ECONorthwest
ECONOMICS · FINANCE · PLANNING

DATE: July 1, 2014   ECO Project #: 21485
TO: City of Milwaukie
FROM: ECONorthwest
SUBJECT: MEETING MINUTES FROM PAC MEETING #6 ON JUNE 26, 2014

Notes from Moving Forward Milwaukie Project Advisory Meeting #6

Location: Milwaukie Public Works Building
Date: June 26, 2014

Attendees

Advisory Committee Members present:
- David Aschenbrenner, South Downtown Committee

- David Hedges, City Council

- Neil Hankerson, Downtown Business/Property Owner

- DJ Heffernen, Central Milwaukie Business/Property Owner

- Dion Shepard, Historic Milwaukie NDA

- Sherry Grau, Design and Landmarks Committee

- Paul Klein, Lewelling NDA

- Betty Fulmore, Ardenwald NDA

- Alicia Hamilton, Island Station NDA

- Sine Bone, Planning Commission

- Brian Sims, 42nd Ave Business/Property Owner

- Debby Patten, Lake Road NDA

Advisory Committee Members absent:
- Paul Lisac, 32nd Ave Business/Property Owner

- Greg Hemer, Linwood NDA

- Larry Cole, Downtown Business/Property Owner

- Jordan Carter, Central Milwaukie Business/Property Owner

- Lars Campbell, Hector Campbell NDA

- Kimberly Keehner, Downtown Business/Property Owner

City of Milwaukie

- Steve Butler – Community Development Director

- Dennis Egner – Planning Director

- Li Alligood – Associate Planner/Project Manager

- Vera Kolias –Associate Planner

Consultant Team:

ECONorthwest

- Nick Popenuk, Project Manager

- Janai Kessi

Angelo Planning Group

- Mary Dorman

Welcome and Overview of Meeting Agenda

Steve Butler welcomed all to the meeting and introduced Nick and Mary.

Nick introduced Mary and her role, along with Angelo Planning Group's role in the planning process. Nick will cover Action and Implementation Plan. Mary will discuss changes to downtown Milwaukie zoning code.

Overview of Action and Implementation Plan

Nick presented overview of Action and Implementation Plan.

Nick first presented vision documents for downtown Milwaukie. He asked if there were questions, no one responded.

Nick clarified that the meeting's purpose is to discuss the strategies in general and not get into the details to any great extent.

Strategy #1 – Clarify Vision and Update Comprehensive Plan

Overview, Questions, and Vote

David A: What is an MMA?

- Nick: The state has a definition of this. An MMA is a Multimodal Mixed-Use Area. The MMA is a way to give more flexibility to the city in order to meet mandates.

David A: There is talk about plans, policies, and actions, but there is very little content regarding these items. This makes it difficult to respond to the strategies.

- Nick: Public feedback will be incorporated as these items are crafted in the future.

Member of public (Jean Baker): When are all of the documents going to be written and approved?

- Nick: The Action and Implementation Plan will be adopted by Council, and the code revisions will be subject to public approval and planning commission and City Council review.
- Jean: Concerned that there is a lot of planning being done but not much else.

Dion: Is Chapter 4 Land Use going to include major changes?

- Nick: Only limited changes will be made.

Dion: Will downtown residential change?

- Nick: Yes this will be covered by Mary

Dion: What is the Milwaukie planning department talking about in regard to updating the comprehensive plan?

- Dennis: Work on the comprehensive plan is separate from the Moving Forward Milwaukie Project.

Strategy #1 Vote: 10 yes and **2 no**

Strategy #2 – Enhance the Culture of Helpfulness

Overview, Questions, and Vote

Dion: Shouldn't this strategy apply to all persons rather than just developers?

- Nick: Yes it should, but for now the plan is focusing on new development, hence the language specific to developers.

Strategy #2 Vote: 12 yes and **0 no**

Strategy #3 – Invest in catalyst projects with Public-Private Partnership (PPP) tools

Overview, Questions, and Vote

Dion: Last meeting ended with very little conversation on these strategies so there is very little background for the group to work from. This is especially the case regarding the specific tools.

- Nick: It may not be necessary for all the details of each tool to be completely understood at this point in time, since each tool will require additional City Council action to implement and the City will continue to involve the public.

