

**CITY OF MILWAUKIE
DESIGN AND LANDMARKS COMMITTEE
NOTES
Milwaukie City Hall
10722 SE Main St
Monday, March 5, 2018
6:30 PM**

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT

Lauren Loosveldt, Chair
Cynthia Schuster
Mary Neustadter
Kyle Simukka

MEMBERS ABSENT

None

STAFF PRESENT

Brett Kelper, Associate Planner (staff liaison)
Vera Kolias, Associate Planner
Leila Aman, Development Manager

OTHERS PRESENT

Scott Mannhard, Hacker Architects
Tyler Nishitani, Hacker Architects
Amy Winterowd, Plan B Consultancy
Evan Osterlund
Dennis Osterlund
Kathryn Krygier, North Clackamas Parks & Rec

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 5, 2018

Chair Loosveldt called for any revisions to the notes from the February meeting. There were none and the notes were approved unanimously.

3.0 Information Items – None

4.0 Audience Participation – None

5.0 Public Meetings

5.1 Recommendation Hearing: Downtown Design Review for Ledding Library renovation (land use master file #CSU-2018-002, with DR-2018-001)

Chair Loosveldt opened the public hearing for review of the proposed renovation of Ledding Library. The Committee is charged with making a recommendation to the Planning Commission about whether the proposal satisfies the approval criteria for projects that trigger downtown design review as outlined in Milwaukie Municipal Code (MMC) Section 19.907. **Associate Planner Brett Kelper** listed the code sections applicable to the proposal.

Associate Planner Vera Kolias gave the staff presentation, using slides to describe the proposal and outline the applicable criteria. The project represents a major modification to the library as a Community Service Use (CSU), which is a type of conditional use in the underlying zone. The CSU application is the master file for the project and the proposal includes a modification of the off-street parking requirement, though the Committee is not responsible for a recommendation on either the CSU or parking aspects. The focus of the Committee's review and recommendation is the design review application, which will be provided to the Planning

Commission as part of their consideration of the overall proposal at a public hearing scheduled for April 10.

Ms. Kolias identified two key questions for the Committee's consideration: (1) does the proposed design meet the downtown site and building design standards? and (2) does the proposed design sufficiently address the Downtown Design Guidelines? She noted several aspects of the proposed new building that did not meet the prescribed design standards (Subsection 19.508.4 of the zoning code), which was what led the application into the discretionary design review process and involved the Committee. In particular, the proposed design did not meet some of the design standards related to horizontal building façade, weather protection, ground-floor wall openings, ground-floor windows, and roofs.

Ms. Kolias elaborated on the details of each noncompliant design aspect. She related them to each of the five guideline elements—Milwaukie Character, Pedestrian Emphasis, Architecture, Lighting, and Signs—and described the design features that staff believed made the proposal consistent with the applicable design guidelines. Within the context of the overarching question of whether the Committee thought the design review portion of the land use application should be approved was a question about the proposal to use a more contemporary design for site lighting and parking lot lighting instead of the ornamental style recommended in the guidelines.

Chair Loosveldt called for questions from the group for Ms. Kolas. She asked someone to point out the locations of the lighting poles on the site plan. **Member Mary Neustadter** noted that the library building is considered a “contributing” resource by the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) and so there should be SHPO involvement in the (pre-)demolition process.

Scott Mannhard and **Tyler Nishitani** of Hacker Architects gave the applicant presentation, walking through the overall design and explaining the decisions behind various features. They noted the unique setting of this downtown site next to a natural area and described the various challenges involved—a 1-story replacement building, Spring Creek, mature trees, the amount of off-street parking desired, etc. A canopy over a wide walkway would lead to a single entry point that would lead past a community room into a central area providing views into both the adult and children's sections. The design would preserve and give space to the very large oak tree in the southeast corner of the site and would relocate the existing sculpture-fountain in the southwest corner of the site to the north side of the new building. In response to a question from Chair Loosveldt, **Mr. Mannhard** noted that the roof material was a light grey membrane that was very flexible and would work well with the proposed undulating roof design.

