

**CITY OF MILWAUKIE
DESIGN AND LANDMARKS COMMITTEE**

NOTES

Milwaukie City Hall
10722 SE Harrison St
Monday, March 4, 2019
6:30 PM

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT

Lauren Loosveldt, Chair
Cynthia Schuster, Vice Chair
Brett Laurila
Kyle Simukka

MEMBERS ABSENT

Mary Neustadter

STAFF PRESENT

Brett Kelter, Associate Planner (staff liaison)

OTHERS PRESENT

Leila Aman, Development Manager
Sienna Shiga, Jones Architecture
Farid Bolouri, Black Rock, LLC
Angela Creais, Black Rock, LLC

1.0 Call to Order – Procedural Matters

Chair Lauren Loosveldt called the meeting to order at 6:31 p.m.

2.0 Design and Landmarks Committee Notes

2.1 February 4, 2019

Chair Loosveldt called for revisions to the notes; there were none, and the notes were approved unanimously.

3.0 Information Items – None

4.0 Audience Participation – None

5.0 Public Meetings – None

6.0 Worksession Items

6.1 Preliminary review of Coho Point design
Staff Person: Leila Aman, Development Manager

Associate Planner Brett Kelter opened the informal session on the proposed design for Coho Point, a development project on the City-owned property at 11100 SE McLoughlin Blvd (south side of Washington St between McLoughlin Blvd and Main St). He emphasized that this was a preliminary review, acknowledging that the committee had not yet seen the design and that this was intended to provide some helpful direction for the applicant team. An official Downtown Design Review application would be submitted and would include a formal hearing with the group. Noting that Chair Loosveldt would soon be leaving the committee and joining the Planning Commission, he suggested that she limit her participation to clarifying questions and encouraged her to declare this session as ex parte contact at a future Commission hearing. He reported that Planning Commission liaison Joseph Edge had asked earlier in the day about whether he should limit his own participation in the session, though a work-related conflict had ultimately kept him from the meeting. (Committee Member Mary Neustadter had previously announced that she would be absent from tonight's meeting.)

Mr. Kelter introduced Leila Aman, the City's Development Manager, for some background on the project. The site was formerly home of the Cash Spot (a long defunct pawnshop) and was now owned by the City. The City was working on a Development and Disposition Agreement to sell the property to a developer for a mixed-use building with housing that responds to the housing needs identified in a recent study. Other goals for the project include making it a green building to get a 5th story, creating a gateway to the city, engaging with the river and providing views, responding to the farmers market and plaza, and being sustainable. **Ms. Aman** and project architect **Sienna Shiga** walked through a slide presentation of the project. **Ms. Shiga** discussed the site constraints, explained the plan and program for the building, and presented the primary design concepts.

The site is in the Downtown Mixed Use (DMU) zone and has several constraints and challenges, including a 13-ft change in elevation from one side to another, the 100-year floodplain, and a designated natural resource area along Kellogg Creek. The project involves moving the floodplain with cut and fill to create a buildable area of approximately 33,500 sq ft. The proposed 5-story building would use allowed bonuses for residential and green building development to get 2 additional stories beyond the 3 stories allowed outright in that part of the DMU zone. Parking would be provided primarily on a basement level with access from Washington St. Three retail tenant spaces would be provided along the Main St frontage, with active corners at the north and south ends of the Main St frontage, including the residential lobby at the southeast corner. A pedestrian path would connect the Adams St part of the south downtown area to McLoughlin Blvd.

With respect to design, the building would present pedestrian-scale elements along Main St, with varying height canopies, signage, and lights to retain a small-scale feel. The building would have defined base, middle, and top sections, with vertical elements to relieve the façade length. An undulating roof would provide opportunities for solar panels.

The committee members asked questions and shared initial reactions to the preliminary design. **Committee Member Kyle Simukka** asked about the potential for having retail at the southeast corner of the building, to tie in with the farmers market and similar activities that would be happening in the plaza space in south downtown. **Committee Member Brett Laurila** asked about providing some retail space on the McLoughlin Blvd frontage, to utilize the pedestrian connection and eliminate dead space in that area. He believed the rest of McLoughlin Blvd would eventually redevelop, so he saw this as an opportunity to make a strong connection between McLoughlin and the south downtown area. **Vice Chair Cynthia Schuster** agreed that McLoughlin Blvd should be more activated and less of a "back door" for downtown. She would like to see a taller building that stepped down toward McLoughlin, allowing more of the units to have views of the river. **Mr. Simukka** asked for clarification about whether a pedestrian crossing over McLoughlin Blvd was an option being considered; staff noted that a planned crossing under the highway along Kellogg Cr had effectively replaced the overcrossing concept.

