestions and to show how the previous version of the code had changed. **Vice Chair Schuster** acknowledged the iterative nature of the review process. **Mr. Kever** asked whether anyone had comments about the bullet-point summary he had provided in advance of the meeting—folks seemed to generally agree that it was good. **Committee Member Brett Laurila** asked about the anticipated timeline for adopting the amended code—**Mr. Egner** said he optimistically hoped the Committee could be finished with its review by the end of the year, with the materials going to the Planning Commission in early 2019 and on to adoption by City Council by the middle of the coming year. **Committee Member Kyle Simukka** indicated he had not been able to make available the documentation example he wanted to show the group but that he would try again next time.

The group then turned its attention to the draft design review document and made suggestions about the following elements:

#### I. Weather Protection

- Revise Standard A-a to read, “All ground-floor building entries shall be protected from the weather by awnings, canopies, or marquis.” The second phrase, about recessed entries, can be deleted since it is probably better addressed in the Doors & Entrance Locations element (Element E).
- Regarding Standard A-c, the requirement to provide weather protection to the “far edge” of the sidewalk is unclear, check the Building Code to ensure consistency with requirements and limitations on covering sidewalks and the public right-of-way. The 4-ft minimum coverage standard probably works because the sidewalks downtown should be at least 8 ft wide.
- Standard B-a can be deleted because the Universal Building Code has it covered; plus, the language about being “visually compatible” is too discretionary to be a standard and should perhaps be shifted to the Guidance section. But look at suggested language from New York City as a model for standards for awning design, and see if there is similar language for canopies.
- There is some redundancy between Standards B-c and C-a; consider moving B-c into C (materials) since it has more to do with materials than design.
- Keep the prohibition on backlighting awnings in Standard C-b.
- Keep the language in Standard C-c regarding limiting signage on awnings and canopies to only the front face but double-check for consistency with the sign code.
- Consider more positive definitions for materials and details—instead of saying what should not be used, be more specific in listing the materials and designs that are desired. For example, specify that the structure or frame materials for awnings and

canopies shall be aluminum or steel. Standard C-a could be changed to read, "Awnings shall be canvas or modified canvas."

- In Guidance D, are canvas and treated wood truly "high quality" materials?

#### **J. Rooftop Equipment Screening**

- For Standard B, the perspective of "public view" needs to be defined—could be across the street from a development, and/or at a height of so many feet above the ground. Perhaps there could be an option of either not being visible from public view or providing a screen as tall as the equipment. Regardless, it does seem important to retain the concept of considering a public view, though not necessarily from adjacent buildings.
- In Standard B-a, delete the distinction of "primary" exterior finish material and leave it at "an exterior finish material."
- In Guidance A, delete the first sentence about roof-mounted mechanical equipment being hidden from view by parapets. Let the second sentence stand, about making the screening an integral part of the architecture when building parapets do not provide adequate screening. Re-frame Guidance B and C each as examples of ways to make roof-mounted mechanical equipment more visually subordinate (i.e., with green features or painting).

#### **K. Service Areas (Screening)**

- Separate the various types of facilities (loading areas, service areas, utility structures, garbage facilities, etc.) and line out specific standards for each, as appropriate. Begin the average standard with "if"—i.e., "If loading areas are provided, then they shall be accommodated on site . . .".
- Question—can you even have outdoor storage downtown (listed in Standard B)?

The group agreed to meet in a special session before the next regularly scheduled meeting on October 1. After looking at calendars, all committee members and Mr. Edge indicated they were available on September 20.

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

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

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

Sept. 20, 2018	Special Session for DDG Assessment
Oct. 1, 2018	DDG Assessment
Oct. 16, 2018	Annual Update to City Council

**Vice Chair Schuster** adjourned the meeting at 8:33 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Brett Kelter, Associate Planner



Lauren Loosveldt, Chair