



CITY OF MILWAUKIE

PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

City Hall Council Chambers
10722 SE Main Street
www.milwaukieoregon.gov

March 23, 2021

Present: Joseph Edge, Vice Chair
Amy Erdt
Greg Hemer
Adam Khosroabadi
Robert Massey
Jacob Sherman

Staff: Laura Weigel, Planning Manger
Vera Koliass, Senior Planner
Brett Kelter, Associate Planner
Steve Adams, City Engineer
Justin Gericke, City Attorney

Absent: Lauren Loosveldt, Chair

(00:13:58)

1.0 Call to Order – Procedural Matters*

Chair Massey called the meeting to order at 6:30 pm 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.milwaukieoregon.gov/meetings>.

(00:15:03)

2.0 Planning Commission Minutes

Commissioner Hemer had corrections to the minutes. Steve Adams was referred to as the City Attorney instead of City Engineer. On page 15, he was referring to tripping over chords. **Vice Chair Edge** had a correction under item 8.0, the Vice Chair's name needed to change to Edge.

Commissioner Sherman recommended approval that the commission approve the minutes as amended from January 12, 2021. Commissioner Hemer seconded the motion. The commission approved the motion.

(00:17:02)

3.0 Information Items

No information was presented for this portion of the meeting.

(00:17:12)

4.0 Audience Participation

Commissioner Hemer shared that Chair Loosveldt's video about the Comprehensive Plan was excellent and he enjoyed the message.

(00:18:34)

5.0 Public Hearings

(00:18:34)

5.1 Hillside Master Plan PD-2020-002

Vice Chair Edge shared, the purpose of the hearing was to request conditional approval of a preliminary development plan and program for a planned development on property located at 2889 SE Hillside Court.

Vera Kolas, Senior Planner shared the applicable provisions of the Municipal Code (MMC), which were:

- MMC 19.302: Medium and High Density Residential Zones
- Chapter 19.311: Plan Development Zone
- Chapter 19.505.3: Multi-family Housing
- Chapter 19.600: Off-Street Parking and Loading
- Chapter 19.700 Public Facility Improvements
- Chapter 19.902: Amendments to Maps and Ordinances
- Chapter 19.1006 Type III Review
- Chapter 12.16: Access Management

Kolas and **Steve Adams, City Engineer** presented the staff report. The subject property is zoned Residential R-3, which is a high density residential zone. The proposal was a mixed income multi-family community with 600 units (400 new units) on the property. In addition to the Hillside Manor units which will remain, there were currently 100 units on site that would be replaced and would be affordable to accommodate the individuals who were currently living onsite. The new buildings would consist of small commercial and office uses, affordable, and market rate housing. There would be a variety of housing choices, which included walk-up town homes and three- and four-story mixed income apartment buildings. The phasing included removing structures, demolition of existing roads, and removal or abandonment of the underground infrastructure. A new street grid and an infrastructure plan was proposed with the streets to be re-aligned. The plan included assisting current residents with relocation into one of the new units upon competition. The first phase anticipated the Housing Authority developing at least 100 replacement units that were projected to be leased to low income residents. The Applicant was seeking a rezoning and change to the Comprehensive Plan Designation in order to reach the density goals and include mixed-use development. The northern portion of the site was proposed as R-1 and Comprehensive Plan Designation of high density residential. The southern portion of the site was proposed at General Mixed Use (GMU) and had a Comprehensive Plan Designation of Town Center. This zoning change would be consistent with

the property directly to the south across Meek St. The applicant was requesting to use the Planned Development process, which allowed for adjustments in lot sizes, dimensions, and some development standards. The hearing was an approval in principle of the preliminary plan. Part of the review of this proposal will include a Transportation Facilities Review and understanding the needs of vehicles, cyclists, and pedestrians and whether transportation improvements are warranted. This applicant applied for a Type III Land Use review, which meant properties within 300 ft were notified of the hearing. If the Planning Commission approved the preliminary plan in principle, then the applicant would need to apply for a Type IV review process by submitting a final development plan, the proposed subdivision, and the other applicable reviews within 18 months of the approval. City Council will issue the final approval through a public hearing.