Chair Loosveldt praised the comprehensiveness of the presentation. Referencing the stated project goals, she had two thoughts or suggestions: (1) the proposed design did not yet provide a strong gateway aspect, especially at the pedestrian and transit level at the southwest corner of the site, though that area has a lot of potential to truly be an effective gateway; and (2) the applicant team should consider providing more specific information about how the building would meet the stated sustainability goal, to outline more clearly how the project would qualify for an additional story based on green building design, as not everyone in the community had bought in to the idea of more dense development downtown. She asked whether any traffic studies had been completed; **Ms. Shiga** explained that studies were currently underway.

Mr. Laurila suggested that flatwork at the southeast corner of the building could duplicate the features on the Adams St connector to strengthen the pedestrian connection. **Vice Chair**

Schuster asked about the goal for number of units to be provided; **Ms. Shiga** said it was just under 200. **Ms. Aman** added that the unit goal was a pro-forma or feasibility goal aimed at maximizing the use of the site. Hearing no other questions or comments, she thanked the group for their feedback and suggested the team might come back to the committee again before submitting the official land use application. **Mr. Kelter** noted that it might be helpful for the group to get a refresher on the current code and guidelines prior to that design review hearing, given how much they have been focused on developing new standards and criteria.

6.2 Downtown Design Review process (continued)
Staff Person: Brett Kelter, Associate Planner

Chair Loosveldt asked for a timeline on getting the new code adopted; **Mr. Kelter** did not have any information but promised to provide an update at the April meeting. **Chair Loosveldt** suggested the update include identification of critical milestones for the project as well as key changes in the code. She asked whether the consultant could do anything to help. **Mr. Laurila** agreed that it would be good to have a timeline that included a proposed date for adoption with target goals along the way, to implement some of the key decisions the group has made through its discussions. He suggested that the consultant could work on imagery while staff produced the text. **Mr. Kelter** agreed that this should be a focus for the April meeting and committed to talking beforehand with Planning Director Denny Egner about a timeline for drafts and adoption. The group expressed a strong interest in having Mr. Egner attend the next meeting.

The group turned its attention back to the draft document and list of outstanding questions.

H. Building Massing

- **Vice Chair Schuster** had sent a graphic to the group in advance of the meeting, and she suggested using it to beef up the Guidance section. **Chair Loosveldt** wondered whether the stair-step diagram was needed for the 1 or 2 properties near the Pietro's site.
- **Vice Chair Schuster** noted that it was important for people to be able to utilize renewable energy sources on their site. She suggested sharing the SolSmart information with the Coho Point design team, pulling some of the SolSmart material into the standards and potentially requiring a solar study of neighboring properties. **Chair Loosveldt** suggested that a separate design section on solar might be useful.

I. Weather Protection

- **Vice Chair Schuster** has long felt that this section was weak and found some information from San Francisco related to canopies and awnings; she wondered whether it could be used instead of rewriting the current language. She thought she had sent that via email to Mr. Kelter earlier, so he made a note to check.
- There was some discussion about whether the title of this section should be changed to "Canopies and Awnings," since weather protection seems to be incidental to the group's interest in these specific physical features.
- In Standard A-c, there was some discussion about how far over the sidewalk these features should be required to extend. Building codes set some requirements (potentially allowing an extension of only up to two-thirds of the sidewalk width), so it might be useful to refer to the applicable building code. There was a suggestion that it would be helpful to know all the different downtown sidewalk widths. There was a question about whether weather protection should be required at corners.

- The group discussed making a connection between the Minimum Frontage Occupancy diagram (the group's revised version) and different percentages of building frontage where canopy-type coverage was required. One suggestion was to require 70% canopy-type coverage where 90% frontage occupancy was required and to retain the current 50% coverage requirement along the 75% and 50% frontages.

The group agreed to focus the April 1 meeting on a timeline and plan for adopting some of the code changes discussed so far (including any changes that can be made more quickly), followed by discussion of the Green Building element and then the Rooftop Screening and Service Areas Screening elements if time allows.

7.0 Other Business/Updates – None

8.0 Design and Landmarks Committee Discussion Items – None

9.0 Forecast for Future Meetings

| | |
|----------------|--|
| April 1, 2019 | Regular meeting |
| April 30, 2019 | Annual volunteer appreciation dinner (at Milwaukie Center) |
| May 6, 2019 | Regular meeting |

Chair Loosveldt adjourned the meeting at 8:35 p.m.



Lauren Loosveldt, Chair

Respectfully submitted,
Brett Kelter, Associate Planner