Mr. Mannhard touched on the five points where the proposal fell short of the design standards and explained the rationale behind the team's decisions. Along the west elevation, where the eastern half of the façade goes more than 150 ft horizontally without a significant break, the design acknowledges the storage and utility functions inside that portion of the building. The proposed canopy provides a more generous overhang than the 6-ft maximum width normally allowed over the primary walkway. Window openings on the western elevation are only approximately 20% of the total façade instead of the minimum required 40%, but the result is more privacy for the adjacent residences in the North Main Village development and is balanced by much higher window percentages on other building elevations. The existing grade drop at the southern part of the site, together with the need to maintain an ADA-accessible slope on the walkway to the main entrance, results in window sills being more than the maximum allowed 30 in above grade. And by eliminating the required cornice or parapet feature, the proposed design more readily allows for the placement of photovoltaic solar panels on the roof.

Chair Loosveldt asked whether the solar panels would be visible from Harrison St—the applicant team was not sure. She asked whether the existing trees would continue to thrive with

the new building located so close and how many of the trees would be protected. **Mr. Nishitani** explained that many of the oaks along the east side of the new building would remain, while a few existing beech trees near the current building and some other existing intermediate vegetation would be removed. He noted that they would identify significant roots of the largest oak and modify the building footings to avoid impacting them. Significant roots would continue to receive air and water even where under the building, though it was likely the tree would develop additional roots to accommodate. **Member Kyle Simukka** asked whether the proposed stormwater management system would retain more water than would be healthy for the remaining trees; **Mr. Mannhard** replied that the site soils were not suitable for significant infiltration, so concentrated stormwater would simply be detained and then overflow into the City's storm system as needed, without overcharging tree root zones.

Chair Loosveldt asked about the decision to demolish the existing building and how much of it would be recovered. **Mr. Nishitani** explained that seismic considerations were a big issue and that the building's mechanical, electrical, and plumbing systems were also at the end of their useful lives. Very little would be saved from the original building. **Member Neustadter** asked whether it would be possible to add on to the new building in the future. **Mr. Nishitani** explained that the library working group had determined that, especially given the site constraints, it would be more practical to establish a branch library in another location in the future than to spend additional money now to construct a building that could be added on to (where experience shows that to be an unlikely outcome).

Member Cynthia Schuster asked about the plan for improvements along Harrison St (e.g., sidewalks, lighting, street trees). She thought it was a good location for street lighting and that it would make sense to have any lights there be consistent with the ornamental style. **Mr. Kelver** clarified that any improvements in the public right-of-way would meet the City's Public Works Standards. **Ms. Kalias** noted a capital improvement project planned to construct frontage improvements on Harrison St, independent of the library project.

Member Schuster asked about the width of the sidewalk at the northwest portion of the site, where people would be pulled in from the parking lot. **Mr. Nishitani** confirmed the sidewalk would be 8 ft wide, with wheelstops to prevent vehicles from overhanging the walkway. **Chair Loosveldt** asked whether there would be a walkway along the east side of the building and around the large oak tree. **Mr. Nishitani** said they were not currently proposing a walkway in that location. **Member Schuster** asked how stormwater was being collected from the roof. **Mr. Mannhard** explained that drains and downspouts would convey water that would daylight into the stormwater planters, and **Mr. Nishitani** confirmed that gutters would be integrated into the roof design, with no water sheeting off the roof.

Chair Loosveldt thanked the applicants for their presentation and turned the group's discussion to the key issues raised by staff, working through them one by one. With respect to the design standard for horizontal building façade, she noted that the main entry is at the 150-ft mark from the front of the building and provided some effective shadowlines, which she felt met the intent of the design standard. **Members Schuster** and **Simukka** agreed; **Member Neustadter** did not like the relatively featureless left-hand side of the west elevation but was ok with the design in general.

