

**DESIGN AND LANDMARKS COMMITTEE  
MEETING NOTES  
WEDNESDAY, JUNE 22, 2011**

**MEMBERS PRESENT**

Greg Hemer, Chair  
Jim Perrault, Vice Chair  
Becky Ives  
Chantelle Gamba

**MEMBERS ABSENT**

Patty Wisner

**STAFF PRESENT**

Li Alligood, Assistant Planner (DLC Liaison)  
Katie Mangle, Planning Director  
Wendy Hemmen, Light Rail Design Coordinator

**TRIMET REPRESENTATIVES PRESENT**

Carol Mayer-Reed, Consultant  
Leah Robbins, TriMet  
Jeb Doran, TriMet  
Ron Hayden, Consultant  
Mark Mikalovich, Consultant  
Jeff Joslin, Consultant

**OTHERS PRESENT**

Meganne Steele, Metro

**1. Call to Order – Procedural Matters**

**Chair Greg Hemer** called the Design and Landmarks Committee (DLC) meeting to order at 6:43 p.m., with Chair Hemer and Vice Chair Jim Perrault present.

**2. Design and Landmarks Committee Meeting Minutes**

2.1 April 27, 2011

This item was taken out of order and addressed after Item 6.3.

**DLC Member Chantelle Gamba moved to approve the April 27, 2011, DLC meeting notes as presented. DLC Member Becky Ives seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.**

**3. Information Items – None**

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

**5. Public Meetings – None**

**6. Worksession Items**

6.1 Summary: Light rail project design update  
Presenter: Carol Mayer-Reed, Mayer/Reed Landscape Architects

**Katie Mangle, Planning Director**, introduced **Carol Mayer-Reed, Mayer/Reed Landscape Architects** and **Jeb Doran, TriMet**. She described her own role with the light rail project in terms of urban design for the Milwaukie section of light rail. She noted the amount of work done so far and that Mayer/Reed had played a key role and been receptive to staff and the community input.

**DLC Member Chantelle Gamba** arrived at 6:45, establishing quorum.

**Ms. Mayer-Reed** introduced members of her team in attendance and thanked the DLC for their time.

- She reviewed the design workshops, monthly meetings, open houses, and other outreach that had occurred since November 2010.
- She presented the proposed design elements via PowerPoint, noting that the focus was on the design of walls, fences, and railings in the Milwaukie section of the alignment.
  - Wall types included: concrete safety walls; soil nail retaining walls, which were taller; mechanically stabilized earth (MSE) walls; gabion walls, which were 4 feet tall; concrete sound walls, which were about 6 feet tall; and poured-in-place walls, which were lower. The general specifications, uses, and proposed placement of each were noted.
    - Considerations when evaluating the various types of walls and their placement included: cost; structural integrity; non-climbable; scale; anti-graffiti elements; ability to clean; topography; overall project continuity; position reference for viewers, pattern and texture; place making and elements of distinction; and architectural context within the city.
    - Examples of form liners were considered. They included simulated stone, board form, fractured fin, MSE, and ashlar stone. Although simulated stone could be used for architectural style, repeat patterns were an issue and there was risk of graffiti. Board form and fractured fin were effective but not very distinctive, and the interlocking MSE pieces could be noticeable.
    - Proposed textures for the safety walls were horizontal board form with quiet texture; safety walls would be mostly viewed by train riders. Other walls could be ashlar stone.
    - Along the Trolley Trail, the community had requested retaining walls with a more “earthy” feel. Possibilities included a “piano keys” pattern, which was rectilinear but also had vertical and horizontal patterns. Board form concrete worked well with vegetation from the top and the ground and would be used along the Trolley Trail segment.
  - Fencing would be on top of walls for safety of the tracks, as guardrails along the sides of tracks, along sloped walls where there were no safety walls, and along the perimeter in some areas.
    - Considerations included level of opaqueness; maintenance requirements; sturdiness; non-climbable; and the safety and security of users.
    - Preferred fencing was black-coated fencing rather than green-coated fencing. Black-coated fencing tended to blend into the landscape and shadows year-round, while green fencing could stand out visually.
    - Welded wire fencing was preferred over chain-link fencing in pedestrian areas. Opaque screening would also be used near neighborhoods.
  - Railings would be used to guide pedestrians near the stations, as handrails, and fall protection.
    - Galvanized pipe was often used. The proposal was black panels with more details. Two options were presented: wire and “reed wall.”

**Ms. Mayer-Reed** noted the importance of differentiating different places along the alignment, and that the design of the individual station areas would be community-specific.

**Ms. Mangle** asked about the scale of the Lake Road walls. Because the walls were very tall, they were inherently not pedestrian-friendly. She asked how the wall treatment would approach the scale and sound.

- **Ms. Mayer-Reed** noted that the intention was to install concrete stonework along the pedestrian level, so the texture could help diffuse sound.
- **Mr. Doran** verified that the pedestrian treatments would be brought back to the DLC in the near future.

