



## AGENDA

### MILWAUKIE PLANNING COMMISSION Tuesday, January 27, 2015, 6:30 PM

MILWAUKIE CITY HALL  
10722 SE MAIN STREET

- 1.0 **Call to Order - Procedural Matters**
- 2.0 **Planning Commission Minutes** – Motion Needed
  - 2.1 October 28, 2014
- 3.0 **Information Items**
- 4.0 **Audience Participation** – This is an opportunity for the public to comment on any item not on the agenda
- 5.0 **Public Hearings** – Public hearings will follow the procedure listed on reverse
  - 5.1 Summary: Moving Forward Milwaukie Downtown Plan and Code Amendments #2  
*continued from 1/13/15*  
Applicant: City of Milwaukie  
File: CPA-14-02/ZA-14-02  
Staff: Li Alligood and Denny Egner
- 6.0 **Worksession Items**
- 7.0 **Planning Department Other Business/Updates**
- 8.0 **Planning Commission Discussion Items** – This is an opportunity for comment or discussion for items not on the agenda.
- 9.0 **Forecast for Future Meetings:**
  - February 10, 2015
    - 1. Public Hearing: VR-14-03 Riverway Lane Addition
    - 2. Public Hearing: CPA-14-02/ZA-14-02 MFM Downtown Plan and Code Amendments #3 *continued*
  - February 24, 2015
    - 1. Public Hearing: CPA-14-02/ZA-14-02 MFM Downtown Plan and Code Amendments #4 *continued*
    - 2. Public Hearing: Renaming Lake Rd to Main St *tentative*

### Milwaukie Planning Commission Statement

The Planning Commission serves as an advisory body to, and a resource for, the City Council in land use matters. In this capacity, the mission of the Planning Commission is to articulate the Community's values and commitment to socially and environmentally responsible uses of its resources as reflected in the Comprehensive Plan

1. **PROCEDURAL MATTERS.** If you wish to speak at this meeting, please fill out a yellow card and give to planning staff. Please turn off all personal communication devices during meeting. For background information on agenda items, call the Planning Department at 503-786-7600 or email [planning@ci.milwaukie.or.us](mailto:planning@ci.milwaukie.or.us). Thank You.
2. **PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES.** Approved PC Minutes can be found on the City website at [www.cityofmilwaukie.org](http://www.cityofmilwaukie.org)
3. **CITY COUNCIL MINUTES** City Council Minutes can be found on the City website at [www.cityofmilwaukie.org](http://www.cityofmilwaukie.org)
4. **FORECAST FOR FUTURE MEETING.** These items are tentatively scheduled, but may be rescheduled prior to the meeting date. Please contact staff with any questions you may have.
5. **TIME LIMIT POLICY.** The Commission intends to end each meeting by 10:00pm. The Planning Commission will pause discussion of agenda items at 9:45pm to discuss whether to continue the agenda item to a future date or finish the agenda item.

#### **Public Hearing Procedure**

Those who wish to testify should come to the front podium, state his or her name and address for the record, and remain at the podium until the Chairperson has asked if there are any questions from the Commissioners.

