

**CITY OF MILWAUKIE
DESIGN AND LANDMARKS COMMITTEE
NOTES
Milwaukie City Hall
10722 SE Main St
Monday, December 4, 2017
6:30 PM**

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT

Michael Corrente, Vice Chair
Cynthia Schuster
Mary Neustadter
Kyle Simukka

MEMBERS ABSENT

Lauren Loosveldt, Chair

STAFF PRESENT

Brett Kelter, Associate Planner (staff liaison)
Vera Koliass, Associate Planner

OTHERS PRESENT

Andrew Tull, 3J Consulting
Matt Jacoby, BRIC Architecture
Gordon Odette, Heery International
Marc Bargenda, Heery International

1.0 Call to Order – Procedural Matters

Vice Chair Michael Corrente called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

2.0 Design and Landmarks Committee Notes

2.1 November 13, 2017

Vice Chair Corrente called for any revisions to the notes from the November meeting. There were none and the notes were approved unanimously.

3.0 Information Items

Associate Planner Brett Kelter proposed shifting the debrief of the November 14 public hearing training to later in the meeting. **Committee Member Cynthia Schuster** suggested instead that the item should be delayed until the next meeting so that Chair Loosveldt could participate—the group agreed.

4.0 Audience Participation – None

5.0 Public Meetings

5.1 Recommendation Hearing: Request to delete Milwaukie High School from the City's list of Historic Resources (land use master file #HR-2017-002)
Staff Person: Brett Kelter, Associate Planner

Mr. Kelter provided some background on the upcoming renovation of the Milwaukie High School campus, which is part of a larger package of improvements across the North Clackamas School District that were funded by a voter-approved bond measure in 2016. The project involves demolishing the old school building, which is locally designated as a historic property. He gave a simple explanation of the processes for demolishing an historic resource as well as for officially deleting one from the City's list. Essentially, the City's code requires a waiting period before demolishing the resource, to offer time and opportunity for someone to purchase and/or relocate the structure. If there appears to be a reasonable project to acquire the resource, the Planning Commission can suspend the demolition permit, but for no more than 120 days after the required public hearing—after that, the demolition may proceed.

A demolished resource remains on the City's list until it is removed through a process to amend the zoning map and applicable Comprehensive Plan map. In this case, because the expectation is that the building will be demolished (i.e., the District will not sell the school property and the building cannot be easily or affordably moved), staff suggested that the applicant pursue the deletion process from the outset, to avoid a repetitive review for demolition. **Committee Member Kyle Simukka** asked about the significance of the school and whether there were options for including any noteworthy elements or commemoration in the new building. **Mr. Kelver** deferred those questions to the applicant team.

Representing the District, **Andrew Tull** (3J Consulting) explained that the District had contacted the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) to discuss the proposed demolition in advance of the bond measure. The project team had explored multiple alternatives to demolition and met with stakeholder groups to discuss the future of the school. Once the preferred option was confirmed, they went through the initial steps in the City's demolition request process, including listing the building for sale and relocation for almost 3 months (there were no responses).

For buildings in Oregon that are more than 50 years old, SHPO has a process for identifying options to mitigate any inadvertent impacts, such as by preserving significant elements where possible or documenting the historic aspects. To date, the findings of the process are confirmations (1) that the building is historic and noteworthy and (2) that its removal will have a significant impact to the property. The consulting architect and the District are developing a Memorandum of Agreement that will formalize the agreed-upon mitigation measures. Ideas include a thorough documentation of the exterior and interior of the building with digital photography, interpretive displays of physical history, and online materials and information. During the demolition itself, they will explore for any other artifacts and repurpose within the new building those that can be salvaged.

Matt Jacoby (BRIC Architecture) came forward to discuss the proposed design and layout of the new school building, referring to the images in a PowerPoint presentation as needed. He explained that the project team had explored a number of options for saving the building or at least some parts of it. Key factors in the determination that demolition was the most feasible alternative included the need for seismic upgrades, the presence of hazardous materials that could not be fully abated by remodeling, and low floor/ceiling heights dictated by existing structures and columns. He noted that the new building would have the same footprint as the old building; that the commons building would remain but be renovated; and that the performing arts building, gym, and grandstand by the athletic field would all remain as they are.

