

**Residential Development Standards Update Project**  
**Steering Committee Meeting / Housing Choices Workshop**  
**April 25, 2011, 6:00 – 8:00 p.m.**  
**Milwaukie Public Safety Building**

**Steering Committee Members attending:**

David Aschenbrenner  
Jean Baker  
Mark Gamba  
Frank Hemer

Arlene Miller  
Jim Perrault  
Dion Shepard  
Terry Whistler

**Staff attending:**

City of Milwaukie

Katie Mangle, Planning Director  
Susan Shanks, Senior Planner  
Ryan Marquardt, Associate Planner  
Li Alligood, Assistant Planner  
Beth Ragel, Program Specialist

Consultants

Marcy McInelly, Principal, Urbsworks

**Introductions**

*Planning Director Katie Mangle* welcomed the group to the meeting. She explained that the workshop was part of the Residential Development Standards update project, and the scheduled April meeting of the project steering committee was being conducted as workshop so the committee and staff could hear from community residents.

- The purpose of the workshop was for community residents to review different dwelling typologies and discuss which types should be allowed in the city. It was not a discussion about density, but what types of single-family and multifamily housing should be allowed in the areas where those types are allowed. No decisions would be made during the workshop.
- Introduced three questions for consideration during the workshop:
  1. Should detached accessory dwelling units (ADUs) be allowed in lower-density residential zones?
  2. Should duplexes be allowed wherever single-family homes are allowed?
  3. Should additional housing types be allowed in the higher-density residential zones?
- Provided an overview of the Residential Development Standards project via PowerPoint, including issues with the current standards.

*Marcy McInelly*, Principal, Urbsworks, reviewed a presentation about housing choices in Milwaukie via PowerPoint, including a review of demographic trends and housing needs.

### **Small group discussion**

Katie and Marcy facilitated a brief question and answer session. Each of the 31 people present was assigned to a small group at one of six tables in the room to discuss the focus questions. Each table was facilitated by City staff and a note-taker took notes of the discussion.

Areas of general agreement included:

#### Question #1: Should detached ADUs be allowed in lower-density residential zones?

- Support for efficient use of space and additional housing opportunities
- Consider whether the size & number of detached ADUs could be proportionate to lot size
- Consider issues of privacy– height, placement on lot, setbacks
- Consider issues of compatibility– size, materials, design, relationship to primary dwelling unit
- Concerns about increased traffic, infrastructure impacts, and parking needs
- Concerns about additional rental units in low-density residential areas

#### Question #2: Should duplexes be allowed wherever single-family homes are allowed?

- Support for duplexes on corner lots
- Preference for duplexes that look like a single-family house
- Consider issues of compatibility – lot size, design, appearance
- Consider/minimize impacts on neighbors and neighborhoods
- Concerns about additional rental units in low-density residential areas
- Disagreement amount whether the process should be easier or if Planning Commission review should be required.

#### Question #3: Should more housing types be allowed in higher-density residential areas?

- Individual housing types discussed included row houses, cottage clusters, “skinny” houses, 2 single family houses on 1 lot, and detached ADUs.
- Support for design standards for multifamily residential development
- Support for row houses as a housing type, but concerns about location, size, design, and number
- Support for cottage clusters as a housing type, but concerns about privacy / height
- Support for housing types or projects that incorporate green space
- Consider issues of compatibility– bulk, massing, transition between higher-density and lower-density areas
- Concerns about privacy for adjacent properties
- Lack of support for “skinny houses” and 2 houses on 1 lot

## Group reporting

Following the small group discussions, Katie and Marcy asked attendees to raise their hands in response to the three discussion questions. Facilitators at each table recorded their table's votes. The results were as follows:

### Question #1: Should detached ADUs be allowed in lower-density residential zones?

- Yes: 15/31 (45%)
- No: 0/31 (0%)
- Depends: 16/31 (52%)

### Question #2: Should duplexes be allowed wherever single-family homes are allowed?

- Yes: 14/31 (45%)
- No: 3/31 (10%)
- Depends: 14/31 (45%)

### Question #3: Should more housing types be allowed in higher-density residential areas?

- Yes: 25/31 (81%)
- No: 0/31 (0%)
- Depends: 6/31 (19%)

## Comment Cards

Although there were 31 attendees present during the small group discussion, one person arrived late so staff received 32 comment cards. Attendees were asked to respond to several questions before they left the workshop. The questions and individual responses are below.