There were three key issues identified for discussion which were: the project's impacts on traffic, impacts on utilities, and if the development satisfied the provision of a Planned Development as described in MMC 19.311. **Adams** shared information about the Transportation Impact Study. During the study, the Engineering Department looked at ten intersections and there were two intersections that would experience sufficient traffic. One intersection that was mentioned was Meek St and 32nd Ave and the goal was to construct a left turn lane to mitigate traffic impacts for individuals who would travel northbound on 32nd Ave. There will be improvements to create a safer walking experience for pedestrians as well. The other intersection was Harrison and 42nd and it would fail whether this development was approved or not. The negative impacts the development would cause are at Meek St / 32nd Ave and the applicant will mitigate the problem by installing a turning lane.

Commissioner Hemer asked about the bicycle connection at 29th and Meek. The Applicant would be responsible for improving 29th up to the North property boundary. **Commissioner Sherman** asked, will there be a sidewalk, plants, and a bike lane on 32nd Ave? **Adams** responded, there would be a bus pickup zone, improved sidewalk, pavement for parallel parking, and a bike lane was not required. **Vice Chair Edge** and **Commissioner Sherman** asked, if a multi-use connection was possible without improving the full road. **Adams** responded, a multi-use street was a possibility and needed to be further explored.

Adams continued his presentation. He shared that all of the streets and the utilities in the area would be brand new with this development. The streets would align with 32nd Ave and the new development would not create a fire or water pressure issue according to the study's findings. **Vice Chair Edge** asked, the bus stop design called for a pull out on Dwyer and 32nd Ave and not the other stop that was about 500 feet to the North? **Adams** responded, the street was already wide enough for parallel parking.

Kolias shared the next key issue, pertaining to the preliminary planned development review. The applicant proposed a blended density on the site between the R-1 and GMU zones. The lower density units would be adjacent to the single unit dwelling neighborhood and the higher density proposed units would be near the GMU zone and the Murphy Site. Overall, 41% of the site would be open space and 29% tree canopy. There would be green building construction, which was a requirement. The proposal would be mixed income with units offered at rents affordable for people at 30% - 80% Area Median Income (AMI). Some modified development standards were sought including a 5 ft minimum setback, except where adjacent to the R - 7 zone. A 15 ft setback to the R-7 zone to the North would be maintained. The applicant would like to use metal panels and fiber cement siding as primary materials. Lastly, the applicant was seeking a parking modification, which included 0.82 parking spaces per unit (including on-street) and 375 bike parking spaces, which is less than the one bike per unit to encourage residents to use alternative modes of transportation. The site would have bike repair stations, an e-scooter program, and onsite coordinator to assist with accessing the various transportation options in the area and onsite. The approval criteria were compliance with 19.311 and other code requirements, including compatibility with surrounding area, and providing public benefit/amenities. The staff recommendation was for the Planning Commission to approve, in principle, the preliminary development plan and program. If the applicant received approval, by code they had to file a final development plan and program within 18 months. The 120-day deadline for the application was waived by the applicant.

The Commission further discussed transportation as it relates to the project. **Commissioner Sherman** asked, if the applicant planned to provide residents with any subsidized transit passes. **Kolias** replied, she was unsure and that was not something the applicant included in their application.

There was a discussion about the project's timeline. **Kolias** shared, the code allowed a seven-year construction period for the entirety of the project.

The applicant presented the project. The applicant shared that affordable housing was a need with 27% of Milwaukie residents being severely cost burdened and were paying more than 50% of their monthly income on rent. The applicant has spent a significant amount of time engaging with the public about their project dating back to July of 2018 and were still participating in public engagement. Their time moving forward was seeking final approval and confirmed that the three phases of the project would be completed within seven years. Due to the existing conditions of the site, the applicant determined a full redevelopment site was needed. The master plan included, 600 apartments, reintroduced the grid, contained a variety of housing options that were not on the site previously including, townhomes for families, walkup apartments, high density mix-used buildings that would be limited to 32nd Ave, and elevator/multi-story apartment buildings. There would be studios, one bedrooms, and two bedrooms for

