



CITY OF MILWAUKIE

PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

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

February 23, 2021

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

Staff: Laura Weigel, Planning Manager
Vera Kolias, Senior Planner
Justin Gericke, City Attorney

(00:00:06)

1.0 Call to Order – Procedural Matters*

Chair Loosveldt 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>.

(00:10:02)

2.0 Planning Commission Minutes

2.1 **Chair Loosveldt** asked the Commission, did anyone have any corrections or suggestions to the December 8th, 2020 meeting minutes?

Commissioner Hemer shared on page 22, his name was spelled incorrectly.

Commissioner Hemer recommended that the Commission approve the minutes as amended from December 8, 2020. Commissioner Massey seconded the motion. The Commission approved the motion.

(00:12:18)

3.0 Information Items

Laura Weigel, Planning Manager shared, the Waverly PD hearing was rescheduled to March 2nd due to the snowstorm.

(00:12:58)

4.0 Audience Participation

Renee Coburn shared, the zoom link was improperly working and individuals were probably having a difficult time joining the meeting.

Chair Loosveldt responded that staff would work on that.

(00:14:12)

5.0 Work Session Items

(00:14:12)

5.1 Comprehensive Plan Implementation Project Update - Code Concepts

Vera Kolas, Senior Planner presented an update of the Comprehensive Plan Implementation Project. The goals of the project were to increase supply of middle housing, increase the tree canopy, preserve existing trees, and manage parking to enable middle housing. The projected outcomes were aligned with the City's Comprehensive Plan and in compliance with House Bill (HB) 2001. A key idea from the Comprehensive Plan Implementation Committee (CPIC) was a livability code, which was intentionally designed to provide more housing choice, maximize trees, minimize on-site pavement, and focus on the form of dwelling units rather than density. A form based code approach was not new to the city. The code already has form based elements when reviewing residential development. This included lot coverage, side yard height plane, minimum setbacks, and maximum height. The City wanted to continue this approach as it amended the housing types that were permitted throughout the city. There were six types of code amendments introduced at that point, which included simplifying the number of residential zones, selective/location bonuses for duplexes, adopting a form based approach, amending on-site parking requirements, establishing a guide or menu for standards, and adopting a tree code for residential property. The overall goal was to allow more housing types in all residential zones. Housing types may be determined based on a lot's size and not its zone. A triplex and quadplex may be allowed on a lot that was zoned as a single family residential zone. The setbacks, building height, and other requirements were being reviewed. The goal of HB 2001 was to allow more housing types in all zones. The CPIC discussed possible residential zoning options, which were no changes (currently there are 8 residential zone), 3 zones (large lot, medium lot, and small lot), or 1 zone (housing type regulated by minimum lot size only). HB 2001 includes specific parking requirements for middle housing. The amendments to the code include additional options such as: requiring 1 parking space per dwelling and amending where the space could be located, allowing on-street parking to count toward minimum requirement, or require no minimum parking and only regulate parking maximums, or allow higher maximums due to street conditions. The goal was to provide more flexibility. The CPIC would meet on February 25th to these discuss code concepts. The consultant and staff were working together to refine code concepts, continue planning public engagement efforts phase #2, and

understand the results of the completed residential parking study. The plan for engagement included Engage Milwaukie, which hosted virtual gathering and survey. Several Meeting in a Box events were planned as well and were designed for NDAs and other smaller groups. Ms. Kolias presented the timeline of the project. She was scheduled to return to the Planning Commission on March 23, 2021 to share more updates and community engagement activities. Ms. Kolias completed her presentation and invited the Commissioners to share their thoughts and ask questions.

The group discussed the number of zones needed and new potential zoning requirements. **Commissioners Hemer and Massey** liked the idea of having one zone and wondered if that was possible. Overall, they were interested in housing development flexibility and ensuring there were rules about setbacks, heights, and other regulations. **Mr. Hemer** encouraged the Comprehensive Plan Implementation Project (CPIC) to evaluate the flag lot code because there was an opportunity to develop more housing depending on how the code was amended. **Ms. Kolias** shared, CPIC would be reviewing the flag lot code. **Commissioner Edge** shared, the policy was more concerned with lot coverage instead of lot size. Many of the lots in Residential R-10 were required to have less lot coverage due to its location near a natural resource. However, in Residential R-5 or Residential R-3 owners were allowed to have more lot coverage. This was more about safety and ensuring we were responding to the natural resources and hazards near any lots. Another question **Commissioner Edge** proposed, was how much open space the community and city wanted to preserve. Lastly, he shared that we needed to be explicit of our goals for the zones and regulate that. **Commissioner Khosroabadi** wondered, if developers did not meet the open space requirement could we require them to build a greener building as a tradeoff. Maybe climate friendly materials needed to be a requirement instead of an incentive. **Commissioner Sherman** wondered, if all of the residential zones could be one zone. This allowed for three zones, which were residential, commercial, and industrial. He wanted the Committee and City to be thoughtful as they amended the code and applied lot coverage standards. **Commissioner Hemer** stated, he wanted to highly protect and not allow any development in our wildlife habitat corridors, riverways, and natural hazardous areas. **Commissioner Erdt** wondered, how a zone change may affect the noise ordinance and if the noise ordinance was based on each zone. Based on her communication with the public, she understood noise control regulations were based on the various zones. **Commissioner Khosroabadi** mentioned, the importance of considering building materials as we amended the zones. He liked the idea of three zones and having some flexibility. He saw this as an opportunity to drive some economic growth.

