



CITY OF MILWAUKIE

AGENDA

October 16, 2018

DESIGN AND LANDMARKS COMMITTEE

Pond House
2215 SE Harrison St
www.milwaukieoregon.gov

1.0 Call to Order — Procedural Matters

2.0 Meeting Notes – Motion Needed

2.1 September 20, 2018

2.2 October 1, 2018

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 — None

6.0 Worksession Items

6.1 Summary: Downtown Design Review Process (ongoing)
Facilitator: Brett Kelter, Associate Planner

6.2 Summary: Review 2018-19 Work Program
Staff Person: Brett Kelter, Associate Planner

7.0 Other Business/Updates

8.0 Design and Landmarks Committee Discussion Items — This is an opportunity for comment or discussion for items not on the agenda.

9.0 Forecast for Future Meetings:

Nov. 5, 2018 Worksession: Downtown Design Review (ongoing)

Nov. 13, 2018 Annual Update to City Council
Extra Session for work on Downtown Design Review

Dec. 3, 2018 TBD (continued work on Downtown Design Review as needed)

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:

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

Planning Department Staff:

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

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

**Milwaukie City Hall
10722 SE Main St
Thursday, September 20, 2018
6:30 PM**

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT

Cynthia Schuster, Vice Chair
Mary Neustadter
Brett Laurila
Kyle Simukka

STAFF PRESENT

Brett Kelper, Associate Planner (staff liaison)
Denny Egner, Planning Director

OTHERS PRESENT

None

MEMBERS ABSENT

Lauren Loosveldt, Chair

1.0 Call to Order – Procedural Matters

Vice Chair Cynthia Schuster called the meeting to order at 6:41 p.m.

2.0 Design and Landmarks Committee Notes

2.1 September 4, 2018

Vice Chair Schuster asked whether there were any corrections to the September meeting notes. There were no changes and the notes were approved unanimously.

3.0 Information Items

Associate Planner Brett Kelper noted that the group's next meeting on October 1 would include an Historic Resource Review related to proposed improvements at Milwaukie City Hall. This was another case where the Committee would hold a review meeting and provide a recommendation for the Planning Commission to consider at its public hearing on October 23. The packet materials for the October 1 meeting will include a staff report with more information about the project. **Committee Member Mary Neustadter** asked whether the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) had been informed of the project and whether any of the SHPO procedures had been followed. **Mr. Kelper** said they had not contacted SHPO; she suggested that staff check in to see what, if any, procedure should be followed. **Planning Director Denny Egner** noted that staff should look into amending the code to incorporate or at least better reflect the SHPO process.

Mr. Kelper reminded the group of the annual update to City Council scheduled for October 16. He had intended to bring copies of the current bylaws and work program for the members to review but left them at the office, so he promised to send them electronically in advance of the next meeting. He encouraged the members to look them over in preparation for a conversation on October 1.

Mr. Kelper also noted that he still needed to follow up on the group's previous questions about the status of the Milwaukie High School historic archiving and the question of whether audio files from past meetings could be made available online.

4.0 Audience Participation – None

5.0 Public Meetings – None

6.0 Worksession Items

6.1 Downtown Design Guidelines (DDG) Assessment, Session 8 Staff Person: Brett Kelper, Associate Planner

Mr. Kelper reopened the work session on the DDG assessment, asking whether there were any further thoughts or comments about the Building Massing section where the group left off last time. **Vice Chair Schuster** mentioned the issue with massing and maintaining solar access, and she provided a copy of some of the state rules for solar easements.

Mr. Kelper asked if there was any follow-up discussion about the documentation issue raised at the last meeting. **Mr. Egner** explained a little more about the conversations that staff was having about the DDG project and how staff was thinking about the next version of the “product.” He indicated that they would find a way to reflect the Committee’s comments and suggestions and to show how the previous version of the code had changed. **Vice Chair Schuster** acknowledged the iterative nature of the review process. **Mr. Kelper** asked whether anyone had comments about the bullet-point summary he had provided in advance of the meeting—folks seemed to generally agree that it was good. **Committee Member Brett Laurila** asked about the anticipated timeline for adopting the amended code—**Mr. Egner** said he optimistically hoped the Committee could be finished with its review by the end of the year, with the materials going to the Planning Commission in early 2019 and on to adoption by City Council by the middle of the coming year. **Committee Member Kyle Simukka** indicated he had not been able to make available the documentation example he wanted to show the group but that he would try again next time.

The group then turned its attention to the draft design review document and made suggestions about the following elements:

I. Weather Protection

- Revise Standard A-a to read, “All ground-floor building entries shall be protected from the weather by awnings, canopies, or marquis.” The second phrase, about recessed entries, can be deleted since it is probably better addressed in the Doors & Entrance Locations element (Element E).
- Regarding Standard A-c, the requirement to provide weather protection to the “far edge” of the sidewalk is unclear, check the Building Code to ensure consistency with requirements and limitations on covering sidewalks and the public right-of-way. The 4-ft minimum coverage standard probably works because the sidewalks downtown should be at least 8 ft wide.
- Standard B-a can be deleted because the Universal Building Code has it covered; plus, the language about being “visually compatible” is too discretionary to be a standard and should perhaps be shifted to the Guidance section. But look at suggested language from New York City as a model for standards for awning design, and see if there is similar language for canopies.
- There is some redundancy between Standards B-c and C-a; consider moving B-c into C (materials) since it has more to do with materials than design.
- Keep the prohibition on backlighting awnings in Standard C-b.
- Keep the language in Standard C-c regarding limiting signage on awnings and canopies to only the front face but double-check for consistency with the sign code.
- Consider more positive definitions for materials and details—instead of saying what should not be used, be more specific in listing the materials and designs that are desired. For example, specify that the structure or frame materials for awnings and

canopies shall be aluminum or steel. Standard C-a could be changed to read, “Awnings shall be canvas or modified canvas.”

