



AGENDA

MILWAUKIE DESIGN AND LANDMARKS COMMITTEE Monday, September 11, 2017, 6:30 PM

CITY HALL CONFERENCE ROOM
10722 SE MAIN ST

- 1.0 **Call to Order—Procedural Matters**
- 2.0 **Meeting Notes—Motion Needed**
 - 2.1 August 8, 2017
- 3.0 **Information Items**
- 4.0 **Audience Participation—**This is an opportunity for the public to comment on any item not on the agenda
- 5.0 **Public Meetings—**Public meetings will follow the procedure listed on reverse
- 6.0 **Worksession Items**
 - 6.1 Summary: Debrief from public review hearings for WG-2017-003 and DR-2017-001
Facilitator: Brett Kelter, Associate Planner
 - 6.2 Summary: Downtown Design Guidelines Update, Session 20
Facilitator: Brett Kelter, Associate Planner
- 7.0 **Other Business/Updates**
- 8.0 **Design and Landmark Committee Discussion Items—**This is an opportunity for comment or discussion for items not on the agenda.
- 9.0 **Forecast for Future Meetings:**
 - October date TBD Continue work on DDG updates
 - Nov 6, 2017 TBD

Milwaukie Design and Landmarks Committee Statement

The Design and Landmarks Committee is established to advise the Planning Commission on historic preservation activities, compliance with applicable design guidelines, and to review and recommend appropriate design guidelines and design review processes and procedures to the Planning Commission and City Council.

1. **PROCEDURAL MATTERS.** If you wish to speak at this meeting, please fill out a yellow card and give to planning staff. Please turn off all personal communication devices during meeting. For background information on agenda items, call the Planning Department at 503-786-7600 or email planning@milwaukieoregon.gov. Thank You.
2. **DESIGN AND LANDMARKS COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES.** Approved DLC Minutes can be found on the City website at www.milwaukieoregon.gov.
3. **CITY COUNCIL MINUTES** City Council Minutes can be found on the City website at www.milwaukieoregon.gov.
4. **FORECAST FOR FUTURE MEETING.** These items are tentatively scheduled, but may be rescheduled prior to the meeting date. Please contact staff with any questions you may have.

Public Meeting Procedure

Those who wish to testify should come to the front podium, state his or her name and address for the record, and remain at the podium until the Chairperson has asked if there are any questions from the Committee members.

1. **STAFF REPORT.** Each design review meeting starts with a brief review of the staff report by staff. The report lists the criteria for the land use action being considered, as well as a recommendation with reasons for that recommendation.
2. **CORRESPONDENCE.** Staff will report any verbal or written correspondence that has been received since the Committee was presented with its meeting packet.
3. **APPLICANT'S PRESENTATION.**
4. **PUBLIC TESTIMONY IN SUPPORT.** Testimony from those in favor of the application.
5. **NEUTRAL PUBLIC TESTIMONY.** Comments or questions from interested persons who are neither in favor of nor opposed to the application.
6. **PUBLIC TESTIMONY IN OPPOSITION.** Testimony from those in opposition to the application.
7. **QUESTIONS FROM COMMITTEE MEMBERS.** The committee members will have the opportunity to ask for clarification from staff, the applicant, or those who have already testified.
8. **REBUTTAL TESTIMONY FROM APPLICANT.** After all public testimony, the Committee will take rebuttal testimony from the applicant.
9. **CLOSING OF PUBLIC MEETING.** The Chairperson will close the public portion of the meeting. The Committee will then enter into deliberation. From this point in the meeting the Committee will not receive any additional testimony from the audience, but may ask questions of anyone who has testified.
10. **COMMITTEE DISCUSSION AND ACTION.** It is the Committee's intention to make a recommendation this evening on each issue on the agenda. Design and Landmarks Committee recommendations are not appealable.
11. **MEETING CONTINUANCE.** Prior to the close of the first public meeting, *any person* may request an opportunity to present additional information at another time. If there is such a request, the Design and Landmarks Committee will either continue the public meeting to a date certain, or leave the record open for at least seven days for additional written evidence, argument, or testimony.

The City of Milwaukie will make reasonable accommodation for people with disabilities. Please notify us no less than five (5) business days prior to the meeting.