families. The development will have a plethora of trees, including street trees and different species. The trees will be maintained by the City of Milwaukie. The Applicant informed the Planning Commission that there was an error in their application. They did not intend to create a bike lane on 32nd Ave. There will be sidewalks throughout the development to ensure residents have easy access to the other buildings and bus stops. There will be bike parking throughout the development, including inside and outside of the buildings. There will be drop off sites for ride share, such as Uber, Lyft, and etc. The applicant discussed there will be three the phasing of the project. Phase one includes selling Lot A for the capital improvements they needed to make to the site and allow flexibility for phases two and three. They were seeking parking reductions based on shared parking between the commercial and residential uses, exterior street parking, and nearby public transit. The Applicant believed, the requested zone changes were compatible with the neighborhood as they did not have one particular character.

The Planning Commission discussed the buildings' efficiencies.

Commissioner Khosroabadi asked if the applicant considered adding solar panels? **The applicant** responded, solar was an option that they were willing to consider. **Commissioner Sherman** asked about their plan for alternative options for stormwater and bio swales. **The applicant** responded, this was site dependent and based on City of Milwaukie's stormwater code. **Adams** shared, that the City of Milwaukie will adopt new stormwater standards in the near future.

The Planning Commission discussed transportation activities. **Commissioner Khosroabadi** asked, if the 375 bike parking was the cap? **The applicant** responded, it was the minimum and where they would like to start. If there was a need for more bike spaces, they were willing to add more. They were willing to consider subsidizing bus passes and needed to discuss this further with their current partners and TriMet. **Commissioner Sherman** shared, he was excited to hear about this and believed subsidized transit passes were probably more valuable than a scooter or bike share program.

Commissioner Khosroabadi asked, if their alternative transportation programs such as the bike parking, a transportation coordinator, and other activities were proposed for the parking reduction or something that would be implemented either way? The applicant responded, they offered the various transportation options to justify their request for a parking reduction.

Commissioner Massey shared, he hoped the bike plan on 29th Ave would be in place before the development is completed. He also asked the applicant to clarify if they were asking if the Commissioners wanted a bike path on 29th. **The applicant** responded, they were asking, if a vehicle connection was needed. They designed the street to only be a bike and pedestrian street. **Commissioner Massey** and **Vice Chair Edge** were happy to hear that. **Vice Chair Edge** asked, did the applicant consult TriMet regarding their pullout and other transportation activities that involve TriMet? **The applicant** responded, they coordinated with TriMet and shared their proposed development. They also discussed that the two bus stops on 32nd needed to be upgraded.

The Planning Commission discussed the zoning of the development and financing the project. There was a discussion about the GMU zone and the proposed PD overlay. **Commissioner Massey** suggested, the applicant needed to simplify their explanation regarding the financing of the project, especially when meeting with the public. **The applicant** agreed.

The Planning Commission discussed emergency access on the site. **Commissioner Khosroabadi** asked, with the increased density would the emergency agencies have the ability to serve the new residents? **Kolias** shared, Clackamas County Fire participated in the Pre-Application Conference and were aware of the project. **Adams** shared, the police were aware of the project and Providence Hospital across street.

Vice Chair Edge invited the public to testify.

Elvis Clarke shared, they were supportive of keeping 29th Ave for pedestrians and cyclists.

Kristine Ackerman asked, about the handicapped parking and/or access by TriMet LIFT program.

The applicant responded, all projects were required to meet the building codes for accessibility from the State of Oregon. There will be ADA parking. They were opened to having TriMet LIFT to assist their residents.

Irisa (last name unclear) testified, the plan looked misleading and wondered about the trees and parking structures. Both did not seem realistic. They also shared, the parking areas looked cramped and believed TriMet LIFT busses would need more space.

This concluded the public comments.

The **Commission** discussed the GMU Zone. **Commissioner Hemer** was interested in understanding how the businesses would impact traffic. **Kolias** responded, the updated zone must comply with the transportation planning rules for trip generation impact. **Commissioner Hemer** shared, the commercial business had the ability to positively impact the residents, Providence Hospital visitors, and other businesses in the area.