1. **STAFF REPORT.** Each hearing starts with a brief review of the staff report by staff. The report lists the criteria for the land use action being considered, as well as a recommended decision with reasons for that recommendation.
2. **CORRESPONDENCE.** Staff will report any verbal or written correspondence that has been received since the Commission was presented with its meeting packet.
3. **APPLICANT'S PRESENTATION.**
4. **PUBLIC TESTIMONY IN SUPPORT.** Testimony from those in favor of the application.
5. **NEUTRAL PUBLIC TESTIMONY.** Comments or questions from interested persons who are neither in favor of nor opposed to the application.
6. **PUBLIC TESTIMONY IN OPPOSITION.** Testimony from those in opposition to the application.
7. **QUESTIONS FROM COMMISSIONERS.** The commission will have the opportunity to ask for clarification from staff, the applicant, or those who have already testified.
8. **REBUTTAL TESTIMONY FROM APPLICANT.** After all public testimony, the commission will take rebuttal testimony from the applicant.
9. **CLOSING OF PUBLIC HEARING.** The Chairperson will close the public portion of the hearing. The Commission will then enter into deliberation. From this point in the hearing the Commission will not receive any additional testimony from the audience, but may ask questions of anyone who has testified.
10. **COMMISSION DISCUSSION AND ACTION.** It is the Commission's intention to make a decision this evening on each issue on the agenda. Planning Commission decisions may be appealed to the City Council. If you wish to appeal a decision, please contact the Planning Department for information on the procedures and fees involved.
11. **MEETING CONTINUANCE.** Prior to the close of the first public hearing, *any person* may request an opportunity to present additional information at another time. If there is such a request, the Planning Commission will either continue the public hearing to a date certain, or leave the record open for at least seven days for additional written evidence, argument, or testimony. The Planning Commission may ask the applicant to consider granting an extension of the 120-day time period for making a decision if a delay in making a decision could impact the ability of the City to take final action on the application, including resolution of all local appeals.

*The City of Milwaukie will make reasonable accommodation for people with disabilities. Please notify us no less than five (5) business days prior to the meeting.*

#### **Milwaukie Planning Commission:**

Sine Bone, Chair  
Wilda Parks, Vice Chair  
Shannah Anderson  
Scott Barbur  
Greg Hemer  
Shaun Lowcock  
Gabe Storm

#### **Planning Department Staff:**

Denny Egner, Planning Director  
Li Alligood, Senior Planner  
Brett Kelver, Associate Planner  
Vera Kolia, Associate Planner  
Alicia Martin, Administrative Specialist II

**CITY OF MILWAUKIE**  
**PLANNING COMMISSION**  
**MINUTES**  
**Milwaukie City Hall**  
**10722 SE Main Street**  
**TUESDAY, October 28, 2014**  
**6:30 PM**

**COMMISSIONERS PRESENT**

Sine Bone, Chair  
 Wilda Parks, Vice Chair  
 Shannah Anderson  
 Scott Barbur  
 Greg Hemer  
 Shaun Lowcock

**STAFF PRESENT**

Denny Egner, Planning Director  
 Li Alligood, Senior Planner

**COMMISSIONERS ABSENT**

Gabe Storm

**1.0 Call to Order – Procedural Matters\***

**Chair Bone** 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**

**Denny Egner, Planning Director**, noted an open house for the Monroe Street Neighborhood Greenway Concept Plan project was scheduled for December 3, 2014 at the Public Safety Building.

**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**

**6.0 Worksession Items**

- 6.1 Summary: Moving Forward Milwaukie Downtown Plan and Code Amendments – Proposed Design Standards  
 Staff: Li Alligood and Denny Egner

**Li Alligood, Senior Planner**, presented the staff report via PowerPoint. She noted this was the ninth worksession for the project with the Planning Commission and this worksession would focus on Downtown Design Standards. She reviewed the project's timeline and goals with regard to the Downtown Vision. Implementation of the goals involved providing more clarity and flexibility for development, ensuring attractive and pedestrian-friendly development, and to streamline the review process.

**Ms. Alligood** summarized the proposed revisions to the Design Standards that would ensure guidelines were codified for a clear and quantifiable review process, provide clarity of the community's expectations, ensure new development was pedestrian-friendly, and provide flexibility for a streamlined review option.

**Ms. Alligood** reviewed the design standards specifics including the intent, related guidelines, and the existing and proposed standards, and showed examples of buildings that met and did not meet the proposed standards:

#### **Building Façade Details:**

- Intent was to provide cohesive and interesting facades using scale-defining devices to create a comfortable and interesting street edge/street wall.
- The existing standard only called for minimal base and top treatments, and the proposed standards would require a tripartite façade with a base, middle, and top. Staff would be 'test-driving' the proposed standards and the standards would also need to be correlated with the development standards.
- **Ms. Alligood** reiterated that these proposals were just proposals at this point and the details would need to be clarified through this process.
- Middle treatment could include stepbacks or balconies.
- Top treatments could allow different types of roof treatments. The current standards called for flat roofs and a prohibition of decorative roofs, although that definition was unclear. The proposal would make the standard more explicit with some finish to the roof with cornices or eaves.
- Buildings over 150ft in length would be required to have a significant break, either into two buildings or have a setback. **Ms. Alligood** reminded that these were options for the proposals and it was up to the Commission if a full-block building with enough articulation was acceptable without needing a break in the building.