Milwaukie Design and Landmarks Committee:

Laurent Loosveldt, Chair
Michael Corrente, Vice Chair
Cynthia Schuster
Mary Neustadter
Kyle Simukka

Planning Department Staff:

Denny Egner, Planning Director
David Levitan, Senior Planner
Brett Kelder, Associate Planner
Vera Koliass, Associate Planner
Mary Heberling, Assistant Planner
Avery Pickard, Administrative Specialist II
Alicia Martin, Administrative Specialist II

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

**Milwaukie City Hall
10722 SE Main St
Monday, August 7, 2017
6:30 PM**

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT

Lauren Loosveldt, Chair
Michael Corrente
Cynthia Schuster

STAFF PRESENT

Brett Kelter, Associate Planner (staff liaison)
Vera Kolias, Associate Planner
Rick Buen, Civil Engineer

MEMBERS ABSENT

None

OTHERS PRESENT

Randy Reeve, Reeve Sherwood
Larry Gescher, HP Civil
Kurt Schultz, SERA Architects
Ben Rippe, SERA Architects
Bob Beauchemin, BC Group
Tom Brenneke, Guardian Real Estate Services
Levi Curran, Guardian Real Estate Services
Kris Bryant, Guardian Real Estate Services
Nathaniel Taylor
Ed Zumwalt
Bill Place
Jim Bernard
Scott Churchill

1.0 Call to Order – Procedural Matters

Chair Lauren Loosveldt called the meeting to order at 6:32 p.m.

2.0 Design and Landmarks Committee Notes

- 2.1 June 5, 2017
- 2.2 July 10, 2017

Chair Loosveldt asked whether anyone had suggested revisions to the notes from the June or July meetings. Hearing none, she called for a vote and both sets of notes were approved unanimously.

3.0 Information Items – None**4.0 Audience Participation – None****5.0 Public Meetings**

- 5.1 Recommendation Hearing: Willamette Greenway review for Kellogg Creek replacement bridge in Riverfront Park (Land use master file #WG-2017-003)

Chair Loosveldt opened the public hearing for Willamette Greenway review of the proposed replacement bridge over Kellogg Creek in Milwaukie Bay Park. One of the considerations for approval of projects within the Willamette Greenway overlay zone is the “advice and recommendations” of the Committee (Milwaukie Municipal Code (MMC) Subsection 19.401.6.1),

so the group would be making a recommendation to forward to the Planning Commission.

Associate Planner Vera Kolias gave the staff presentation, using Power Point to describe the proposal to construct a new bridge over the mouth of Kellogg Creek where it meets the Willamette River in Milwaukie Bay Park. The bridge is parallel to Highway 99E (McLoughlin Boulevard) and provides access across Kellogg Creek within the park. The supports of the existing bridge were damaged by the high-water events of 2016, which scoured the banks and compromised the integrity of the bridge abutments. The new bridge would have a longer span and be slightly wider than the existing one, with a sidewalk on one side for safe pedestrian access. It would be in roughly the same location and would include lighting similar to what is there now. The banks on either side of the creek are within the Water Quality Resource (WQR) area designated for natural resource protection and would be replanted with native vegetation as part of the work to repair damage from the high water event.

Vice Chair Michael Corrente asked about the proposed plantings shown in the color photo simulation of the new bridge. **Randy Reeve**, an engineer working on the project, explained that all new plantings would be native species and would provide shade for the creek, as recommended by Rob Livingston, the City's erosion control specialist. He noted that actual work in the water should be fairly minimal but that a silk curtain would be used to contain sediment and that other measures to prevent fish entrapment and limit erosion would be installed.

Chair Loosveldt asked whether there would be pavement markings for bicycles and pedestrians using the bridge. **Mr. Reeve** and **Civil Engineer Rick Buen** explained that a grade-separated sidewalk on the west side of the bridge would provide pedestrian access and that bicycles would share the travel lane with vehicles. A future path along Kellogg Creek will come under the Highway 99E bridge and this proposed new bridge to connect with the park and the sidewalk on the new bridge. In response to a question about lighting on the bridge, **Mr. Reeve** and others from the consultant team noted that the bridge area would have 4 lights, with 2 lights at each end and 2 more lights just beyond each end. **Vice Chair Corrente** asked whether anyone knew why the City Council asked for a change in design. **Mr. Buen** explained that Council had wanted to match the existing arches, as well as the concrete railings on both sides.

There was no public testimony about the project. The Committee deliberated and made a motion to recommend approval of the project with the following suggestions:

- That the erosion control requirements included in Mr. Livingston's comments on the project be met, with follow-up provided to the Committee to indicate how those measures are implemented.
- That the Committee be kept in the loop with information about the future bicycle/pedestrian undercrossing.