The group discussed the relocation criteria. **Vice Chair Edge** questioned, if they needed to include the relocation aspect of the proposed development in mind while deliberating. **Kolias** responded, the relocation

program is beyond the approval criteria. **Justin Gericke, City Attorney** agreed with Kolas and shared this was more of an internal process for the applicant and didn't have any implications in the land use context. **The applicant** shared, the relocation program was part of the HUD process and definitely would occur.

The group discussed the transportation activities on and near the site. **Commissioner Hemer** was concerned about parking. He was unsure if the residents would get rid of their cars. He believed the commute to Safeway was intense and residents may not be interested in using public transportation or walking to get their groceries. **Commissioner Sherman** would like the applicant to look closer at subsidized transit passes as part of the TDM. **Vice Chair Edge** shared that he wanted to see more transportation options that aligned with the Comprehensive Plan section 8.2.4.B. He asked the Commission if they were interested in approving with a condition. He wanted the applicant to revisit their transit bus stop location, as well as, design and collaborate with TriMet. The Commissioners agreed with and approved Vice Chair Edge's amendment.

The group discussed affordable housing. **Commissioner Massey** was excited about the increase in affordable housing units. **Commissioner Sherman** shared, affordable housing was needed and will meet the needs of our many individuals in our community.

The group discussed the Central Milwaukie Bikeways Concept Plan which intercepts with the project. There were three routes the Planning Department was discussing, which were base case from the transportation system plan, 32nd Ave, and Llewellyn St and 34th Ave. The group has conducted community engagement with property owners and business owners, community partners, and the general public.

Commissioner Sherman recommended to approve the preliminary development plan and program in principle with the added condition that the applicant consult with TriMet and implement best practices on the location and design of proposed bus stops, pullouts, and other transit services on the site. Commission Massey seconded the motion. The commission approved the motion.

(02:54:14)

6.0 Work Session Items

(02:54:14)

6.1 Central Milwaukie Bikeway Connection Update

Brett Kolver, Associate Planner and **Derek Abe, Consultant** with Alta Planning and Design shared an update on the Central Milwaukie Bikeway Connection project, following up on the last report to the Commission in December 2020. **Kolver** shared a slide presentation and pointed out some

of the key development sites (Hillside Manor, Murphy, Providence hospital, and Monroe Apartments) and main streets in the project area (32nd Ave, Harrison St, and Highway 224 and the railroad tracks). This project was a result of the Central Milwaukie Land Use and Transportation Plan, which identified the need to design a safe bikeway route connecting the southern end of 29th Ave with the Monroe St greenway. Although some of the responses to the public outreach effort included a call for a better route to downtown on Harrison St, that will be the focus of a different project. This project has looked at three routes, each with a different crossing of Harrison St—the Base Case option crosses Harrison St near the railroad tracks and 31st Ave; Option 1 crosses at the intersection with 32nd Ave; Option 2 crosses at 34th Ave.

Abe presented some of the technical analysis, which included the conceptual design report and the routes matrix options. The Llewellyn St and 34th Ave route (Option 2) had the best score across the board. The ranked measures included traffic safety, route comfort, route directness, access to destinations in the project area, alignment with development plans of key properties, feasibility, and cost. Alta Planning recommended Option 2. This route will be user friendly, especially for individuals who will be beginners in cycling or new to the area. Alta Planning also recommended a marked crossing at 34th Ave with a median and/or rectangular rapid flashing beacons. There could also be a relocation of the existing TriMet stop to provide better visibility of those who will use the bike route. There were also recommendations for traffic-calming features at other crossings on the bike route. The route would use the dead-end portion of 34th Ave south of Harrison St and a new pathway through the City's water-treatment facility site to continue the route through to connect with the Monroe greenway. The public responses also indicated a lot of interest in the Base Case, which the most direct route. The next steps included refining the draft report on the route options, solidifying a recommendation, and providing cost estimates for implementation. Staff would share a similar update with the City Council on April 6, hoping to bring the final concept plan forward for adoption in May.