#### **Residential Buildings:**

- **Ms. Alligood** reminded the Commission of the Residential Development Standards project a few years ago where the first design standards for multifamily residential buildings were adopted.
- The intent was to clarify which standards should apply to stand-alone residential buildings and the residential portion of mixed-use buildings.
- Currently there were no standards that applied to stand-alone residential buildings in downtown. The proposal would be for multifamily standards that were adopted for the rest of the city to also apply to stand-alone residential buildings in downtown.
- **Commissioner Hemer** asked about requiring off-street parking and garages for rowhouses in downtown
- **Ms. Alligood** responded that that could be an option but perhaps not to be too restrictive on how that would look.
- **Mr. Egner** reminded the Commission to keep in mind how many driveway cuts would be wanted in downtown when a pedestrian-friendly environment was the goal. Parking should be behind the street frontage.

#### **Corners:**

- The intent was to reinforce intersections as important places for people to gather. The related guideline was to locate entry doors on the corners of commercial/retail buildings where possible.

- There was no current design standard for corners and the proposal was to require entrances at corners when possible and to reinforce the prominence of the corner.
- **Chair Bone** asked if other codes required how deep the corners were, etc.
- **Ms. Alligood** responded that she hadn't seen that but other aspects to keep in mind were weather protection requirements like awnings or canopies, etc.
- **Ms. Alligood** noted that there were four options for enhancing the corner and a new building would have to incorporate two of those options. These included locating the primary entrance at the corner, cutting the corner at a 45 degree angle or the like, including prominent architectural elements, and using a combination of materials, furnishings, and plantings where appropriate.
- Standards would require entrances on Main St and when possible, for the entrances to be on the corner of the Main St frontage.

#### **Weather Protection:**

- The intent was that ground floor awnings and canopies protect pedestrians, encourage window shopping, and create visual interest. The related guideline was to protect pedestrians from weather.
- There was no current standard. The proposal was to require awnings, canopies, recesses, or similar above entrances and along 50% of the ground floor elevation.
- **Ms. Alligood** noted that the Commission would want to decide if some types of materials should be allowed or not allowed.
- **Ms. Alligood** added a conflict with creating standards was that there were some key elements that help to make a building successful, but there was also the matter of personal taste. It was difficult to regulate taste.
- **Chair Bone** asked the Commission if there should be standards that required some light through the awnings and if allowing different types of awnings would provide variability, or should one type be required.
  - **Commissioner Lowcock** felt that variety was more appealing to the eye; a full block of flat metal awnings would create a tunnel feeling.
  - **Vice Chair Parks** agreed with Commissioner Lowcock.
- **Ms. Alligood** reminded that there could be options and variables built into the standards.

#### **Exterior Building Materials:**

- The intent was to provide a sense of permanence and add articulation and visual interest through a variety of materials and designs. The related guideline was to use materials that create a sense of permanence.
- The current standard was only a list of prohibited materials with allowed materials understood by omission. The proposal was to expand the permitted list to establish primary, secondary, and accent materials for use on new development. The types would be broken out into percentages as some may not be appropriate for a primary material but work well for accent.
- **Mr. Egner** added that it was important to use materials that provided permanence rather than materials that would only last a short time and would need replacing or maintenance.
- **Commissioner Hemer** noted his concern about the proposal that would require removal of materials, paneling, and paint covering surfaces for significant façade renovations. He was concerned about the impact of removing paint in terms of mess, waterways, etc.
  - **Ms. Alligood** responded that the idea was to remove materials that had been layered up. Perhaps this should not apply to all cases, but for historic buildings and when it applied.

**Chair Bone** was concerned about developers just checking boxes and asked if staff had considered incentivizing exemplary design.

