

**CITY OF MILWAUKIE  
DESIGN AND LANDMARKS COMMITTEE  
NOTES**

**Milwaukie City Hall  
10722 SE Main St  
Monday, October 1, 2018  
6:30 PM**

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT**

Lauren Loosveldt, Chair  
Cynthia Schuster, Vice Chair  
Mary Neustadter  
Brett Laurila

**STAFF PRESENT**

Brett Kelper, Associate Planner (staff liaison)  
Vera Koliass, Associate Planner  
Leila Aman, Downtown Development Coordinator  
Damien Farwell, Fleet & Facilities Supervisor

**MEMBERS ABSENT**

Kyle Simukka

**OTHERS PRESENT**

Tracy Orvis, DiLoreto Architecture

**1.0 Call to Order – Procedural Matters**

**Chair Lauren Loosveldt** called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

**2.0 Design and Landmarks Committee Notes**

2.1 September 20, 2018

**Associate Planner Brett Kelper** reported that notes from the last meeting were not yet available but would be in time for the next meeting.

**3.0 Information Items**

**Mr. Kelper** explained that some changes had been proposed to the Ledding Library design, which the group had reviewed and made a recommendation on as part of the earlier land use approval process. When modifications are proposed prior to the start of construction, they are evaluated by the Planning Director to determine what level of review is needed. In this case, the Planning Director has identified the changes as minor and do not warrant a new Type III review by the Planning Commission. However, the modification will be processed with Type II review, which includes public notice to property owners near the site and an opportunity to provide comments. The application will be referred to the Committee for review, though **Mr. Kelper** explained that the members would be limited to commenting as individuals. He noted that there should be no substantive discussion of the modifications at tonight's meeting, only questions for clarification.

**Associate Planner Vera Koliass** gave a short presentation of the project, explaining that budgetary constraints and a need to avoid the critical root zone of the large oak tree had resulted in a shrinking of the building footprint (from 20,000 sq ft to 18,000 sq ft). The proposal included adjustments to programming inside the building (including at the southwest corner) and other small changes to the stormwater planters, parking stall width, the driveway apron, and the width of the canopy over the walkway in front of the building. Her slides included plan views showing the original and revised building footprint and elevations. She noted that the proposed modifications would bring the percentage of transparency on the west elevation up to 25%, which was part of the Committee's original recommendation. There would be more windows into the children's reading area and staff area, with accent paneling and plantings on the northwest elevation to break up the large expanse of wall, reflecting another of the group's original

suggestions.

**Chair Loosveldt** asked about the changes at the southwest corner of the building; **Ms. Kolia**s explained that no real exterior changes were proposed there, just that a multipurpose room would occupy the space instead of open reading area. **Chair Loosveldt** asked whether the project's sustainability goals were still in place, including the proposed rooftop solar array; **Ms. Kolia**s indicated that the proposal appeared to retain the solar array and other approved sustainability features.

**Mr. Kolver** later pointed out the hard copy of the modification materials that was available if anyone wanted to look at it or take it home.

**Mr. Kolver** noted that he had reached out to one of the architects involved with the Milwaukie High School project but had not yet heard back about any of the archiving activities. He also reported that video-conference options were limited unless the group were to meet at the Johnson Creek Blvd facility. The members indicated that an audio-conference option was probably the most critical; **Mr. Kolver** said he would follow up with that in mind.

#### 4.0 Audience Participation – None

#### 5.0 Public Meetings

- 5.1 Historic Review—Remodeling of City Hall (File #HR-2018-001)  
Staff Person: Vera Kolia, Associate Planner

**Chair Loosveldt** read from the standard script to open the public meeting for proposed modifications to City Hall (land use file #HR-2018-001). The Committee was being asked to review the proposal and make a recommendation to the Planning Commission. **Committee Member Brett Laurila** noted his professional relationship with the applicant and affirmed that it would not affect his ability to make an objective recommendation.

**Ms. Kolia**s presented the project, which centered on converting the existing second-floor Council chambers into office space and moving the chambers to the ground-floor fire bay. The existing roll-up doors in the fire bay would be replaced with new roll-up doors that would meet energy code requirements and provide the security and privacy needed for Council and municipal court functions there. An accessible entrance would be provided at the rear of the building, existing wood windows would be replaced with new wood windows, the south entry door would be replaced, and exterior lighting would be provided above the south entry and the accessible entrance.