### Question #1: Should detached ADUs be allowed in lower-density residential zones?

- Yes: 19 (59%)
- No: 0 (0%)
- Depends: 12 (38%)
- No Answer: 1 (3%)

### Question #2: Should duplexes be allowed wherever single-family homes are allowed?

- Yes: 11 (34%)
- No: 5 (16%)
- Depends: 16 (50%)

### Question #3: Should more housing types be allowed in higher-density residential areas?

- Yes: 26 (81%)
- No: 0 (0%)
- Depends: 6 (19%)

### How would you rate this workshop?

- Very Useful: 17 (53%)
- Somewhat Useful: 4 (13%)
- Not Very Useful: 0 (0%)
- No Answer: 11 (34%)

### Did this workshop change your mind about anything?

- Yes: 10 (31%)
- No: 10 (31%)
- No Answer: 11 (28%)

If yes, what?

- The value of cluster housing for nursing homes and other institutional uses; doesn't have to look institutional.
- Broader cross-section of opinion/concern to guide next steps.
- My concerns
- Value of having a broad housing base
- Housing needs and demands in our community
- Was shocked and disappointed by the huge prejudice and bias in the discussion. The word "rent" was synonymous with "slum", "crime", and "minority." I am disappointed and shocked - amazing that this exists in such a degree in 2011. Wow...
- Please continue with more meetings!
- Variety of ideas
- Allowing / encouraging cottage cluster development and setting stringent design standards.
- Would like to be able to build ADU

### Other Comments or Questions?

- Do duplexes have to be 2 garage doors and split in the middle? Can they be stacked? True thoughts of infrastructure, water runoff, traffic flow, and loss of green space with accessory dwelling.
- Redouble our efforts to provide more parks and open space as we infill. Can't depend on schools. Add a layer of approval required for these types of projects. To make sure they fit in, are designed nicely, and of good quality. Thank you!
- Duplexes can provide more units on the same parcel, but can also break up the continuity of a neighborhood. New construction rarely ends up blighting an area, but common sense must still prevail.
- Square footage of lot should be larger for duplexes but not necessarily doubled. Row houses should be limited.
- Would be OK if lot size is adequate.
- I like cottages.

- I would like maximum flexibility to build detached or attached ADUs, perhaps more than one, on a single property. It's no one's business whether I do this for my own family members or if I choose to rent it out a non-family member (sorry to see bigotry is alive and well in America).
- In considering the housing format in Milwaukie, you need to take into advisement that from 1970-mid 90s the housing stock was decimated by taking down the majority of the housings close in Milwaukie and replaced with a vast amount of apartments, Section 8, etc. This brought down the demographics in Milwaukie. Milwaukie has become the preferred location for agencies for those individuals with challenges. Why - because the land is cheaper here. How are we going to change this trend?
- 1. Permit one level ADUs with current setbacks. 3. As long as there is parking for 2 cars per unit.
- Good design standards and reviews. Cottage clusters should be allowed in lower density and higher density zones.
- No more apt buildings!
- Thanks for bringing us together and revising the codes!
- I believe flexibility to alternate housing is important but it should be with design review and compatibility to promote a livable aesthetic. Also detached accessory dwellings should be evaluated on individual basis.
- Design review or standards are key. How it fits in neighborhood.
- Infrastructure capacity, design standards, parking requirements, lot size - maybe not "wherever" single family homes are allowed.
- Keep Marcy involved!
- Yes - but we need to create design standards and development standards for ADUs and other housing types.
- I am in favor of a lot of options with quality design standards and adequate green space.
- My concern with making it easier to develop duplex units is further increasing the percentage of rental vs. owned properties.
- Yes on all as long as there are healthy guidelines and boundaries. Q1. Yes - with guidelines. Q2. Yes - with guidelines. Q3. Yes - with guidelines.
- I do not support multi-unit dwellings. I feel we have too many rental units already. Not opposed to row houses or cottage clusters, as long as owner-occupied. Support allowing ADUs as long as they do not look out of place in neighborhood and do not interfere with the livability of neighbors. Prefer housing that provides off street parking. Duplexes might be acceptable if they are owner-occupied, or shared mortgage owned and occupied. Row houses would be acceptable if NOT rental units.
- What is difference between attached ADU vs. duplex?

## Wrap-up

Katie thanked everyone for coming, and invited attendees to chat with staff after the workshop. She noted that the presentations and notes from the workshop as well as background information on the project would be available on the project web site at <http://www.ci.milwaukie.or.us/planning/residential-development-standards-update-project>.