- **Ms. Alligood** responded not in a design-sense but agreed it was a good idea. However, incentives would more likely be in the form of such elements as building height or floor area ratio rather than design. Staff could prepare proposals to bring back to the Commission.
- **Commissioner Lowcock** noted that incentivizing taste would be difficult.
- **Chair Bone** noted that some options would be green building. She wanted developers to want to build better buildings so incentives were important.
- **Ms. Alligood** added that regardless of incentives, the standards needed to be high enough that checking boxes would result in what the community wanted and was buildable. The goal of the proposal was for a Type II review option to require more than minimum standards with a Type III option for proposals that may be more creative and needed more discretionary review.
- **Chair Bone** asked what the trigger would be to move an application from Type II to Type III review.
- **Ms. Alligood** responded that if a proposal did not meet at least one of the standards, it would move into Type III review which would be limited to the standard that was not being met.
- **Ms. Alligood** reminded the Commission that what was being presented was a starting point for discussion – nothing was set in stone yet. The first hearing for these amendments was scheduled for November 25, 2014, and there were a number of hearings scheduled to break them into sections.

#### **Windows and Doors:**

- The intent was to enhance street safety and provide a comfortable and interesting walking environment. The related guideline was to provide human scale and variety to the pedestrian environment.
- The current standard was only at least 50% glazing of the ground floor on certain sections of Main St. The proposal was to increase Main St to 60% and expand requirements to 30% for McLoughlin Blvd, 40 % for the remainder of downtown, and add 30% glazing to upper floors with 60% of that to be vertically-oriented.
- She asked the Commission for direction about the upper floor requirements. She noted that the windows would be measured by pane rather than by bank.
  - **The Commission** agreed that the overall vertical feel was more important than the orientation of the individual windows.
- **Ms. Alligood** noted that these standards would only apply to mixed-use or commercial buildings.

#### **Residential Doors:**

- For standalone residential buildings, doors that face a very active street should be separated from the street by a change of grade. The related guideline was to define a friendly transition between the public and private realm.
- Currently there were only dimension standards, but no requirement to provide front entry areas. A new transition area standard was proposed between the public street and ground floor units.
- A reason for this proposal was to couple with the proposal to allow multifamily residential development on the ground floor throughout downtown but for Main St south of Scott St.

### **Roofs and Rooftop Equipment:**

- The intent was to create visual interest for the pedestrian experience and to integrate equipment into the design. The guidelines call for detail in the roofline and integration of equipment.
- Currently there were only requirements for cornices on flat roofs and no standards regarding equipment. The proposal was to clarify which types of roofs were permitted and treatment requirement, and to establish screening requirements for equipment.
- **Ms. Alligood** added that there were standards for sustainability-related accessory structures that would need to work with the proposed standards.

### **Open Space / Plazas:**

- To provide amenities for downtown residents and promote livability. The guidelines were to provide safe and comfortable resting places, and spaces designed for a variety of activities.
- There were no standards for open spaces currently. The proposal called for projects larger than 20,000 sq ft to provide a minimum 400 sq ft open space, and for a minimum square footage of outdoor space per unit for residential units of four or more.
- **Chair Bone** noted that this was a section she thought to incentivize.

**Ms. Alligood** noted she would take into consideration the Commission's direction and questions and bring some updates back at the next meeting.

**Chair Bone** called for public comment.

**David Aschenbrenner, Moving Forward Milwaukie (MFM) Project Advisory Committee (PCA) member**, commented that as the proposals were written, it was confusing to have so many variations of standards and requirements for different streets and sections of downtown. He felt that the vision, desired character, and treatments should apply throughout downtown rather than only for Main St and those streets connecting to the riverfront.