**Mr. Laurila** asked whether there had been an assessment of the existing south-side windows to see if the glass could be replaced and the windows kept, as they are historical. **Committee Member Mary Neustadter** confirmed that those were the only original wood windows remaining in the building; she asked whether storm windows could be installed so the existing windows could remain. She cited the General Services Administration (GSA) website as a source for more information and suggestions about upgrading historic windows.

**Chair Loosveldt** called the project architect forward to answer questions and explain more about the proposed improvements. She asked for more information about the decision to replace the roll-up doors with less transparency. **Tracy Orvis** with DiLorento Architecture explained the challenge of balancing security with accessibility, particularly where the court functions were concerned, as they required some privacy. She noted that the proposed doors maintained the proportions of the existing doors, that the glass would be translucent but opaque.

**Vice Chair Schuster** wondered whether the calculation of the façade's transparency (which was proposed to be reduced from 42% to 26%) had taken the entire front elevation into account,

as the figures seemed low. **Ms. Neustadter** asked how the doors would look if metal was used instead of wood; **Ms. Orvis** answered that there would still be panels or some form of relief provided on the doors, to avoid a more commercial or industrial look. **Mr. Laurila** asked whether an insulated glass could be used if the design was required to provide more glass, perhaps with a laminated veneer on the inside for translucency; **Ms. Orvis** responded that insulated glass was an option, though they would prefer to go with the single row of windows in each door and have the rest be a solid material.

**Chair Loosveldt** reiterated her concern about the proposed loss of transparency, and she questioned whether there was not a way to provide more glass without completely compromising privacy, such as by making the top 3 rows glass and confirming that someone standing at the street would not have a direct line of sight into the space where most people might be seated or at tables. **Damien Farwell**, the City's Fleet and Facilities Supervisor, came forward and discussed some of the security concerns the project was grappling with, including the challenges that clear glass presents for a courtroom. **Chair Loosveldt** asked whether ballistic glass had been considered; the applicants responded that ballistic glass and several other alternatives had been considered but that there were budget constraints to contend with as well. **Chair Loosveldt** acknowledged that it was especially challenging to balance these concerns and observed that there were bound to be issues when trying to locate a use with so many privacy and security concerns in such a public and visible portion of the building. She felt that returning to the 1970s-style doors was a disservice to the building as a public building, one that she imagined most residents would like to see retained in its original form.

**Mr. Laurila** asked whether it would be possible to use a heavy, ballistic curtain on the inside of the doors, which could be drawn closed when privacy and security were needed and left open the rest of the time to provide views into the space. He also wondered whether the applicants had considered using the building code for existing buildings as a way to avoid having to do all of the energy updates, since it was a historic building and they were proposing only minor upgrades. **Ms. Orvis** responded that since establishing thermal comfort and sound insulation in the space were priorities, they would be opening up the inside walls and so would need to address the energy requirements.

**Vice Chair Schuster** asked whether any protection would be established outside the building in front of the roll-up doors, to prevent someone from driving into the space; **Ms. Orvis** confirmed that there had been discussion about installing bollards at the sidewalk. **Ms. Neustadter** asked whether the existing fire pole would remain in place inside; **Ms. Orvis** said it was in the middle of the proposed improvements and would have to be removed but that they would try to incorporate it somehow in the redesigned interior space.

**Chair Loosveldt** asked whether the applicants had evaluated the other points around the building where there might be a security risk, such as some of the windows. **Ms. Orvis** responded that most of the windows were up high enough to not pose a security problem, although the proposed new swing doors would include half windows that obviously presented a potential weakness. **Chair Loosveldt** pointed out the slippery slope of using security concerns to justify the loss of transparency at the front of the building, which would be highly visible from the public right-of-way, while introducing new security weaknesses at the less-visible swing doors. **Ms. Orvis** noted the trade-offs with the half-glazed swing doors, with the window being both a point of vulnerability and providing a view of what is on the other side of the door for those inside the building.

**Ms. Neustadter** noted the large size of the access door proposed on the north side of the building; **Ms. Orvis** confirmed that the door was large (nearly 4 ft wide) and was designed to not require significant changes to the remaining windows. **Ms. Neustadter** observed that a similar

treatment had been given the emergency door to the existing Council chambers (with windows remaining above and that it was not a good look.

With no additional comments or questions, **Chair Loosveldt** summarized the group's recommendations as follows:

1. Investigate the possibility of retaining the existing historic south-side windows by either refurbishing them with insulated glass or using storm windows (referring to the GSA guidelines for upgrading historic windows).
2. Provide greater transparency in the roll-up doors, balancing the needs for privacy and security with maintaining transparency closer to the current (and historically original) level. Research options like translucent panels and ballistic curtains. Additional note to update the calculations for glazing/transparency on the front façade.
3. Look into options for bollards and similar security barriers.

