

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

**Milwaukie City Hall
10722 SE Harrison St
Monday, November 5, 2018
6:30 PM**

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT

Lauren Loosveldt, Chair
Mary Neustadter
Brett Laurila

STAFF PRESENT

Brett Kelper, Associate Planner (staff liaison)
Vera Kolas, Associate Planner

MEMBERS ABSENT

Cynthia Schuster, Vice Chair
Kyle Simukka

OTHERS PRESENT

Tracy Orvis, Di Loreto Architecture
Joseph Edge, Planning Commissioner

1.0 Call to Order – Procedural Matters

Chair Lauren Loosveldt called the meeting to order at 6:38 p.m.

2.0 Design and Landmarks Committee Notes

2.1 October 16, 2018

Chair Loosveldt called for any revisions to the notes. No changes were suggested and the notes were approved unanimously.

3.0 Information Items

Associate Planner Brett Kelper reintroduced the Historic Review application for the City Hall remodel (land use file #HR-2018-001), referring to the information provided to the group late last week about the proposed replacement windows. He noted that the Planning Commission would continue its hearing on this item next Tuesday (November 13) and that they would likely want to hear the Committee's thoughts on the revised materials.

Associate Planner Vera Kolas and **Tracy Orvis** from the project team came to the presentation table and reviewed the new information, including a spreadsheet comparing figures (window dimensions and costs) and communication from the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) received just prior to the meeting. **Ms. Kolas** summarized SHPO's latest recommendations: (1) SHPO would like to see a cost estimate for repair of the existing windows; and (2) if the existing windows cannot be repaired, the Milgard Essence (fiberglass, wood-clad) windows appear to be the better choice, as the exterior view is the most important.

Committee Member Mary Neustadter recommended that the applicants pick someone from SHPO's approved list for the cost estimate. **Ms. Orvis** passed around a handout showing details of the proposed replacement windows. **Chair Loosveldt** suggested the applicants provide an image showing the new window overlaid with the existing window for a better comparison—she thinks there is a significant difference between the two. She asked the other members for their thoughts about wood versus fiberglass windows. **Ms. Neustadter** acknowledged that fiberglass lasts longer but said she always prefers wood.

Chair Loosveldt said it would be helpful to have information from the supplier to back up the applicants' information on cost. She also said it was important that the applicants show the full breadth of their research. **Committee Member Brett Laurila** said he prefers insulated wood

windows. It would be good if the applicants could show samples and photos of the proposed windows to compare with the existing ones. He cited the importance of the City being a good steward of this historic building, as there were so few historic-listed buildings downtown and only this one owned by the City. The City should be consistent in holding a high standard for historic preservation, both for itself and for other historic building owners.

There was some discussion about how to commemorate the fire pole and preserve the sense of high-ceiling space in the fire bay. The group also discussed the proposed location of bollards in the driveway outside the roll-up doors, including consideration of loading areas.

Regarding the location or placement of windows (with respect to how much they would be inset from the wall façade), **Chair Loosveldt** agreed with the revised proposal. **Ms. Neustadter** asked whether the entire window (including the frame) would be replaced or if some portion (the frame, the sill) would remain. **Ms. Orvis** responded that they were still unsure.

Regarding the structure of the continued hearing on November 13, **Ms. Kolias** explained that she would present the staff report and summarize the Committee's latest comments, and then Chair Loosveldt could come forward and elaborate on the group's comments as needed and answer any questions the Planning Commission may have. The two groups' meetings would be at the same time in different parts of City Hall that night, so it should be relatively easy for Chair Loosveldt to pop over for the Commission's hearing and then return to the Committee's special session.

4.0 Audience Participation – None

5.0 Public Meetings – None

6.0 Worksession Items

6.1 2018-19 Work Program Staff Person: Brett Kolver, Associate Planner

Reviewing the format of the draft work program **Mr. Kolver** asked whether the group had any comments or suggested revisions. **Chair Loosveldt** suggested that the Council should be given a heads up that the group wanted to discuss the prospects for the Committee's return to Commission status with decision-making authority, as well as the possibility of requiring design review for the Central Milwaukie opportunity sites (Murphy site, McFarland site, Milwaukie Marketplace). After some discussion, **Mr. Kolver** agreed to draft some language to include in the work program and to share a draft with the group prior to finalizing the meeting packet if possible.

6.2 Downtown Design Review Process Assessment (ongoing) Facilitator: Brett Kolver, Associate Planner

With the time remaining, the group resumed its review of the draft design review document, identifying the following suggestions for the Pedestrian Circulation element:

- Purpose/Intent
 - Delete the last phrase, "through and between buildings and site" (redundant).
- Design Standards
 - Is there anything that would make Standard A-a more objective? "Continuous connections" seems a little discretionary and open to interpretation.
 - Is Standard A-b intended to make pedestrian connections across an entire block from one street to another or is it more about connecting the building to the street?

It is also unclear whether the 200-ft frontage measurement is supposed to be cumulative or if a connection is required to each individual street frontage regardless of length.

- In Standard A-d, the requirement for permeable walkways may be overly prescriptive. If it is removed from other similar sections of the code, it should be revised accordingly here.
- In Standard A-e, how is “average” footcandle level measured? Perhaps there should be some language added about cutoffs, shielding, and/or Dark Skies standards.
- Guidance
 - There should be some guidance related to lighting, about providing minimal lighting for safe pedestrian passage during evening hours.
 - Walkways should be ADA compliant, should logically connect to street frontages and key features (such as transit stops), and should be integrated into a stormwater collection and management system.

7.0 Other Business/Updates – None

Mr. Kelper reminded the members that the annual update to City Council would begin at 5:45 p.m. next Tuesday, November 13, at the Public Safety Building (corner of 32nd Ave and Harrison St). That session would last approximately 30 minutes and then the group would reconvene in the fire bay at City Hall for a special session to continue work on the Downtown Design Review draft. Food would be provided.

8.0 Design and Landmarks Committee Discussion Items – None

9.0 Forecast for Future Meetings:

Nov. 13, 2018	Annual Update to City Council, followed by Special Session
Dec. 3, 2018	Regular meeting—focus on DDG assessment
Dec. 6, 2018	Community Housing forum
Dec. 11, 2018	Comprehensive Plan update (w/ City Council & Planning Commission)

Chair Loosveldt adjourned the meeting at 8:14 p.m.



Lauren Loosveldt, Chair

Respectfully submitted,
Brett Kelper, Associate Planner