- **Commissioner Hemer** asked, with regard to the specific building materials standard called for in the South Downtown Concept Plan which Mr. Aschenbrenner was involved with, why the list was so restrictive, and even more restrictive than these current proposals.
- **Ms. Alligood** reminded that there was a difference between the Pattern Language document and the adopted South Downtown Concept Plan.
- **Mark Gamba, City Councilor, MFM PAC member, and member of South Downtown group**, responded that the limited materials list was a part of the Pattern Language document. The goal of that list was for materials that reflected a northwest character with traditional northwest materials.
- **Ms. Alligood** responded that a goal of the project was to implement the adopted South Downtown Concept Plan which was a more refined document from the Pattern Language. She noted that there were some limitations to what was called for in the Pattern Language. Although these amendments addressed regulatory issues for implementing the Concept Plan, there were other elements that were needed to fully implement it. She added that the draft Downtown and Riverfront Land Use Framework Plan amendments referenced the Concept Plan but staff was working out how it should be referenced in terms of either the document or the image, etc.

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

- 7.1 Recommendation of a Planning Commission Representative to the Library Expansion Task Force

**Mr. Egner** asked for a volunteer for the Library Task Force.

**Commissioner Barbur** volunteered.

## **8.0 Planning Commission Discussion Items**

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

November 12, 2014 1. Worksession: Moving Forward Milwaukie Downtown Plan and Code Amendments – Downtown Design Review

*Due to scheduling conflicts, it was moved to reschedule the meeting to November 13, 2014.*

November 25, 2014 1. Public Hearing: CPA-14-02 Moving Forward Milwaukie Downtown Plan and Code Amendments – Development Standards  
2. Public Hearing: ZA-14-03 Commercial-Limited Zone Update  
3. Public Hearing: VR-14-02 9925 SE 37<sup>th</sup> Ave Variance

**Mr. Egner** noted that there was a Moving Forward Milwaukie public open house the following evening, October 29, 2014, at the Masonic Lodge.

Meeting adjourned at approximately 8:49 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Alicia Martin, Administrative Specialist II

---

Sine Bone, Chair





# MILWAUKIE

*Dogwood City of the West*

**To:** Planning Commission

**Through:** Denny Egner, Planning Director

**From:** Li Alligood, Senior Planner

**Date:** January 20, 2015, for January 27, 2015, Public Hearing

**Subject:** **File:** CPA-14-02, ZA-14-02  
Downtown Plan and Code Amendments  
Hearing 2 of 4

**File Types:** Comprehensive Plan Text Amendment, Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment, Zoning Ordinance Map Amendment

**Applicant:** Dennis Egner, Planning Director, City of Milwaukie

## **ACTION REQUESTED**

Open the public hearing for application CPA-14-02, ZA-14-02. Discuss the proposed amendments to the downtown Milwaukie use standards. Take public testimony if presented and provide direction to staff regarding desired revisions to the proposed amendments.

This is the second of 4 scheduled hearings on the downtown plan and code amendment package. The draft ordinance and Findings of Approval will be provided at subsequent hearings.

## **HEARING SCHEDULE**

Due to the complexity of the amendment package, the hearings on the downtown plan and code amendment package have been packaged into 4 dates, each with an anticipated focus on a specific section of the draft amendments. See the [January 13, 2015, staff report](#) for the referenced attachments.

The hearings schedule and anticipated topic of focus are as follows:

- January 13, 2015: Policies (*Downtown Land Use and Framework Plan and Comprehensive Plan – Chapter 4*). This hearing focused on the materials contained in Attachments 1 and 2 and pages 3-7 of Attachment 3.
- January 27, 2015: Use standards. This hearing will focus on new definitions (Section 19.201) and downtown uses (Section 19.304), contained in Attachment 3.
- February 10, 2015: Development and design standards. This hearing will focus on Sections 19.304 and 19.508, contained in Attachment 3.
- February 24, 2015: Design standards and design review procedures. This hearing will focus on Sections 19.508 and 19.907, contained in Attachment 3.

## BACKGROUND INFORMATION

See the January 13, 2015, staff report for a discussion of project background and the public process and outreach.

During the January 13 public hearing, there was public testimony and Commission discussion about the South Downtown Concept Plan (SDCP) and the ways in which it is being implemented through the proposed plan and code amendments. The SDCP will primarily be implemented through inclusion of the concept in the *Downtown and Riverfront Land Use Framework Plan*, as discussed on January 13, and through the proposed revisions to the downtown development and design standards, which were scheduled for discussion on February 10 and February 24.