**The Committee** provided feedback on the presentation.

- **Ms. Gamba** stated her preferences:
  - She liked the “piano key” form liner design because it looking like weaving.
  - She appreciated the ashlar stone form liner but felt it could be more natural looking.
  - She emphasized that incorporating sustainable aspects were crucial.
  - She was resistant to the vertical board form design for the safety walls because they did not look like real wood.
  - She preferred the gabion walls because they were natural and could be host to plants and wildlife. She noted that she had seen non-galvanized gabions that allowed the steel to weatherize, creating a more natural look.
  - She had no strong feelings about the fences and railings. She liked the “reed wall” railing design and thought it was appropriate for a wetland area.
- **Mr. Perrault** applauded the design team for being so receptive to the community’s wishes.
  - He liked the ashlar stone form liner safety walls and the use of pilasters to break up the expanse of the Lake Rd wall.
  - He appreciated the idea of the “reed wall” railing, and separate designs for the different sides of the Kellogg Bridge.
- **Chair Hemer** noted that he had been very apprehensive about the design, but his faith had been restored. He thanked the TriMet design team.
  - He looked forward to the art project and elements at the Lake Road station, and was excited to see how closely the TriMet design team had listened to community feedback and honed in on the requests of the neighborhoods in creating a natural textures and elements.
  - Specifically, he liked the ‘piano key’ form liner, gabion walls, the welded wire fencing, and ‘reed wall’ fencing.

**Chair Hemer** opened the meeting up to public comment, reminding attendees that the topics open for discussion tonight were walls, fencing, and railings.

**Mark Gamba, 10414 SE 24th Ave, Milwaukie**, noted the effects of sound walls and asked why there was one planned for the Island Station neighborhood, but sound walls were so far denied in other areas that may need them more, such as downtown.

- **Leah Robbins, TriMet**, and **Mr. Doran** confirmed that study results were still being collected, but that sound walls were only being installed where required by the U.S. Department of Transportation Federal Transit Administration (FTA), which did not include downtown. However, that issue and more details of sound walls would be discussed in future DLC meetings.

**David Aschenbrenner, 11505 SE Home Ave, Milwaukie**, stated that although he liked the concepts presented, he disliked the presented wood pattern design of safety walls. He asked if the medallion in the panel style railings could be something that designates Milwaukie, such as the City medallion or a dogwood medallion.

**Ray Bryan, 11416 SE 27th Ave, Milwaukie**, inquired if there was still going to be a chunk of barrier wall near the light rail platform and noted his concern with regard to potential security issues. He asked about the inconsistency between galvanized and black-painted catenary poles at the stations, throughout downtown, and on the bridge.

- **Mr. Doran** confirmed that the barrier wall was required by the FTA as there were strict guidelines regarding placement near the intersection; however, TriMet was still looking for some flexibility. He noted he was aware of the discrepancy with the catenary poles and would take another look at that.
- **Chair Hemer** suggested that the catenary poles could be rounded rather than H-shape.

**Bill Corti, 3963 SE Lake Rd, Milwaukie**, asked about an area of fencing on his property on Monroe St that had a high risk of damage from delivery trucks, and if there were plans for guardrails to protect that fencing and who was financially responsible if his fence was hit.

- **Mr. Doran** stated there were no current plans for guardrails but affirmed it should be taken into consideration. However, the design hadn't gotten to that level of detail yet.

**Dion Shepard, 2136 SE Lake Road, Milwaukie**, noted she liked the railings and faux stone, but still had concerns about noise bouncing off of the walls through downtown.

**Barb Anderson, Waldorf School, 2300 SE Harrison, Milwaukie**, liked the natural look of the stone wall treatment proposed for behind the Waldorf School as well as the squareness.

**The Committee** agreed that they were in favor of the direction the design team was going regarding the proposed design elements for the Milwaukie light rail section, but preferred not to give a formal endorsement because two DLC members were not in attendance.

**Chair Hemer** called for a 5 minute break.

**DLC Member Becky Ives** arrived at 7:55 p.m. and the group reconvened at 8:01 p.m.

6.2 Summary: Façade Improvement Program application review  
Staff: Li Alligood, Assistant Planner

**Li Alligood, Assistant Planner**, introduced **Meganne Steele, Metro**. Ms. Steele had worked with staff to craft the Façade Improvement Program, which was funded jointly by the City and Metro.

**Ms. Steele** stated that Metro was pleased to initiate the program and extended compliments to staff and the City regarding the initial interest and thus success of the program.

- She encouraged the DLC to use discretion the use of the limited funds, and reminded the Committee that the program goal was “to encourage and fund high-quality façade improvement projects to make downtown Milwaukie a more attractive, pleasant, and vibrant place.”
- She understood that some proposals may have met minimal standards, but encouraged the Committee to use their best judgment on where the bar should be set and to keep in mind what kind of environment would make a difference for pedestrians, rather than auto-focused improvements.

**Ms. Alligood** explained that staff had done a preliminary review of the proposals to verify that they met the baseline downtown design standards before sending them on to the DLC.

- The review process was first come-first served rather than competitive. The proposals had been presented to the DLC in the order which they were received.
- Per the terms of the program, the DLC could make suggestions to the applicant but could not condition the approval of the grant.