David H: What is the difference between an urban renewal plan and an urban renewal district?

- Nick: A Plan is a document that describes the boundaries of a URD and the types of projects within the URD.

David A: Is debt financing included in the strategy?

- Nick: No, debt financing is not included in the strategy.

DJ: Adopting the Action and Implementation Plan does not require city council to set up a URD?

- Nick: Correct. If the City adopts the Action and Implementation with this strategy, the City would then need to undertake a separate process to create an urban renewal plan authorizing the use of TIF. This process would involve more public outreach and City Council action.

DJ: Why are specific sites rather than a more general URD being pointed out?

- Nick: Feedback from the City Council has indicated that targeting sites within Milwaukie's downtown is preferred to a larger URD that would capture appreciation of existing property in addition to new development.

DJ: Would a limited improvement district (LID) be a good idea?

- Nick: Yes there is mention of an LID in the strategies

Alicia: To whom did Nick refer to in his comment about URD public feedback?

- Nick: Feedback was from multiple sources, including the advisory committee

David H: It seems that the "ship has sailed" for URDs.

Strategy #3 Vote: 11 yes and **1 abstain** (Dion would support some actions within the strategy but not all actions)

Strategy #4 – Support existing businesses through actions encouraging adaptive reuse

Overview, Questions, and Vote

DJ: The National Main Street program doesn't come up, but maybe it should?

- Li: The City has been a Main Street program, but there has been very little interest from downtown property owners to use the program.

Strategy #4 Vote: 12 yes and **0 no**

Strategy #5 – Proactively encourage development

Overview, Questions, and Vote

Betty: Who will initiate this strategy? Milwaukie Planning?

- Nick: It is up to City Council to direct who will be responsible.

Betty: Will City Council also be responsible for tax abatement decisions?

- Steve: Yes, tax abatement decisions will be up to City Council

David A: Will all of the changes be made before inviting a developer into the picture?

- Nick: Yes

Dion: Can the language be changed to be more in line with "selective", so we are not just inviting any and every developer?

- Nick and Steve: Both answered that there would be room for change.

Strategy #5 Vote: 12 yes and 0 no

Strategy #6 – Provide more clarity and flexibility on allowed development

Overview, Questions, and Vote

Betty: Reducing onsite parking was discussed (Action 6C). Why use the word "reduce"?

- Nick: The parking conversation was left open due to the lack of technical background. More specifics can be discussed later. Is some reduction needed or not? At the last meeting, 7 committee members responded no reduction and 5 were not clear yet.

DJ: Will the strategy apply to central Milwaukie?

- Nick: Specific changes may apply in the future but for now, no.

Betty: What does "allow by-right" mean?

- Nick: Some things that the City and the public agree are desirable will be allowed for certain, without forcing developers to go through a subjective approval process.

Revise the language of Action 6C to "Consider" reducing on-site parking requirements

Strategy #6 Vote (with revision): 12 yes and 0 no

Strategy #7 – Ensure development is attractive and pedestrian-friendly

Overview, Questions, and Vote

No questions.

Strategy #7 Vote: 12 yes and **0 no**

Strategy #8 – Lower the cost of development for catalyst projects

Overview, Questions, and Vote

David H: This strategy is not suggesting that the City cover the SDCs going to the County?

- Nick: No. The City may wish to ask the County if they would consider waiving their SDCs, because the City passes most of the SDCs it collects through to the County.

Strategy #8 Vote: 12 yes and **0 no**

Strategy #9 – Encourage adaptive reuse

Overview, Questions, and Vote

No questions.

Strategy #9 Vote: 12 yes and **0 no**

Strategy #10 – Provide adequate infrastructure to support new development

Overview, Questions, and Vote

Alicia: She has serious concerns with MMA as an effective solution (Action 10A).

- Nick: The benefits of an MMA are far from certain. The strategy directs the City staff to "consider" creation of an MMA, but if further analysis determines an MMA is not an appropriate tool for this area, then it would not be pursued any further.

Strategy #10 Vote: 12 yes and **0 no**

Downtown Plan and Zone Revisions

Mary: provided an overview of key proposed downtown plan and code revisions.