The motion passed unanimously.

5.2 Recommendation Hearing: Downtown Design review for new mixed-use development at 2036 SE Washington St (Land use master file #DR-2017-001)

After a very short break to allow the first applicant group to clear out and to reset the stage, **Chair Loosveldt** opened the public hearing for the proposed mixed-used development at 2036 SE Washington St (the site of Bernard's Garage). **Associate Planner Kolias** gave the staff presentation, describing the proposal to construct a 5-story mixed use building on the Bernard's Garage site, providing for commercial activity on the ground floor and approximately 110 apartments above. The project design actually met almost all of the downtown design standards but had opted to go through the discretionary review process to have more flexibility with the design. In addition, variances were requested from the requirement to provide a 6-ft step-back on

the 4th and 5th stories and from the access spacing standard for the garage access proposed on Washington St. In lieu of the step-back, the applicant proposed to utilize various design elements (e.g., mixed materials, cantilevered shadowboxes, upper-level balconies, and cornice roof overhangs) to reduce the building's perceived height and overall bulk. Staff is recommending approval of the step-back variance, with a condition requiring the installation of art murals on the Adams St façade as well as next to the garage door on the Washington St façade.

Committee Member Cynthia Schuster asked about the parking requirements. **Associate Planner Koliias** indicated that the applicant was providing the minimum amount of vehicle parking, after factoring in the allowed reductions (30%) for proximity to transit and the MAX station as well as for the 94 covered and secured bicycle parking spaces being provided.

Kurt Schultz from SERA Architects explained the applicant's approach to the project, noting that they chose the Type III design review process to have a little more flexibility in the design and to produce an even better building. He described some of the project features: new sidewalks on Main St and Washington St; main entrance of the apartments on 21st Ave, close to the MAX station; the Main St frontage focused on the farmers market and public plaza, with high ceilings in the ground-floor storefronts because of the downslope; innovative stackable parking, with garage entrance on Washington St and a high-speed roll-up door to avoid queuing issues on the street; and second-story terrace space, with stormwater facilities on top of the parking garage. He acknowledged that the river views that would be provided from the second level and above could be affected by future redevelopment of the adjacent Bloom garden supply store site. He noted that the step-back requirement for the 4th and 5th floors was problematic because it makes the building seem top-heavy and makes it harder to efficiently stack the units and align the internal infrastructure, plus you lose almost 5,000 sq ft of area per floor. Although the code would allow for a building height up to 69 ft, their design came in at 57 ft.

Mr. Schultz described the distinctions between the base, middle, and top of the building. The base was a deep red brick, with glass and fixed canopies. The middle used cedar siding and fiber cement and included columns of bay windows. The top included a sub-cornice between the 4th and 5th stories. Mural art was proposed near the garage door on the Washington St façade. An existing mural on the Adams St façade of the existing building could potentially be relocated to the Adams St side of the new building.

Member Schuster noted that, with respect to the open space calculations, the patios and balconies shown in the earlier version presented in May had disappeared. She commented that balconies sometimes help with horizontal modulation. Regarding the blank walls on the Adams St façade, she suggested that shifting stairwells within the building could allow space for windows. **Chair Loosveldt** agreed that the large blank wall on the south (Adams St) elevation was a big concern for her. She asked whether any product specifications were available for the fiber cement siding—**Mr. Schultz** said a decision had not yet been made about a particular product.

Chair Loosveldt and **Member Schuster** agreed that carrying the ground-floor brick material from the 21st Ave façade to the Adams St façade would provide greater continuity. **Mr. Schultz** noted the challenge of deciding whether to use more expensive material or place art in a location that could potentially be covered by future development on the adjacent property. **Chair Loosveldt** suggested that expanding the recommended mural on that wall could help with that issue.

Chair Loosveldt expressed concern about the building's impact on the pedestrian element along Washington St, noting that the design does not provide much transparency into the building where it has a very visible and public face. She suggested the use of alternative

materials that would help give at least the illusion of transparency and balance the impact of the opaque garage door. She also noted that the proposed canopies were not continuous and did not provide much protection of pedestrians from the elements. She clarified that more canopies would help and that they did not necessarily have to be continuous.