Mr. Jacoby explained that in fact very few of the original architectural features remain in the old school, as there have been many remodeling efforts over time. He indicated that the south entry maintains some of the original aspect and that they would try to reinstall it somewhere inside the new building as part of the mitigation discussed by Mr. Tull. **Vice Chair Corrente** asked whether the exterior of the old building was concrete—**Mr. Jacoby** responded that it was. **Vice Chair Corrente** suggested that some of the significant exterior features could perhaps be repurposed and used along a path or in planters outside.

Mr. Jacoby shared some of the other repurposing ideas the project team has been developing, including for using chunks of the existing wood columns in a display in the community room. He showed renderings of a possible "past-present-future" wall that would connect to the commons building. There could be a history wall inside the new building where artifacts would be displayed. Rather than attempting to display an artifact in every classroom, they were thinking of focusing on 3 to 5 display areas within the building.

Vice Chair Corrente noted that the existing building sits up prominently on a shelf, and he wondered whether the new building would be as visible. **Mr. Jacoby** explained that the new building will be a full 3 stories and thus a bit taller than the old building. **Committee Member Mary Neustadter** asked how long it would take to build the new structure—**Mr. Jacoby** responded that the construction would take approximately 2 years, plus site work. Noting that at least one of the large existing cedar trees in front of the old school would be cut down, **Vice Chair Corrente** asked whether any other trees would be removed. **Mr. Jacoby** indicated that some other smaller trees would likely be cleared out and that they were evaluating whether a large maple would remain near the southwest corner of the new building. He confirmed that the one large cedar was the most significant tree that would be removed. **Member Simukka** asked whether the wood from the big cedar tree would be repurposed for furniture or some other use on the site. **Mr. Jacoby** indicated that the wood would be available for reuse—it would likely be used for benches and perhaps other furniture and could be made available to local artists.

Member Neustadter asked who had been identified as stakeholders in the historic review process. **Mr. Tull** responded that a lot of the outreach had occurred prior to the bond's passage and that he was not sure about the exact list. But a lot of organizations had been contacted and notified about the project, including the Milwaukie Historical Society and all of the Milwaukie Neighborhood District Associations, and over 440 invitations were sent for the open house event held at the high school. **Member Neustadter** asked about any public outreach efforts conducted as part of the SHPO Memorandum of Agreement. **Mr. Tull** indicated that there had been no formal outreach related to the Memorandum of Agreement, that they had been focusing on the City's process related to Historic Resource demolition. **Member Neustadter** suggested that it would be nice to have a local entity such as the City or the Historical Society involved in the SHPO process, to establish some local buy-in and accountability regarding the agreed-upon mitigation measures.

Mr. Kelper asked whether there were any other comments or questions from the group, and he created a simple document to capture the Committee's essential recommendations on the project for the Planning Commission and City Council. **Member Schuster** noted that she wished the commons building was the one being demolished or significantly improved instead of the historic classroom building, as the commons building is not particularly appealing aesthetically and yet it will be tied in to the new structure. **Mr. Jacoby** reported that the District agrees that some minor improvements to the commons building are warranted and will likely be funded—exterior paint, new doors, and perhaps some new "skin" or a panel where the commons building meets the new building.

The list of essential recommendations from the Committee was determined to be as follows:

1. Include the City and/or the Milwaukie Historical Society as a consulting entity in the SHPO Memo of Agreement process, to have a local point of contact and local input as a stakeholder throughout the process.
2. Consider using some of the existing building features or elements for things like site walls, planting beds, gateway elements, etc.
3. Repurpose elements from the building and from other natural resources or elements from the site (especially the large cedar tree) for things such as furniture, benches, etc.
4. Take advantage of opportunities to improve the exterior of the commons building.

6.0 Worksession Items

- 6.1 Follow-up on design standards for North Milwaukie Industrial Area (NMIA)
Staff Person: Vera Kolias, Associate Planner

Associate Planner Vera Kolias reopened the discussion that was started at the November meeting regarding the proposed updates to the City's Comprehensive Plan and zoning code with respect to the North Milwaukie Industrial Area (NMIA). In advance of the upcoming Planning Commission discussion on December 12, she indicated that staff was focused on the proposed standards for key streets and wanted to see if the Committee had any other ideas. She reported that the Planning Director had liked the group's earlier suggestion to provide a discretionary option for glazing (e.g., allowing some of the required glazing percentage to be art or living walls).