Key questions:

- Combine downtown zones into 1? **(General sentiment that this is a go)**
  - o David A: This is fine if office use is addressed.
  - o David H: Keep it all as one big zone to facilitate a mix of uses throughout. This includes the DR zone. DR should be scattered throughout downtown.
- Keep north DR intact? **(General sentiment that DR zone should be changed)**
  - o David A: These properties [Pietro's Pizza, Kellogg Bowl, Nelson's Nautilus] are limited in how much they can expand
  - o Dion: How would this DR be transitioned into other zones?

- - Mary: One method could be to use a step down transition or retain the existing transitional housing overlay.
    - o DJ: Keep the transitions loose to allow for temporary uses.
    - o Dennis: Posed the question, are existing DR uses what all people envision for these areas in the future? Maybe other uses could be allowed through a conditional use process?
- Keep D/OS? **(General sentiment that this should be done)**
    - o David A: Keep the D/OS
    - o Dennis: Maybe use a broader OS zone throughout the city, this would limit confusion about having residential in OS zone
- Treat other parts of downtown differently? **(General sentiment that it this unnecessary)**

Development and Design Standards

Neil: West facing windows cause issues for retail (the sunlight can bleach their products, causing them to fade). Awnings are not effective. Window coverings may help?

Mary: Many communities try to regulate window coverings, which becomes a huge code enforcement issue.

Key Questions:

- Should City adopt ped-friendly design standards:
    - o 21st **(yes)**
    - o Monroe/Harrison/ Washington Streets? **(yes)**
    - o David A: Add Adams St **(OK)**
- Should City adopt design standards for:
    - o McLoughlin? **(yes)**
- Should different streets be treated differently? **(General sentiment that this was not necessary, except perhaps along McLoughlin)**
    - o David A: Downtown should all be built out to the street.
        - - Mary: A little flexibility is nice for allowing landscaping [along McLoughlin]
    - o Dion: Would this apply to the Graham Building?
        - - Li: No, the Graham Building would not be forced to change.
        - - Mary: The code can be written to say that non-conforming uses cannot make it any worse

Uses on the Ground Floor

David A: Visibility into the building front can be an issue if the use is an office or some other use that needs privacy.

Steve: Standards should be loosened up to allow a broader range of uses.

Debby: Alternative methods, such as window displays, could be used for limiting view into ground floor uses.

DJ: What about parking? Mandating employment or retail may make parking a necessity.

Key Questions:

- What uses should be allowed on ground floor on Main St.?
- Uses not allowed on Main St.? **(general support for not allowing office uses that have closed off windows and/or do not generate foot traffic)**
- Uses allowed on Monroe St? **(none specified)**
- Uses not allowed on Monroe St? **(none specified)**
  - Li: At the last PAC meeting, the group had decided that adult businesses, industrial, and auto repair uses should not be allowed downtown.

Member of public (Lisa Batey): Supports limiting ground floor office use to support an active streetscape.

Neil: Dark Horse employs many people in its offices and they support many restaurants downtown. Office is beneficial in downtown.

Lisa: Agreed but felt office uses should not be on the ground floor on Main St.

Nick: Should the committee keep talking about ground floor uses or move on to PARs?

Neil: Keep talking about ground floor uses so we know what has been decided.

Sine: There should be uses that are of a retail type, i.e., bring people in.

DJ: Don't be so prescriptive that opportunities are missed. Keep future parking in mind.

Sine: Wasn't office space found to be in low demand?

- Nick: Yes, but this is a snapshot of the market.

Public Area Requirements

Li: The PAR material will be sent out via a mini-survey early next week.

Mary: Covered the PAR material to give committee members the background. PARs are designed to encourage a vibrant, pedestrian-friendly downtown. They include half street improvements, including curb & sidewalk; street lights; street trees; undergrounding utilities; street furniture (benches, bike racks); and more.

Nick: Worked with Denny to come up with a scenario in which a given size of TIF project could pay for a certain level of street improvements. Nick, will send this out with the mini-survey.

Design review options

Mary: Briefly reviewed the current design review process. All new development in downtown subject to Type III review and approval. Did the PAC support a lower level of review for projects that meet all of the approval criteria? (**Yes, as long as public notice is provided.**)

Nick, closed meeting at 8:28 PM.