Member Schuster said it would be nice to see the service elements on the Washington St façade more recessed into the building—**Mr. Schultz** indicated there were specific utility requirements that had to be met. **Chair Loosveldt** reiterated that a glazed garage door would be preferable, while acknowledging the requirement for a fast-raising door to reduce traffic impacts. She wondered whether there could be more street trees installed along Washington St, even just one more tree. **Mr. Schultz** suggested that underground vaults on Washington St may limit the space available for street trees. **Vice Chair Corrente** suggested expanding the size of the landscape boxes in order to accommodate tree roots and to get more shrubs and ground-level plants. He wondered about street furniture and echoed the comments provided by the Historic Milwaukie Neighborhood about that item. He suggested that the project team consider ways to highlight the pedestrian and furniture zones using concrete scoring patterns and similar techniques. **Mr. Schultz** reminded the group that the City's public works standards would dictate those elements but said he would check to see about options.

Chair Loosveldt inquired about the Green Globes certification proposed for the project. **Mr. Schultz** and members of the project team in the audience noted that the Green Globes certification is provided by the Green Building Institute and that the project would be seeking a rating of 2 or 3 globes. **Chair Loosveldt** asked whether the applicant could provide an early checklist of how the project would qualify for the certification, since it related to the ability to have a 5th story and then indirectly to the requested variance from the step-back requirement. Regarding the 6-ft step-back requirement, she wondered if some step-back could be provided for the 5th floor, even if less than 6 ft. She felt that the absence of the step-back was most notable on the longer building elevations (Washington St and 21st Ave).

Mr. Schultz explained that they were trying to keep the facades from being too “fussy” and without too many features tacked on. **Member Schuster** suggested that the cornice and shadow line already provided a strong top. She asked whether there would be any mechanical equipment visible along the rooflines, since they are fairly flat and linear. **Mr. Schultz** explained that the roof pitches were angled inward, so mechanical equipment would be effectively screened. **Chair Loosveldt** asked about the stair and elevator overruns and whether they needed to be screened—the code seemed to indicate that they did require screening.

Chair Loosveldt wondered about the choice to use cedar siding, especially with the bay windows on the west (Main St) elevation, noting that maintenance and lifespan could be issues, particularly on the western exposures. **Mr. Schultz** noted that cedar had an expected lifespan of 20 to 30 years. **Member Schuster** said she liked the wood look, though wondered if there were other products that have a similar look but require less maintenance. She asked about building-accent lighting—**Mr. Schultz** said it was still early for that detail.

Noting concern for the fiber-cement siding material, **Chair Loosveldt** asked whether there was a list of building materials that would show percentages. She also wondered whether there was any information available yet about signage (particularly locations), whether for the various ground-floor businesses or for the overall building itself. She noted that the Bernard's Garage sign was a landmark of sorts and that the garage had long been an integral part of downtown. **Mr. Schultz** responded that they had not yet done any branding for the project, so it was too early to say. He suggested one idea for the Bernard's Garage sign would be to install it within the building's parking area, which would work no matter what the final building name or branding turned out to be.

Chair Loosveldt asked whether there would be any stormwater management happening at the ground level. **Mr. Schultz** reiterated that the stormwater facilities for the runoff of the building itself would be on the 2nd floor terrace. **Chair Loosveldt** asked about the proposed window size and orientation, which was one of the few areas where the design does not meet the relevant standard. **Mr. Schultz** explained that the design team preferred the larger panes of glass because mullions would further break up the views.

With no further questions from the Committee, **Chair Loosveldt** opened the hearing to public testimony.

Nathaniel Taylor (2836 SE Washington St), a 2-year resident of Milwaukie, wanted to see more environmental features provided with the sustainability certification. He also felt that the proposed height was massive and would block views of the river from further up (east) Washington St.

Scott Churchill (2708 SE Monroe St), a 13-year resident of Milwaukie and a licensed architect, noted that he had previously served on the Committee, the Planning Commission, and the City Council. He had been involved in the conversations about step-backs when the current code was being developed and noted that one of the reasons had been to provide a better experience and scale for pedestrians on the street. He wondered how utility service like garbage collection would affect the access on Washington St and noted the requested variance to the access spacing requirement as a concern. He suggested that step-backs on the 4th and 5th stories would create terrace spaces for those units and so should not be considered “lost” space. His opinion was that the south (Adams St) façade needs more than artwork to offset its mass, and that sequential canopies on the Washington St frontage would be good. Regarding the step-back requirement, he felt that the difference in scale was important for the pedestrian experience. He noted one typo in the recommended conditions.