### A. History of Prior Actions and Discussions

- **January 13, 2015:** The Commission reviewed the proposed amendments to Chapter 4 of the Comprehensive Plan and the *Downtown and Riverfront Land Use Framework Plan*, and directed staff to include the following revisions in the February 24 version: revise the SDCP graphic to change the "station" label to "development site"; retain the McLoughlin Bridge crossing and add text clarifying that access over, under, and through McLoughlin Blvd should be prioritized; and add a project to install wayfinding and historical plaques throughout downtown.

### B. Existing Code History

The current downtown zones were adopted in 2000 to implement the *Downtown and Riverfront Land Use Framework Plan (LUIFP)*. There are 4 commercial zones (Downtown Commercial, Downtown Office, Downtown Residential, and Downtown Storefront), one open space zone (Downtown Open Space), and two overlays (Downtown Residential Transition Area and Village Concept Area). Each zone has very specific requirements for and limitations of the types of businesses that can locate there and how new development looks and functions.

Council adopted minor revisions to the downtown zones in 2013. These amendments exempted changes of use from triggering public improvements (e.g. the Public Area Requirements, or PARs); allowed retail uses as standalone uses in the DO zone and increased the maximum size for retail uses in the DO zone from 3,000 sf to 5,000 sf; and established "flexible ground floor space" requirements for new buildings along Main St. At the time, Council directed staff to conduct a more thorough review of the downtown zones and the ways in which the current regulations were inhibiting business and new development.

### C. Proposed Amendments

The City is proposing amendments to its existing downtown zones and use standards to: combine the commercial zones for easier comprehension; allow a broader range of residential and mixed use development; broaden the range of permitted uses in downtown; and streamline the review process for nonconforming uses, structures, or development. The amendments are intended to implement the vision of the *Downtown and Riverfront Land Use Framework Plan* (as amended with components of the *South Downtown Concept Plan*). See Attachment 1 for an evaluation of how the proposed amendments implement that vision.

The commentary on the amendments (see Attachment 3 of the January 13, 2015, staff report) describes in detail how the proposed amendments would change the regulations in the downtown zones. The following is a summary of the key aspects of the proposed amendments for discussion on January 27.

### **New and Revised Definitions**

Several new definitions are proposed to clarify existing standards or to add new use types to the zoning ordinance. See Attachment 3 pages 11-13. Those definitions include:

- Abutting: Clarifies what this term means where used in the zoning ordinance.
- Awning: Coordinates with proposed new design standard requiring weather protection.
- Canopy: Coordinates with proposed new design standard requiring weather protection.
- Downtown zones: This definition is being revised to reflect the new Downtown Mixed Use Zone DMU.
- Live/Work Unit: These types of dwellings are permitted in the Tacoma Station Area Manufacturing Zone M-TSA and are proposed for downtown Milwaukie. This is a new definition to clarify what live/work units are and how they are expected to function.
- Mixed Use: This term is used throughout the zoning ordinance, but is not defined.
- Office: Two new types of offices are proposed for downtown Milwaukie – "Production-related office" and "Traditional office." These terms are defined and distinguished from "Professional and administrative office." Traditional office uses are intended to be more customer-oriented and are expected to generate foot traffic, while production-related office are expected to be less service-oriented and to generate less foot traffic.
- Porch: This term is used throughout the zoning ordinance, but is not defined.

### **Changes Affecting All Downtown Commercial Properties**

Key proposals include the following:

- Combining 4 commercial zones (Downtown Commercial DC; Downtown Residential DR; Downtown Storefront DS; and Downtown Office DO) into one Downtown Mixed Use Zone DMU with consistent use, development, and design standards. See *Attachment 3 pages 19-20*.
- Allowance for a more streamlined review process that allows the alteration or expansion of a nonconforming use, structure, or development that brings the nonconformity closer to compliance to be reviewed through Type II rather than Type III land use review. An example of a project that would have been able to utilize a more streamlined review process is the veterinary clinic on Main St. See *Attachment 3 page 21*.
- Reformatted table of allowed uses that includes cross-references to other applicable standards. See *Attachment 3 pages 21-25*.
- Revisions to permitted uses:
  - New parking facilities (such as structured parking) are currently permitted outright in downtown; the revisions would require Type III Conditional Use review. See *Attachment 3 page 24*.