Member Simukka asked whether reducing truck traffic on key streets was one of the goals of the NMIA project. **Ms. Kolias** said that reduced truck traffic might result as a by-product but that it was not a stated goal of the NMIA planning effort. **Member Schuster** suggested that the group look at the text of the proposed code and asked for a quick recap of the project, including the overall vision for what the area might look like. **Member Simukka** provided a summary of the project and noted the group's previous discussion about maximum setbacks, key streets, and improving aesthetics and safety. **Member Schuster** argued against providing a discretionary option for glazing because of the importance of windows along the key street frontages. With some discussion, the group agreed that a limit should be set on how much the required glazing could be reduced for alternatives like art, down to requiring a minimum of 20% actual glazing along key street frontages.

Member Neustadter noted the amount of parking currently provided along some of the key streets and wondered whether it was feasible to limit parking along those frontages. **Ms. Kolias** drew a distinction between on-street and off-street parking and clarified that the reorientation of off-street parking toward the sides and rear of key-street sites is most applicable for redevelopment situations and not for simple tenant improvements. **Member Schuster** suggested that front yard areas should not be 100% restricted from parking, as there may be requirements for accessibility to main building entrances—the group agreed.

The group discussed the list of commercial exterior building materials. **Vice Chair Corrente** questioned stucco as a primary material. **Member Schuster** wondered why concrete block (split-face finish) would be limited to an accent material and suggested making it a secondary material, while moving the glazed finish concrete block from secondary to accent material. There was some discussion of exterior insulation finishing system (EFIS), which is installed over concrete block, looks like stucco, and is currently listed in the code as a prohibited material. **Member Schuster** speculated that the current prohibition may be based on an early history of poor installation, which significantly reduced the material's performance. Current building codes have addressed the installation issues, and **Member Schuster** suggested that it could be an acceptable material.

Returning to the question of stucco as an acceptable material, the group discussed whether it should be dropped to a secondary or lower level. The consensus was that it could be acceptable and so should remain as a primary material. **Mr. Kelver** asked whether there were additional comments about any other proposed design standards. **Member Simukka** asked about weather protection and whether there was or should be a minimum clearance and/or uniform height for canopies; **Ms. Kolias** suggested that the variability of ground-floor heights might make minimum or uniform canopy height requirements impractical. **Mr. Kelver** asked whether there were any distinctions to be drawn between designs in the mixed-use and employment-focused portions of the NMIA; **Ms. Kolias** pointed out that, because industrial uses

could still be developed in the mixed-use area, it seemed difficult to establish distinct, workable design standards for the two subzones. **Member Schuster** suggested that establishing a minimum required first-floor height (13 or 14 ft, whatever it is in the downtown zones) would be a way to preserve the potential for new buildings in the mixed-use subzone to be usable for either industrial or mixed uses in the future.

Member Simukka asked about any standards for building lighting that would be provided along the key streets; **Ms. Koliias** agreed to raise the question with the Planning Commission. **Vice Chair Corrente** wondered whether the streetscape aspect of the NMIA plan had been adopted into the City's Public Works standards; **Ms. Koliias** reported that the adoption was in process and that the challenge was in getting the timelines for the two projects (updates to code/Comp Plan and Public Works standards) to mesh.

Mr. Kelper noted the late hour and confirmed that **Ms. Koliias** had captured the group's key suggestions to share with the Planning Commission at their December 12 meeting.

6.2 Downtown Design Guidelines Update, cont. (Session 22-a)
Staff Person: Brett Kelper, Associate Planner

The group again agreed to table the update work on the Downtown Design Guidelines (DDG) until the next meeting in January 2018.

7.0 Other Business/Updates – None

8.0 Design and Landmarks Committee Discussion Items – None

9.0 Forecast for Future Meetings:

Jan 8, 2018	Continue DDG Update work
Feb 5, 2018	TBD

Vice Chair Corrente adjourned the meeting at 8:28 p.m.



Lauren Loosveldt, Chair

Respectfully submitted,
Brett Kelper, Associate Planner