Regarding the weather protection standard and the wider-than-6-ft canopy over the walkway, **Member Schuster** thought it was appropriate and provided a good connection to Harrison St. **Member Simukka** agreed and noted that the wider canopy provided welcome coverage for the book drop and bicycle parking. **Chair Loosveldt** also liked the wider overhang but was concerned that it did not extend farther to the north to provide coverage for people coming from that part of the parking lot. She noted that hers was not a significant concern. **Member**

Neustadter agreed with Chair Loosveldt and confirmed that hers, too, was only a minor concern.

In relation to the design standard for ground-floor wall openings, **Chair Loosveldt** focused first on the west elevation (only 20% openings instead of the minimum 40%) and suggested there may be ways to achieve greater transparency on the northern-most side of that façade, using different materials to break up the wall, or somehow opening the northwest corner of the building (children's reading area) to be more café-style like the southwest corner. She was concerned about the pedestrian experience along that northern portion of the western façade. **Member Simukka** agreed, and echoed the thought that it would be good to copy the southwest corner at the northwest corner, making a pitch for more transparency along that façade. **Member Neustadter** agreed, as did **Member Schuster**, who suggested there may be ways to use screening to minimize solar gain. **Chair Loosveldt** suggested the applicant consider additional glazing, or find ways to focus the transparency, or use material changes within their design pallet to break up the west elevation wall. She suggested opening the northwest corner along the west wall up to the point where the back-of-house functions begin, trying to get to at least 25-30% openings there.

Considering the south elevation (approximately 35% openings), **Chair Loosveldt** thought the design was reasonable; the other members agreed.

On the question of the bottom edge of some windows being more than 30 in above grade, **Member Schuster** suggested that this particular design standard is more meaningful on Main St and noted that there were grade issues to contend with. She thought the design was fine in this regard; the other members agreed.

Regarding the lack of a cornice or parapet on the roof, **Chair Loosveldt** suggested that the intent of the standard seemed to come most into play at the points where the undulating roof dips down, such as at the northwest corner for the children's storytime space. **Member Schuster** suggested that the applicant team consider presenting the Planning Commission with a view that shows the perspective from a height of 5 to 6 ft above grade instead of the second-story type of view they showed the Committee. That would make it easier to assess the effect of having no parapet from the pedestrian level. **Chair Loosveldt** noted how much of the roof will be viewable when one is east of the new building and traveling west down the hill on Harrison St. She asked how the roof would be cleaned or maintained. **Mr. Nishitani** was not sure of a specific method or schedule for cleaning but noted that the roof would be accessible for cleaning and maintenance. **Chair Loosveldt** clarified that she is not significantly concerned about this issue and thought that the proposed roof design is a good direction. **Member Neustadter** said she liked the roof, and the other members agreed.

Before tackling the key question on lighting, **Chair Loosveldt** asked whether the members had any questions or comments on the design guidelines in general. She returned to the issue of the northern third of the west elevation of the new building, noting the lack of relief for a pedestrian on the sidewalk adjacent to the blank wall. She described this as her largest area of concern for the whole project. Without landscaping, cover, or transparency, it was not a welcoming environment for pedestrians where there would be a significant level of pedestrian activity. She asked whether the design team had considered adding landscape buffering along the sidewalk. **Mr. Mannhard** explained that there was not much room to work with between the parking area and the building, and the design had prioritized a wider walkway over landscaping. The design did not open up the northwest corner with additional glazing in order to minimize distractions in the children's reading room adjacent to the parking area (headlights, pedestrian traffic, etc.). **Chair Loosveldt** maintained that even a sliver of landscaping would provide some visual relief for a pedestrian in the environment between the parking area and the blank building façade.

She suggested a recommendation to the Planning Commission that the blank portion of the west elevation façade be looked at more closely, to consider requiring something to provide relief for the pedestrian, whether with a landscape strip or by pulling the building back a bit from the walkway or increasing the transparency. **Member Schuster** wondered whether there was an opportunity to do something along the edge there, to tie in somehow to the relocated fountain or extend a water feature alongside the walkway, like at the Armory in downtown Portland.