- Standalone multifamily development is currently permitted only in the existing Downtown Residential Zone DR (north of North Main Village and east of Main St; on the current Milwaukie Lumber site). It is proposed to be permitted throughout downtown.
- Increase in the maximum size for Day Care uses from 3,000 sf to 5,000 sf.

*See Attachment 3 pages 21-25.*

- Several new types of uses are added as permitted uses, including:
  - Live/work units. This proposal implements the SDCP idea of "shop houses" and small-scale businesses.
  - Distinct types of offices based on their customer base and foot traffic generation:
    - Traditional office
    - Production-related office
  - Indoor recreation. Currently, "commercial recreation" uses are permitted. Indoor recreation would allow a broader range of uses.
  - Boarding, lodging, or rooming house

*See Attachment 3 pages 21-25.*

- Retail use size restrictions are increased from 5,000 sf in some areas to 20,000 sf throughout downtown. Retail uses larger than 20,000 sf would require Type III Conditional Use approval. *See Attachment 3 page 25.*

### **Changes Affecting Main Street Properties**

- Ground floor residential uses are permitted throughout downtown, but those on Main St are limited to the area north of North Main Village. Rowhouses or live/work units would be permitted along McLoughlin Blvd, 21<sup>st</sup> Ave, and east/west streets. *See Attachment 3 pages 25 and 27.*
- Live/work units are not permitted on Main St, but are permitted on other streets in downtown. *See Attachment 3 page 25.*
- Production-related offices are not permitted on the ground floor along Main St; traditional office uses are permitted on the ground floor along Main St. *See Attachment 3 page 25.*

## **KEY ISSUES**

### **Summary**

The following key issues have been identified for the Planning Commission's deliberation. During worksession discussions leading up to the hearings on this proposal, the Planning Commission reviewed the draft amendments and provided direction to staff regarding potential revisions. Staff has highlighted policy choices as key issues on which Commission direction is being requested.

- A. Should size limits apply to all uses, not just retail?
- B. Should production-related office uses be prohibited on the ground floor in all of downtown, instead of just Main St?

## Analysis

### A. Should size limits apply to all uses, not just retail?

A key proposed amendment would limit the size of retail uses to 20,000 sf in area on the ground floor – approximately half of a downtown city block. Retail uses larger than 20,000 sf would require Type III Conditional Use review and approval by the Planning Commission. The intent of this limitation is to require large-format retailers, such as Walgreens or Target, to demonstrate the appropriateness of a large retail development in downtown as well as to allow community discussions about how any impacts should be mitigated.

Some members of the public have questioned whether all downtown uses should be limited in size. The advantage of this approach would be to encourage smaller-scale development; a disadvantage would be the creation of additional barriers for new development and difficulty enforcing size limits.

Staff is seeking Commission direction regarding size restrictions for new uses in downtown Milwaukee.

### B. Should production-related office uses be prohibited on the ground floor in all of downtown, instead of just Main St?

Currently, offices are prohibited on the ground floor of buildings fronting Main St. Current regulations require new buildings on Main St to include "flexible" ground floor spaces that can be converted to retail when the market supports it. The proposed amendments would allow "traditional office" uses on the ground floor of Main St, and both "traditional office" and "production-related offices" on the ground floor of buildings on other streets. Traditional office uses are intended to be more customer-oriented and are expected to generate foot traffic, while production-related office are expected to be less service-oriented and to generate less foot traffic.

Some members of the public have suggested that production-based offices be prohibited at the ground level of all buildings in downtown, rather than only those fronting Main St. Staff is seeking Commission direction regarding limitations on ground floor "production-related office" in downtown.

## CONCLUSIONS

### A. Staff recommendation to the Planning Commission is as follows:

Reach consensus on the recommended draft amendments and agreement on recommended actions in advance of the anticipated February 24, 2015, vote on the full amendment package.