There was no rebuttal from the applicant, so **Chair Loosveldt** closed the public testimony portion of the hearing and moved into group discussion.

Chair Loosveldt appreciated the level of design by the project team and the effort by those residents who had come to testify. She noted that the question of the variance request from the step-back requirement would be a point of particular focus for the group. In addition, she noted the following concerns: the south (Adams St) elevation and the proposed white finish and material (**Member Schuster** added that the cedar materials and the base of the south elevation wall were also concerns); the size and location of art recommended for the south wall; transparency on Washington St, and the art proposed near the garage door (**Member Schuster** noted her opinion that art should not be a substitute for better design, or for more transparency and articulation); the addition of canopies on the Washington St façade; material calculations (primary, secondary, and tertiary materials); the Green Globes certification and a checklist to demonstrate that it would be a highly sustainable building; additional street trees on Washington St, and more vegetation at the ground level on all 3 streets; and signage for the building, including incorporation of the Bernard’s Garage sign somehow. **Vice Chair Corrente** added that he was interested in seeing more coordination of the applicant with the City for distinguishing the furnishings zone.

Acknowledging interest from the applicant in presenting additional information, **Chair Loosveldt** agreed to re-open the hearing to public testimony. **Mr. Schultz** expressed concern about the feasibility of the project if the step-back variance was not granted, due to the loss of floor area. The long list of extensive comments from the Committee also presented additional challenges for project feasibility. He suggested that a small step-back at a building corner might be feasible but a continuous step-back was probably not.

Mr. Churchill returned to suggest that 3-ft to 6-ft setbacks were common, even if they were a little more expensive, and there were other examples of the practice in the U.S. He reiterated that there were good reasons the Planning Commission and City Council had established the step-back rule.

Chair Loosveldt closed the hearing to public testimony again, and the group continued its discussion. **Member Schuster** observed that Milwaukie is growing and is looking for more density, that there are trade-offs to be managed. **Chair Loosveldt** called for a motion on the proposal, and **Member Schuster** made a motion to recommend approval, and **Mr. Kelper** facilitated a compilation of the following list of recommendations:

- Consider an alternative material for the proposed cedar siding (something with a wood look), due to concerns about maintenance issues and durability. A specific concern was noted regarding the bay windows, which are not under cover of the overhang and are significantly exposed on the west (Main Street) elevation.
- South elevation
 - Concern was expressed regarding the use of a single material on a large majority of the south elevation. Suggestion to provide a continuation of more permanent and durable siding materials (such as brick) at the base or ground level.
 - Recommendation to increase the height and overall area of art to cover a multi-story portion of the south elevation.
- Washington Street elevation
 - Provide a continuing rhythm of canopies for greater protection of the pedestrian from the elements.
 - Considering that Washington Street is a primary pedestrian route between the riverfront and Downtown, increase the amount of transparency along the ground level to meet the relevant development standard (40%). Consider a transparent garage door, defined art area(s), and other options potentially using transparent or translucent materials (such as back-painted glazing), proportional to the adjacent retail storefronts.
 - Investigate options for adding more street trees on the Washington Street frontage.
 - Lengthen the required tree-well size to accommodate ground-level plantings.
- In response to concern about the potential overuse of secondary and tertiary materials, the applicant should provide a list of material calculations showing percentages of primary, secondary, and tertiary materials for each elevation.
- In consideration of the variance request to the 6-ft step back requirement on the 4th and 5th floors, the Planning Commission should review the applicant's preliminary checklist for Green Globes certification (to be provided), to evaluate the overall sustainability aspects of the proposed development with respect to the bonus height requirement.
- Show preliminary locations for retail signage as well as for signage for the larger building.
- Coordinate with the City to investigate a material change for the Furniture Zone, such as concrete pavers, to aid in identifying the pedestrian pathway and visually separate it from the roadway.

The motion passed unanimously.

On the question of the step-back variance, the members expressed varying opinions. **Chair Loosveldt** indicated comfort with the 4th-story not having a step-back but concern about the 5th

story; **Member Schuster** was satisfied without a step-back on either floor but did not press the issue. **Chair Loosveldt** suggested a motion to recommendation to approve the variance with the suggestion that the Planning Commission review the 5th story step-back and require a minimum 4-ft step-back or some additional studies from the applicant to support other alternatives or options to achieve the same effect, particularly on the 21st Ave and Washington St facades. The motion passed unanimously.