**Chair Loosveldt** concluded the discussion by noting that it seemed important for the City to continue to maintain an engaging and welcoming presence for the community.

## 6.0 Worksession Items

- 6.1 Prep for Annual Update to City Council (2018-19 Work Program, Bylaws)  
Staff Person: Brett Kever, Associate Planner

**Mr. Kever** informed the group that the date for the Committee's annual update to the City Council had been rescheduled from October 16 to November 13. He was not yet sure of the start time for that but felt confident it would not be as early as the 4:30pm time that had originally been scheduled on October 16. He promised to confirm the November 13 start time as soon as it was known. The group also agreed to keep the October 16 meeting date and use the time to work more on the downtown design review process; **Mr. Kever** suggested that the meeting would most likely be at the Pond House and said he would confirm that.

**Mr. Kever** distributed copies of the 2017-18 work program and current Committee bylaws and asked whether the members had any immediate questions or suggestions. Given that the Council update had been moved to November 13, there was more time to discuss possible revisions at upcoming meetings. He explained that the 2018-19 work program should probably focus on the downtown design review work but somehow maintain a placeholder for the other long-term priorities (e.g., historic preservation). **Chair Loosveldt** suggested rewriting the description of the downtown design review project to more fully describe the work, since the scope of the project has changed so much over the past year. That should include bringing the consultant team back in to finish the work. She thought it would help to break some of the tasks out into bullet points and to identify deliverables, as a way of helping ask for additional funding as needed. **Mr. Kever** agreed to draft a revised document for discussion at the October 16 meeting.

Regarding the bylaws, **Mr. Kever** noted that there may not be anything significant to adjust but suggested the members review the document before the next meeting. **Mr. Laurila** asked whether the 75%-attendance requirement should be adjusted, noting that meant one could afford to miss only 3 or 4 meetings throughout the year. **Mr. Kever** clarified that the attendance provision was not as much a hard-and-fast rule as a tool available to the group if chronic attendance problems needed to be addressed.

With respect to the "opportunity sites" noted in the work program, **Mr. Laurila** asked about the status of the Murphy site (on the west side of 32<sup>nd</sup> Ave north of Harrison St). **Mr. Kever** explained that the Murphy site was not one of the identified opportunity sites, as it was not located downtown and was not owned or controlled by the City. **Mr. Laurila** said that it was an

important site whose development he felt should fall under the Committee's purview, and he asked whether it could be somehow pulled into the design review process. He also wondered whether the site was included in the City's urban renewal zone. **Mr. Kelper** did not believe the Murphy site was within the urban renewal area, and he explained that it would likely require some sort of code amendment to expand the reach of the design review process to include it. He agreed to verify these answers for the next meeting. *[Post-meeting note: The Murphy site is in fact within the City's urban renewal area.]*

6.2 Downtown Design Guidelines (DDG) Assessment, Session 9  
Facilitator: Brett Kelper, Associate Planner

Given the late hour, the group agreed to table further discussion of the downtown design review process until the October 16 meeting, when they would begin with the Green Architecture section (Element L). **Chair Loosveldt** reported that she had recently met with Planning Director Denny Egner, City Manager Ann Ober, and Downtown Development Manager Leila Aman to discuss green certification options for allowing an additional floor in new development. She indicated that they had discussed the Path to Net Zero and LEED programs as well as a local option (she could not remember the name) and work was continuing to develop these ideas further. She suggested that it would be good for Leila to know about the group's suggestion for providing an affordable housing option, and **Mr. Kelper** agreed to do so.

**Vice Chair Schuster** suggested that the listed order of the design elements should be reorganized at some point. She suggested leading with points related to site and landscaping and then to list the various details of building design.

7.0 Other Business/Updates

**Mr. Kelper** asked whether the group would be willing to have a special session after the annual update to City Council on November 13 to work more on the downtown design review process; the members agreed. He indicated they would plan to meet in the fire bay, as the Council chambers would be occupied by the Council.

8.0 Design and Landmarks Committee Discussion Items – None

9.0 Forecast for Future Meetings:

Oct. 16, 2018	Special Session—DDG assessment
Nov. 5, 2018	Regular meeting—focus on DDG assessment
Nov. 13, 2018	Annual Update to City Council, followed by Special Session

**Chair Loosveldt** adjourned the meeting at 8:16 p.m.



---

Lauren Loosveldt, Chair

Respectfully submitted,  
Brett Kelper, Associate Planner