



MILWAUKIE

Dogwood City of the West

To: Planning Commission
From: Alicia Martin, Administrative Specialist II
Date: May 17, 2012 for May 22, 2012
Subject: Supplemental Packet for the May 22, 2012 Planning Commission Meeting

The following additional items are being provided to you for the packet you received earlier this week:

1. Item 2.1 March 27, 2012 Planning Commission Minutes
2. Item S5.1 for CPA-10-01 North Clackamas Park North Side Master Plan – Attachment 3 Additional Public Comments Received

CITY OF MILWAUKIE
PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES
Milwaukie City Hall
10722 SE Main Street
TUESDAY, March 27, 2012
6:30 PM

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT

Lisa Batey, Chair
 Nick Harris, Vice Harris
 Chris Wilson
 Mark Gamba
 Scott Churchill
 Russ Stoll
 Clare Fuchs

STAFF PRESENT

Katie Mangle, Planning Director
 Ryan Marquardt, Associate Planner
 Li Alligood, Assistant Planner
 Justin Gericke, City Attorney

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT

1.0 Call to Order – Procedural Matters*

Chair Batey called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and read the conduct of meeting format into the record.

Note: The information presented constitutes summarized minutes only. The meeting video is available by clicking the Video link at <http://www.ci.milwaukie.or.us/meetings>.

2.0 Planning Commission Minutes

3.0 Information Items

Katie Mangle, Planning Director, introduced the new member of the Planning Commission, Shaun Lowcock.

4.0 Audience Participation –This is an opportunity for the public to comment on any item not on the agenda. There was none.

5.0 Public Hearings

5.1 Summary: Residential Development Standards *continued from 3/13/12*

Applicant: City of Milwaukie

File: ZA-11-03

Staff: Li Alligood and Ryan Marquardt

43 **Chair Batey** opened the public hearing for ZA-11-03 and read the conduct of continued
44 legislative hearing into the meeting record.

45

46 **Ms. Mangle** noted the Commission would review and discuss the list of topics and issues
47 received from the Commissioners, provide direction to staff, and staff would be available to
48 provide background and further information as requested.

49 The list of issues discussed was as follows:

50

51 *Commercial Uses as Conditional Uses in Residential Zones* – The Commission agreed that
52 further discussion and outreach regarding this topic was needed. It was decided to keep the
53 current policy and defer this part of the proposal.

54

55 *Cottage Clusters in Single-Family Residential Zones* – Staff clarified that since cottage clusters
56 use was a type of multi-family use, it was grouped with the multi-family discussion. Allowing
57 cottage clusters in SFR zones had not been discussed previously within the scope of the project
58 and to add it would require significant adjustments and outreach.

59

60 Although the Commission supported cottage clusters, they understood how density change
61 would occur within lower density zones and agreed not to include allowing cottage clusters in
62 lower density zones.

63

64 *Single-Family Residential Design Standards*

- 65 • Expansion Threshold – Currently, a 300sf addition of new façade did not trigger review and
66 design standards requirements.

67 The Commission directed staff for the proposal to read: an addition of less than 75sf
68 addition, no windows were required; a 75-200sf addition would require 15% windows for the
69 addition; an equal or greater to 200sf addition full design standards would apply, including
70 articulation, 15% window requirement, and main entrance standards.

- 71 • Articulation Menu – The Commission directed staff to expand the articulation standards list.

72

73 *Required Vegetation of Required Front Yard* – The Commission directed staff to increase the
74 proposed 30% minimum to 40% minimum landscaping for the required front yard setback area.

75

76 *Buy America* – Staff noted that applying this standard would be difficult to administer. The
77 Commission agreed that it was a great idea but may not belong in the zoning code. They
78 agreed to send a letter of support to City Council and table it as a future project as more fine-
79 tuning work needed to be done.

80

81 *Garage Door Width* – The proposed width was 50% linear measurement and staff noted the
82 general standard in the city was between 35 to 40%, so 50% would be sufficient. The
83 Commission directed staff to look at impacts of decreasing the proposal to 40% and allowing for
84 a 2-car garage and a variance up to 50%.

85

86 *Eyes on the Street Variance* – Agreed to keep as proposed with 15% window requirement of
87 façade which included doors and 50% of garage door windows.

88

89 **Chair Batey** assured that this project in no way was creating increased density or changing
90 zoning.

91

92 *Accessory Structures*

- 93 • *Tarps/Temporary Materials Structures* – Staff noted that currently, temporary structures
94 were allowed to be seen from the right-of-way or in the front yard for a 3-month period. If it
95 was not removed after 3 months, the code compliance process would begin. If they were not
96 viewable from the street, they were not regulated. This issue was more of a policy question
97 for the Commission and City Council.