The group discussed parking. **Commissioner Massey** asked if one parking space per unit meant a dwelling unit was only allowed one parking space. **Ms. Kolias** responded, that was a possibility for a minimum or maximum parking requirement. The goal was to offer the same regulations for a single unit and middle housing, as well as, allow for some flexibility. **Commissioner Edge** shared, he wondered about considering on-street parking as option

due to the conditions of the curbs and streets. If the amended policy allowed on-street parking maybe the owner needed to have a curb, it needed to be formalized, or established as a permanent permit parking district. He wanted to ensure parking was available. **Commissioner Sherman** added, a conversation about parking permits and districts were useful and needed to connect to our climate goals. He wanted the committee to consider electrical vehicle chargers. The research stated individuals were charging their cars at their home and place of work. He suggested that if the one parking spot was going to be onsite, the owner needed to think about implementing the infrastructure for an electric vehicle. It was cheaper to do it now than wait 5 to 10 years from now. **Commissioner Hemer** agreed they needed to plan for electric vehicles and he was concerned about cords in the streets. **Commissioner Erdt** shared, most of the population were projected to have a subscription to a self-driving car in the next 20 – 25 years. This meant a homeowner would not need a charging station. She believed we should factor that in when discussing and planning for parking and charging stations.

Commissioner Hemer shared, the group needed to let the market determine what was built. The market determined development and housing types not a mandate by the city or desires of the developer. The developer responded to the market. The lot size didn't matter as much. This also allowed for more buildings on various lots. He also wondered if there was an opportunity for developers to receive a bonus or SDCs fee waiver for proposing projects that were not in a hazardous, wildlife habitat corridors, or riverways areas. He also wondered if the bonus or waiver could be applied towards small or affordable housing. **Commissioner Erdt** agreed with a program incentivizing developers. **Commissioner Khosroabadi** shared, there were functional climate friendly materials available and as we consider incentivizing developers, building materials needed to be part of the conversation.

Commissioner Erdt wondered about the environmental impacts as they related to the percentage of tree canopy and different types of trees. She agreed with the intent of more tree canopy and trees and wondered about their impacts on a fire or snowstorm. During the recent snowstorm, there were branches everywhere and some caused property damage. She wanted the group to ensure people were protected as well. She also shared about the commercial industry in the city and wondered moving forward what the need for commercial spaces was. Since the pandemic, individuals were working from home and the function of businesses were changing. There were community members who were interested in renting commercial space, but the high cost of rent and finances were preventing them from doing so. She wanted to explore this further.

Chair Loosveldt concluded the discussion by hoping the CPIC and Planning Department were closely looking at precedent, case studies, where things had previously failed and succeeded, and using that information to proceed with what was currently happening and needed.

(01:06:45)

6.0 Planning Department Other Business/Updates

There were no updates.

(01:12:00)

7.0 Planning Commission Committee Updates and Discussion

Commissioner Hemer shared, the Blue Ribbon City Hall Committee had their final meeting on February 24th and soon they were sharing their recommendations with the City. He also shared, the Milwaukie History Society, City of Milwaukie, Facebook group Milwaukie Chit Chat, Ledding Library, and Willamette Falls studio were hosting a women's conversation about community on March 3rd at 6pm with prominent women from the community.

(01:12:00)

8.0 Forecast for Future Meetings

March 8, 2021	No agenda items are currently scheduled for this meeting.
March 23, 2021	1. Hillside Preliminary PD 2. Comprehensive Plan Implementation 3. Central Milwaukie Bikeways Connection
April 13, 2021	No agenda items are currently scheduled for this meeting.

Meeting adjourned at approximately 7:45 PM

Respectfully submitted,



N. Janine Gates