With regard to building signage, **Chair Loosveldt** appreciated the perspective of the proposed signage from Harrison St but wondered if a better indication of signage could be given from 21st Ave. **Mr. Mannhard** clarified that the proposed sign is not actually on the building face, it was a freestanding monument sign and would be in front of the café-style window in the southwest corner of the new building. **Mr. Nishitani** added that there had been extensive discussion about the sign and the team had landed on the proposed design and location in part because the sign would be clearly visible from most perspectives. **Member Simukka** asked whether the new sign would be lighted—**Mr. Nishitani** responded that they intended to provide lighting but had not gotten that far into figuring out that particular detail of the sign. **Chair Loosveldt** suggested that the team develop an additional rendering or vantage point to more clearly show the Planning Commission the sign, and she recommended using lighting in the canopy or in the stormwater planter to provide some illumination for the sign.

Chair Loosveldt asked whether the rooftop solar panels would definitely be included as part of the project. **Mr. Nishitani** confirmed that the panels were definitely in (a State requirement) and would be in the location shown—only the size of the array was still in question. **Chair Loosveldt** asked whether there would be any public display of the power being generated by the panels, as an educational tool or publicity piece. **Mr. Mannhard** confirmed that there would certainly be an interpretive component to the panel array and that the details would be worked out farther along in the process. **Chair Loosveldt** noted that the new building would be one of the highest performing sustainable buildings in the downtown core and that it would be great to highlight that somehow.

Member Neustadter asked about any public art aspects of the project, inside or outside the new building. **Mr. Nishitani** responded that they were still very early in the process of integrating art into the project, though they had someone working on a request for qualifications from artists and they had been asked to identify potential locations both inside and outside for public art. **Member Neustadter** asked whether there would be an opportunity for public involvement in the art-selection process, and **Chair Loosveldt** noted that the library working group included members of the public. **Mr. Nishitani** indicated that there would be a series of community meetings where the art aspect could be addressed, although the specific art-selection process was not yet known. **Mr. Mannhard** emphasized that there was money set aside for public art in this project, so it would not be a casualty of a project budget shortfall.

Finally, with respect to the lighting question about whether a contemporary style would be allowable, **Member Schuster** observed that a lot of cities were looking for dark-sky options for lighting and that there were some dark-sky modifications that could be made to the traditional ornamental, globe-style fixtures prescribed by the guidelines. She noted that the dark-sky options tended to have lower outputs and might work well on narrow streets but might not work as well for area lighting or for parking lots. She wondered whether the team had looked at dark-sky options for the traditional lights and whether they had any photometrics for the lights they were proposing. **Mr. Mannhard** confirmed that the civil engineer and lighting designer on their team had provided recommendations about placement and type of fixtures to ensure that the site was adequately lighted for safety. **Member Schuster** liked the way the contemporary fixtures matched the colonnade on the new building and thought it was fine to vary from the prescribed

ornamental style because the proposed lights matched the building design, but she was concerned that they may not provide adequate lighting, especially for the sidewalk at the northwest corner of the building. **Chair Loosveldt** suggested that the team provide the Planning Commission with the photometrics and perhaps a better view or rendering of the fixtures with respect to the building.

Member Simukka expressed a reservation about setting a precedent for future projects to propose their own lighting styles instead of using the prescribed ornamental fixtures, in terms of consistency. That said, he appreciated the need to innovate and improve lighting systems in the city. **Chair Loosveldt** suggested that a solution might be to utilize both types of fixtures, with an ornamental fixture closer to Harrison St (perhaps with another ornamental fixture close to the oak tree) and contemporary fixtures farther into the site (in the parking area). She agreed with Member Schuster's statement that 21st Ave did not feel much like a street and that the contemporary fixtures were more allowable beyond the "threshold" of the site at Harrison St. **Member Schuster** clarified that it might make sense to maintain the ornamental fixture already in place near Harrison St.