98 The Commission directed staff to bring back a proposal for an outright ban, with a refined
99 definition of temporary structures and an exception for greenhouses.

- 100 • *Barns* – The Commission agreed to leave as proposed but directed staff to investigate ways
101 to limit barns to agricultural uses.

- 102 • Rooftop Wind Systems – The Commission agreed to leave as proposed but asked staff to
103 bring back pictures of examples.
- 104 • Rain Cisterns – The Commission agreed to leave as proposed.
- 105 • Guest House – Staff clarified ‘guest houses’ as dwelling units without kitchens and should
106 not be occupied on a permanent basis. The Commission agreed to leave as proposed.
- 107 • Minimum Setbacks for Accessory Structures – Discussed the impacts of accessory
108 structures with small setbacks. Staff reminded that 5ft was the current side setback for the
109 primary structure. Commission directed staff to return with pictures or examples of large
110 structures in rear yards.

111

112 *Multifamily Amenities*

- 113 • The topic was prompted by comments from Jean Baker. The Commission agreed to review
114 her comments and the current code and proposal before discussing options further.

115

116 **Commissioner Gamba moved to continue the public hearing for legislative application**
117 **ZA-11-03 to April 10, 2012. Commissioner Fuchs seconded the motion, which passed**
118 **unanimously.**

119

120 **6.0 Worksession Items – None**

121

122 **7.0 Planning Department Other Business/Updates**

123 7.1 Office Elections

124

125 **Commissioner Gamba moved to continue the current Planning Commission leadership.**
126 **Vice Chair Harris seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.**

127

128 **8.0 Planning Commission Discussion Items**

129

130 **Commissioner Churchill** asked for further clarification regarding the new position of Planning
131 Commission alternate.

132

133 **Chair Batey** thanked Commissioner Stoll for his insight and tenure on the Planning
134 Commission.

135

136 **Commissioner Fuchs** noted she met with the Portland State University students and walked
137 the corridors identified in the Neighborhoods Main Street project, and the tour was productive.

138

139 **9.0 Forecast for Future Meetings:**

140

141 **Ms. Mangle** noted that on April 10, Mr. Marquardt will provide a brief update on the
142 Neighborhoods Main Street project.

143

144 April 10, 2012 1. Worksession: North Clackamas Park North Side Master Plan
145 *tentative*

146 April 24, 2012 1. Public Hearing: CSU-12-01 5555 SE King Rd Royalton Place
147 Signage

148

149

150 Meeting adjourned at approximately 9:48 p.m.

151

152

153

154

Respectfully submitted,

155

156

Alicia Martin, Administrative Specialist II

157

158

159

160

161 _____
Lisa Batey, Chair

Alligood, Li

From: Susan Shawn <sbshawn44@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 15, 2012 11:24 AM
To: Alligood, Li
Cc: Eric Shawn; Maria Shepard; Nancy Newton; Tony Clark; Pat and Anne O'Donnell; Steve Berliner; Dick Shook
Subject: Re: North Clackamas Park North Side Master Plan

Hello Li,

As the current Chair of the Friends of North Clackamas Parks, I would like to offer the following comments for the record for the Planning Commission regarding the North Side Plan for North Clackamas Park.

We have been a part of the NCPRD's Master Plan process for this section of NCP since the beginning, once the South Side was completed. We sit at the table of the Stewardship Committee and participate through that citizen group as well. The initial plan for the North Side was way over built, particularly considering that most of it, if not all of it, is in the flood plain as designated by FEMA. Much of the South Side of the Park is also in a flood plain, as attested to by an hydrologist we hired during the controversy over the regional tournament baseball complex. That designation for the south side of the park was never acknowledged or accepted by the Park District, the County or the City of Milwaukie. By law, jurisdictions only have to deal with the FEMA mapped flood plains, even if they are inaccurate, so that was never a consideration. In order to build legally in a flood plain, as I understand it, one must do a balanced cut and fill, which may explain in part their reluctance to change the FEMA map.

I am assuming that the Park District plans to do a balanced cut and fill on the north side of the park. I do not know if they did that in the south side, FEMA map or not. If I were on the Planning Commission, this is one major question that I would want discussed and assurances provided. When a balanced cut and fill is not done, the overflow water has to go somewhere, and it's not fair to simply redirect it off the property onto someone else's, particularly when erosion of the creek banks could result.