A. Applicant: Troy Reichlein  
Owner: Kana, LLC  
Address: 11074 SE 21<sup>st</sup> Ave

**The Committee** discussed the application. They noted that the current office building felt uninviting because of the covered windows, and agreed with staff recommendations to provide greater transparency to offices.

**The Committee** approved the application unanimously in the amount of \$2,800.

B. Applicant: Troy Reichlein  
Owner: Kana, LLC  
Address: 11050 SE 21<sup>st</sup> Ave (Duffy's Pub)

**Chair Hemer** agreed with staff recommendations regarding the rooftop signage, exterior lighting, and handrails. He noted his appreciation for the improvements the owner had done to the building thus far.

**The Committee** discussed the application and agreed that they were not in favor of the proposed exterior lighting to the vinyl sign, preferring that there be a permanent sign. It was agreed that lighting of a temporary sign would not be approvable.

**The Committee** denied the application unanimously with a request for the applicant to revise and resubmit with the recommended changes.

C. Applicant: Milwaukie Masonic Lodge  
Owner: Milwaukie Lodge #109 AM & AM  
Address: 10636 SE Main St

**Chair Hemer** noted that although the request was only for exterior painting, the Masonic Lodge was a statement building of downtown and highly visible.

**Mr. Perrault** asked why window repairs were excluded from the proposed project, as he would prefer to suggest that the windows be included, although not funded through this project.

**Eric Hurt, Chairman of the Milwaukie Masonic Lodge**, addressed the DLC and agreed that his preference was for a complete restoration but that there was limited funding available.

- Although the window repairs were not ideal, the proposal would further the longevity of the windows and improve the pedestrian view on the south side of the building as those windows would have the most work done.
- He noted that the building was listed as a significant resource on Milwaukie's historic resource inventory.

**The Committee** agreed that although complete restoration of the windows would be ideal, the

proposal would improve the aesthetics of the building as well as give the Masonic Lodge some time to raise money for a more thorough window restoration.

**The Committee** approved the application unanimously in the amount of \$10,000.

**Mr. Huth** thanked the DLC and the City for their time and the opportunity.

D. Applicant: Doug Naef  
Owner: Same  
Address: 2045 SE Washington St

**The Committee** discussed the proposed replacement window for the storefront portion of the building and expressed a desire to see a more architecturally pleasing window, perhaps a three-panel window. The two portions of the building lacked connectivity and having the proposed new window and awning would help. However, the proposal did not go far enough.

**The Committee** denied the application unanimously with a request for the applicant to revise and resubmit with the recommended changes.

E. Applicant: Bernard's Garage  
Owner: MDDA LLC  
Address: 2036 SE Washington St

**The Committee** discussed the proposal and the current state of the property. Although the need for the proposed repairs was noted, it was agreed that there was a lack of interesting elements in the proposal and the proposed work would not enhance the downtown experience. Suggestions for an improved proposal included better lighting, installation of an awning on 21st, and perhaps different paint color options to help create a more inviting and pedestrian-friendly building.

**The Committee** denied the application unanimously with a request for the applicant to revise and resubmit with the recommended changes

F. Applicant: WSCO Petroleum (Arco Station)  
Owner: Z-Eldest LLC  
Address: 11010 SE McLoughlin Blvd

**The Committee** noted that the building seemed to have been recently painted. Since the building did not currently have a pedestrian draw, there would need to be more drastic improvements proposed to meet the standards of the program, like awnings, permanent planters, or different paint colors. However, most of those features were beyond the scope of the façade improvement program.

**The Committee** denied the application unanimously.

**The Committee** requested that **Ms. Alligood** provide information to applicants if they wished to revise and resubmit their applications.

6.3 Summary: Land use training  
Presenter: Katie Mangle

**Ms. Mangle** noted that Damien Hall, City Attorney, had recently done land use training with the Planning Commission regarding their role in the light rail project, and upcoming land use hearings related to that project.

- The expectations around the light rail project would be the same for the DLC as the Planning Commission in terms of how to report outside communications and ex parte communications.
- She cautioned the group to be aware of involvement in conversations and contacts that may occur. The DLC would be reviewing the Kellogg Bridge, the downtown light rail station, utility buildings, and some stormwater management areas. Once those elements come to design review, members would need to declare any ex parte contacts that may have occurred.
- Consequences of not declaring ex parte contact could include exclusion from the decision-making process and a higher possibility of appeal of the Planning Commission decision.

## **7.0 Other Business/Updates**

7.1 Joint Meeting with City Council scheduled July 5

**Ms. Alligood** stated the main topic for discussion with City Council would be the 2011-2012 DLC work plan. She noted that the draft work plan would be a framework for the discussion with Council, but was not final, and encouraged DLC members to contact her with any additional suggestions.

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

## **9.0 Forecast for Future Meetings**

July 27, 2011	1. Worksession: Façade Improvement Program application review
	2. Worksession: Light rail design update
August 24, 2011	1. Worksession: Façade Improvement Program application review
	2. Worksession: Light rail design update

Meeting adjourned at 9:35 p.m.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Greg Hemer, Chair

8:45 PM