Member Simukka asked whether the new light color (output) would match that of the existing ornamental lights; **Mr. Nishitani** confirmed they could ensure that the colors matched for consistency. **Ms. Kolia** noted that the City's Public Works Department is coordinating with PGE to convert the existing ornamental lights to LED bulbs and with the dark-sky nightcaps. **Member Schuster** specified her suggestion to maintain the existing ornamental light near Harrison St but to relocate it into the public right-of-way if necessary, to make it part of the lighting system that would be maintained by the City instead of a responsibility of the library site. **Development Manager Leila Aman** informed the group that, since the library since is a City property, Public Works staff would be maintaining the lights on the library site and would be working with PGE to ensure that all lights were up to the "Schedule A" standard. **Chair Loosveldt** reiterated the group's recommendation that the existing ornamental light near Harrison St be retained and that the lights more internal to the site be allowed to be the contemporary style. The other members concurred.

Chair Loosveldt thanked the applicant team for its effort on the design. She asked whether anyone else at the meeting wanted to present testimony—two gentlemen said they were neighboring property owners to the east and were very interested in the project but had no comments. **Chair Loosveldt** asked staff to summarize the group's recommendations. **Ms. Kolia** began her summary for the Planning Commission with the note that the group was comfortable with the staff report and recommendations with respect to the project's compliance with the design standards and applicable design guidelines, except where the northern third of the west elevation façade was concerned. Recommendations from the group included revising the design to increase the percentage of opening on that façade by treating the northwest corner like the southwest corner, opening it up or creating more breaks by using glass, spandrel glass, art, screens, or other materials to increase the percentage of openness to a minimum of 25%. With respect to the question on light fixtures, the group was comfortable recommending the contemporary fixtures where more internal to the site but that the existing ornamental fixture should be retained near Harrison St, where it would tie in with the prescribed design for public improvements.

Chair Loosveldt confirmed that, if the group's recommendations were followed for the northern third of the west façade, the concerns expressed about the design guidelines in general (with respect to the pedestrian environment along that section of the building) would be sufficiently addressed. She reiterated that the group's other suggestions about the applicant team's presentation included providing a rendering of the pole fixtures and their photometrics, plus an

additional rendering to more clearly show the sign when looking east. With that, she thanked everyone and closed the design review portion of the meeting.

6.0 Worksession Items

- 6.1 Downtown Design Guidelines Update, cont. (Session 24)
Staff Person: Brett Kever, Associate Planner

Mr. Kever informed the group that a contract was being developed with SERA Architects to work with the Committee on the update of the Downtown Design Guidelines. **Chair Loosveldt** expressed concern about the selection, given the group's recent experience with SERA in the design review for the Guardian project and the perceived difficulty the SERA team had in responding to the City's design guidelines. **Mr. Kever** noted that they had needed to move quickly to identify potential consultants and that the nature of the update project was very different than a submittal for design review. The SERA team that would be working with the group was also different from the team that worked on the Guardian project. **Chair Loosveldt** suggested talking to a couple of other firms, like Hacker or LRS Architects (the firm that Member Schuster works for), to see how they might respond to the proposed scope of work. **Mr. Kever** agreed to talk further with the Planning Director about options at this point.

Mr. Kever noted that, regardless of which firm they ended up working with, the short timeline for the project meant that the group might need to be flexible in its scheduling of meetings between now and June 30. It seemed likely that two-hour meetings would be necessary to make the most use of the time, and the group members indicated willingness to meet longer if needed. **Member Simukka** suggested that if the meetings started any earlier it would be good to have some food or nourishment due to the conflict with a normal dinner time.

7.0 Other Business/Updates

- 7.1 Election of Vice Chair

Mr. Kever reminded the group of the need to elect a new Vice Chair. **Chair Loosveldt** called for nominations or volunteers. **Member Schuster** agreed to serve if others agreed, and the group affirmed her as the new Vice Chair.

8.0 Design and Landmarks Committee Discussion Items – None

9.0 Forecast for Future Meetings:

- | | |
|---------------|--|
| April 2, 2018 | Kickoff of DDG Assessment project with SERA Architects |
| TBD | Meeting schedule for May-June to be determined |

Chair Loosveldt adjourned the meeting at 9:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Brett Kever, Associate Planner



Lauren Loosveldt, Chair