We agree to the much smaller parking lot proposed now, adjacent to the covered picnic area, compared to the lot as initially drawn. Our preference would be for that lot to be paved in a permeable fashion. During high flow times, that whole area is like a river, and more impermeable surfaces can lead to erosion and damage to the sensitive Camas Creek and ultimately to Mt. Scott Creek, as well. If permeable paving cannot be done, then perhaps the parking lot itself needs to be reconsidered.

Having a bridge over Camas Creek in lieu of a culvert at the connection between the proposed parking lot and the current lot for the Milwaukie Center has always been our preference, for obvious reasons.

We also agree with the dog park being moved further to the east and away from the buffered area of Mt. Scott Creek itself. Many of our members are pleased to see the additional dog park features, such as a separate section for smaller dogs, a way to keep the mud out of the water source, and so on. Our stated position regarding the dog park is that if the Park District could find a place as good or better relatively nearby, then we would support removing the dog park from NCP altogether. Perhaps one way to do this now would be to indicate that on the Master Plan itself, as a place holder until a better location can be found. Perhaps the land east of the park that is owned by the Turning Point Church could be purchased and developed as a dog park, with parking adjacent.

It's interesting that dog walkers use the parks more than anyone else, year round, but their needs are always the ones to be set aside for yet another ball field, or even a protected natural area, much as we need them too!

Because NCP is most often used by dog walkers, and by senior citizens, having a walking trail on the north side is imperative. People don't like to walk too close to the regional tournament baseball complex during the season because of the noise and fear of the balls and such. Our wish is for permeable surfaces for these trails, and to keep them out of the buffers for Camas Creek and for Mt. Scott Creek.

I hope that the 8 to 10 nature interpretive signs that were promised to the Friends group by Jon Mantay, then County Administrator, will be included in this plan. Promises made, promised kept, and all that. If you have any doubt about that promise, I suggest you contact Nancy Newton, who is an Assistant County Administrator now. She was present to all our 30 hours of conversations during that time and will affirm this promise.

Thank you all for the hard work you have done on this long postponed project and good luck.

Susan Shawn
Chair, Friends of North Clackamas Park

On May 15, 2012, at 9:23 AM, Alligood, Li wrote:

Hello Susan,

Katie forwarded your comment regarding the Planning Commission hearing on May 22. It has been included in the public record for the file, and you have been added to the list of "interested persons" for the project. I will send out an e-mail update after the hearing with information about next steps.

Thanks,

Li Alligood

Assistant Planner

City of Milwaukie Planning Department

6101 SE Johnson Creek Blvd

Milwaukie, OR 97206

P 503-786-7627

F 503-774-8236

alligoodl@ci.milwaukie.or.us



May 14, 2012

Milwaukie Planning Commission
c/o Katie Mangle, Director, Milwaukie Planning Department
6101 SE Johnson Creek Boulevard
Milwaukie, OR 97222

Re: North Clackamas Park North Side Master Plan

Dear City of Milwaukie Planning Commission,

I am sharing, on behalf of the Milwaukie Center/Community Advisory Board, our support of the North Clackamas Parks and Recreation District's amended Master Plan for North Clackamas Park. Our board had significant concerns that the existing plan would cause increased vehicular traffic flow right past the front door of the Milwaukie Center, to access the north side and new parking lot in North Clackamas Park. In the last year, North Clackamas Parks and Recreation District (NCPRD) staff worked with our advisory board to study the issue of traffic flow and patron safety involving the existing parking lot. Ideally, increased vehicular traffic would not flow through the existing parking lot and there would be a separate access to the new north side parking lot. We have been advised that, due to environmental constraints, this is not possible and we would need to work within the footprint of the existing parking lot to ameliorate the issues.

NCPRD staff and advisory board members were able to come to a "best case scenario" agreement of rerouting traffic flow, improving signage, and installing cross walks and a sidewalk, to maximize patrons' safety. We hope to have the City of Milwaukie's support in moving these changes forward as soon as possible. The Milwaukie Center will be closed to the public during Labor Day week, September 3-7, 2012, and this specific time would be ideal for NCPRD to complete these changes.

We are looking forward to several of the amenities planned for the north side of the park, including the accessible walking trail and exercise stations. With a rapidly increasing number of older adults and people with disabilities in our community, these improvements will be well used and appreciated.

Thank you for your hard work and diligence in making North Clackamas Park a wonderful destination for all – young and old, individuals and families, those who are active and those with disabilities.

Sincerely,

Eleanor Johnson, Chair person
Milwaukie Center/Community Advisory Board

Cc: Katie Dunham, NCPRD Planner
Dave Miletich, NCPRD Deputy Director