## COMMENTS

See the January 13, 2015, staff report for a summary of comments received as of January 20, 2015. No additional comments have been received.

## ATTACHMENTS

Attachments are provided as indicated by the checked boxes. All material is available for viewing upon request.

	PC Packet	Public Copies	E- Packet
1. Evaluation of Framework Plan implementation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Key:

PC Packet = paper materials provided to Planning Commission 7 days prior to the hearing.

Public Copies = paper copies of the packet available for review at City facilities and at the Planning Commission meeting.

E-Packet = packet materials available online at <http://www.milwaukieoregon.gov/planning/planning-commission-119>.

ATTACHMENT 1

**Evaluation of Framework Plan & South Downtown Concept Plan Implementation  
File #CPA-14-02, ZA-14-02, Downtown Plan and Code Amendments**

Framework Plan Concept	Description	Implementing Regulations			Other Implementation
		Use Standards	Development Standards	Design Standards	
Anchors and Attractors	Anchors and attractors at either end of downtown generate pedestrian traffic and draw it along Main St.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Variety of housing uses permitted throughout downtown</li> <li>Ground-floor residential permitted on Main St north of North Main Village</li> <li>Mid-sized retail uses (including grocery stores), permitted throughout downtown</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Build-to lines along future public plaza and Adams Street Connector to activate public spaces</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Primary entrance requirements</li> <li>Ground floor transparency (windows and doors) requirements</li> <li>Weather protection</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Public Works Standards (pedestrian improvements)</li> </ul>
Main Street "Retail Spine"	Reestablish and strengthen a pedestrian-oriented and lively storefront retail character; establish a north-south flow of activity.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Office uses limited on the ground floor along Main St</li> <li>Flexible ground space requirements so Main Street spaces can easily be converted to retail</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Build-to lines and frontage occupancy requirements</li> <li>No parking lots permitted within 50 ft of Main St</li> <li>Non-residential uses exempt from off-street parking requirements</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Building façade design standards</li> <li>Ground floor transparency (windows and doors) requirements</li> <li>Weather protection</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Public Works Standards (pedestrian improvements)</li> </ul>
McLoughlin Blvd Commercial Corridor	Along McLoughlin Blvd, new buildings will provide a comfortable pedestrian environment while welcoming visitors to the riverfront into downtown.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Parking behind or beside buildings</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Non-residential uses exempt from off-street parking requirements</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Corner design requirements</li> <li>Weather protection</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Public Works Standards (pedestrian improvements)</li> </ul>

Framework Plan Concept	Description	Implementing Regulations			Other Implementation
		Use Standards	Development Standards	Design Standards	
21 <sup>st</sup> Ave Mixed Use Corridor	Establish a pedestrian environment that is pedestrian-friendly, vibrant, and attractive.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Combination of live/work units, residential, and mixed use development permitted</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Build-to lines and frontage occupancy requirements</li> <li>Non-residential uses exempt from off-street parking requirements to allow for consistent streetscape.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Building façade design standards</li> <li>Ground floor transparency (windows and doors) requirements</li> <li>Weather protection</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Public Works Standards (pedestrian improvements)</li> </ul>
Connecting to the River	Safe pedestrian and bicycle crossings between downtown and Riverfront Park and multiuse trails are important.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transportation System Plan</li> <li>Public Works Standards (pedestrian improvements)</li> </ul>
South Downtown Planning Area	South downtown contains an active, vibrant public plaza; the light rail station; the Adams Street Connector; and several natural areas.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Allow a broad range of commercial and residential uses in the station area, including retail, live/work, office, etc.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reduced minimum lot sizes</li> <li>Reduce maximum height</li> <li>Build-to lines along future public plaza and Adams Street Connector</li> <li>Non-residential uses exempt from off-street parking requirements to allow for consistent streetscape</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Expanded materials allowance</li> <li>Expanded applicability of ground floor transparency requirements</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transportation System Plan</li> <li>Public Works Standards (plaza and Adams Street Connector)</li> </ul>