The group discussed safety concerns regarding routes. **Commissioner Hemer** requested that the Planning Department or Alta consult with Clackamas Fire and the City of Milwaukie Police to ensure they can safely access 34th Ave with any new bulb-outs and/or median refuge island in place. **Commissioner Hemer** wondered about whether a new crosswalk would back up traffic, including near the railroad. **Abe** and **Kelver** shared that there would probably be a median and not a bulb-out. Also, there would be a conversation with Clackamas Fire and Milwaukie Police during the design phase.

Chair Massey asked about the Railroad/Oak/Monroe intersection and asked about the traffic control. **Kelver** shared that he believed the intersection may change with the Monroe Apartments development. **Chair Massey** asked, whether cyclists would have the right of way at the

intersection over the vehicles on Railroad and Monroe. **Kelver** and **Abe** shared that cyclists would not have the right of way beyond what happens in a regular marked crosswalk. **Adams** added that the area would be studied with the Monroe Greenway project and would not be improved based on the Monroe Apartments project. **Adams** shared, Clackamas County's Traffic Maintenance division would not be concerned about the 34th Ave crossing as it is 500 ft from the 32nd Ave intersection.

Commissioner Khosroabadi wanted to further discuss the route option on 32nd Ave (Option 1). **Kelver** responded that this route is very direct but was too narrow. It would not feel the safest because there was not any room for a bike path. **Abe** noted that the Option 1 route would be congested since there were currently a lot of vehicles moving through the 32nd/Harrison intersection and many unpredictable turning movements.

Commissioner Sherman commented that he wished more public engagement had been done with the current residents along 34th Ave, as they would be affected by Option 2. He appreciated the proposed safety improvements along the Option 2 route but wondered how they would be paid for, where it seemed much of the Base Case route would be paid for by the developer of the Murphy site. Any concessions made now that facilitate Murphy site development should be remembered when/if the developer asks for additional concessions in the future. **Kelver** clarified that Option 2 has much lower estimated costs than either of the other two routes, with several of the proposed improvements being ones that are needed regardless of the route chosen (e.g., a safe crossing of 32nd Ave at Meek St). He added that the report would encourage continued efforts to make the Base Case route happen over the longer term but that a more feasible alternative was needed in the more immediate term.

Adams shared that he did not believe the community would support a route that would go between buildings and the railroad tracks based on previous experience as the City Engineer. He added that ODOT-Rail has specific distances that a crossing must be from a railroad and that the tracks are too close to the 32nd/Harrison intersection to keep an enhanced pedestrian crossing near the tracks from significantly impacting the signal at that intersection. **Adams** noted that an undercrossing of Harrison St was not a realistic option (too many underground pipes in that location) and that an overcrossing would likely be more expensive than the cost of the rest of the entire bikeway route.

The group discussed financing the routes. **Commissioner Khosroabadi** was interested in exploring the Option 1 route, especially since the upcoming nearby developments would seem to provide an opportunity to make needed improvements to the 32nd/Harrison intersection. **Adams** responded that improving the intersection would cost over 1 million dollars.

Commissioner Edge noted that it would be nice to have the political will and finances to create the route that was most user-friendly and designed

to get people to the places they would be interested in traveling to, rather than winding around and away from key destinations. It would be ideal to be able to develop the Base Case route in the future as a type of "bike highway" option for commuters. In the meantime, he felt Option 2 was the most practical option and should be designed well as an intentional gateway to the Ardenwald neighborhood.

(03:50:04)

7.0 Planning Department Other Business/Updates

Laura Weigel, Planning Manger shared that the CPIC survey was on Engage Milwaukie. She encouraged the Commissioners to take the survey and requested Commissioner Erdt to post it on her Facebook group.

(03:52:12)

8.0 Planning Commission Committee Updates and Discussion

(03:52:23)

9.0 Forecast for Future Meetings

- | | |
|----------------|--|
| April 13, 2021 | 1. Milwaukie High School sign variance. |
| | 2. Providence Hospital Conditional Use |
| | 3. Worksession Item: Review Draft Comprehensive Plan |
| May 11, 2021 | CoHo presentation (tentative) |

Meeting adjourned at approximately 10:00 PM.

Respectfully submitted,



N. Janine Gates
Assistant Planner