6.0 Worksession Items

- 6.1 Downtown Design Guidelines Update, cont.
 Staff Person: Brett Kelter, Associate Planner

Given the late hour, **Mr. Kelter** suggested that the group table this item until the September meeting, and the group agreed.

Chair Loosveldt noted that a more final version of the checklist the group had been working with would have been helpful in reviewing the Bernard's Garage application. **Member Schuster** noted that it did not seem right that an applicant could ignore the design standards and move directly into the guidelines.

The group expressed some interest in reviewing the audio of the meeting, and **Mr. Kelter** agreed to try to make the file available online somehow.

7.0 Other Business/Updates

Mr. Kelter noted that the Bernard's Garage application would go to the Planning Commission for a public hearing on August 22 and that it would be good for someone from the Committee to be there to represent the group's recommendations. Both **Chair Loosveldt** and **Vice Chair Corrente** indicated they could attend.

Mr. Kelter also noted that 3 candidates for the 2 open Committee positions would be interviewed on August 10. Chair Loosveldt had been invited to sit in on the interviews but would not be able to attend, so **Mr. Kelter** made a note to check with the City Recorder's office to see whether another Committee member could sit in instead.

8.0 Design and Landmarks Committee Discussion Items – None

9.0 Forecast for Future Meetings:

Sept 11, 2017	Update of Downtown Design Guidelines
Oct 2, 2017	TBD

Chair Loosveldt adjourned the meeting at 9:53 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
 Brett Kelter, Associate Planner

Lauren Loosveldt, Chair



MILWAUKIE

Dogwood City of the West

To: Design and Landmarks Committee

Through: Dennis Egner, Planning Director

From: Brett Kelter, Associate Planner

Date: September 5, 2017, for September 11, 2017, Worksession

Subject: Debrief from Public Review Hearings (WG-2017-003 and DR-2017-001)

ACTION REQUESTED

None. This report is preparation for debriefing two recent public review hearings.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

History of Prior Actions and Discussions

- **August 7, 2017:** As required by various sections of the Milwaukie Municipal Code (MMC), the Committee held public review hearings to make recommendations on two land use applications being decided by the Planning Commission—Willamette Greenway review file #WG-2017-003 and Downtown Design Review file #DR-2017-001.

KEY QUESTIONS FOR DEBRIEF

Committee members are encouraged to consider the following questions to prime the pump for our debriefing session at the September 11 meeting, with the aim of improving our process for future public review meetings:

1. What things worked well? What things did not work well or made you feel uncomfortable?
2. Are there any tools that would have facilitated the review process?
3. What ideas or suggestions do you have for future review meetings?

ATTACHMENTS

None

Note: E-Packet materials will be available online at <http://www.milwaukieoregon.gov/planning/design-and-landmarks-committee-73>.



MILWAUKIE

Dogwood City of the West

To: Design and Landmarks Committee

Through: Dennis Egner, Planning Director

From: Brett Kelper, Associate Planner

Date: September 5, 2017, for September 11, 2017, Worksession

Subject: Downtown Design Guidelines Update – Session 20

ACTION REQUESTED

None. This report is preparation for the Committee's ongoing efforts to update the Downtown Design Guidelines (DDG) document.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

History of Prior Actions and Discussions

- **Winter 2016 - Present:** The group has been drafting revisions to the DDG, focusing on the Milwaukie Character and Pedestrian Emphasis elements.

PROCESS TO UPDATE DOWNTOWN DESIGN GUIDELINES

At recent meetings, the group has been working with the matrix comparing the design guidelines with the design standards. The effort has been to identify which guidelines are applicable to which standards, so that applicants, staff, and the Committee can all be clearer about the approval criteria for discretionary design review applications. In addition, staff has asked the group to help identify areas where there are gaps in the code, where the design standards do not adequately achieve the aims of the guidelines.

In light of the recent design review for the Bernard's Garage site (2036 SE Washington St, file #DR-2017-001), the Committee is encouraged to evaluate the effectiveness of that particular process, where the applicant opted to take the discretionary review path.

As time allows, staff will discuss the timeline for processing the proposed interim amendments to the Downtown Design Guidelines document.

ATTACHMENTS

None

Note: E-Packet materials will be available online at <http://www.milwaukieoregon.gov/planning/design-and-landmarks-committee-73>.