- In Guidance D, are canvas and treated wood truly “high quality” materials?

J. Rooftop Equipment Screening

- For Standard B, the perspective of “public view” needs to be defined—could be across the street from a development, and/or at a height of so many feet above the ground. Perhaps there could be an option of either not being visible from public view or providing a screen as tall as the equipment. Regardless, it does seem important to retain the concept of considering a public view, though not necessarily from adjacent buildings.
- In Standard B-a, delete the distinction of “primary” exterior finish material and leave it at “an exterior finish material.”
- In Guidance A, delete the first sentence about roof-mounted mechanical equipment being hidden from view by parapets. Let the second sentence stand, about making the screening an integral part of the architecture when building parapets do not provide adequate screening. Re-frame Guidance B and C each as examples of ways to make roof-mounted mechanical equipment more visually subordinate (i.e., with green features or painting).

K. Service Areas (Screening)

- Separate the various types of facilities (loading areas, service areas, utility structures, garbage facilities, etc.) and line out specific standards for each, as appropriate. Begin the average standard with “if”—i.e., “If loading areas are provided, then they shall be accommodated on site . . .”.
- Question—can you even have outdoor storage downtown (listed in Standard B)?

The group agreed to meet in a special session before the next regularly scheduled meeting on October 1. After looking at calendars, all committee members and Mr. Edge indicated they were available on September 20.

7.0 Other Business/Updates – None

8.0 Design and Landmarks Committee Discussion Items – None

9.0 Forecast for Future Meetings:

Sept. 20, 2018	Special Session for DDG Assessment
Oct. 1, 2018	DDG Assessment
Oct. 16, 2018	Annual Update to City Council

Vice Chair Schuster adjourned the meeting at 8:33 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Brett Kelter, Associate Planner

Lauren Loosveldt, Chair

**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 – None

- 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. Kolias 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 32nd 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.

Respectfully submitted,
Brett Kelper, Associate Planner

Lauren Loosveldt, Chair

Milwaukie Design and Landmarks Committee

2018-19 WORK PROGRAM

To be Confirmed by City Council on November 13, 2018

Accomplishments of 2017-18

Between July 2017 and October 2018, the Design and Landmarks Committee (DLC) met 19 times, including 3 special meetings outside the Committee's regular monthly schedule.

The Committee was back to full membership in September 2017 with the addition of Mary Neustadter and Kyle Simukka. After Michael Corrente stepped down in February 2018, Cynthia Schuster assumed the Vice Chair role; in June 2018, Brett Laurila was appointed to fill the open position.

Public meetings for recommendations on land use applications:

- **August 2017** = Willamette Greenway review of City's replacement of bridge in Milwaukie Bay Park (file #WG-2017-003); also, Design Review for Axletree mixed-use development proposed at 2036 SE Washington St (DR-2017-001)
- **December 2017** = Historic Review for removing Milwaukie High School from Historic Properties list (HR-2017-002)
- **March 2018** = Design Review for replacement of Ledding Library (DR-2018-001)
- **October 2018** = Historic Review for modifications to Milwaukie City Hall (HR-2018-001)

Throughout the year, the DLC continued its work to update the Downtown Design Guidelines. What began in 2016 as an effort simply to refresh the photos has evolved into a more in-depth overhaul of the Guidelines and the relevant parts of the Zoning Code. The Committee noted a need to revise some of the text and then identified gaps between the design elements addressed in the clear and objective standards versus the more discretionary guidelines. Eventually, it became clear that the scope for this important task had expanded enough to warrant outside help.

The Planning Director identified available funds in the department's budget and contracted with a team from SERA Architects to assist in revamping the Downtown Design Review process. The consultants worked with the group from March to June 2018 to synthesize existing code and guideline language and organize it in a revised framework of design elements. The Committee has been reviewing the draft language to make edits and identify issues that need further discussion.

Work Program for 2018-19

Downtown Design Review Update

The Downtown Design Review update continues to be the DLC's focus for the coming year, with the following tasks and **deliverables**:

- Finish reviewing initial draft of Design Review document (late 2018)

- Develop a **summary** of comments and questions from the initial review
- Draft **revised code language** for Design Review, including applicability and process (late 2018/early 2019)
- Develop **revised diagrams and graphics** for proposed code
- Provide **commentary document** to explain proposed changes
- Present draft documents to Planning Commission and City Council in worksession settings and solicit feedback (early 2019)

Some funding remains available for re-engaging the SERA team in a focused and strategic way to help complete the development of the revised materials.

Other Tasks

In addition, the DLC is prepared to respond as needed for review of the following types of applications:

- Downtown Design Review. For development proposals in Downtown zones, conduct public design review meetings to advise the Planning Commission on implementation of the Downtown Design Guidelines.
- Post-Decision Limited Design Review. Conduct design review meetings on development proposals when the Planning Commission has made design review a condition of approval or to assist with other City projects.
- Historic Resources Review. Review Historic Landmark alteration or demolition requests and advise the Planning Commission on applications when City approval is required by the Milwaukie Municipal Code (MMC).

“Parking Lot” Items

There are several topics and tasks that the Committee would like to work on but will probably not have time for in 2018-19. Those items are captured in a “parking lot” of ideas for future activity:

1. Historic Preservation
 - a. Update the City’s inventory of Historic Resources.
 - b. Update code language for the Historic Preservation Overlay Zone (MMC Section 19.403), to clarify and strengthen the City’s protections for designated historic resources.
2. Development of Opportunity Sites

As opportunities present themselves, participate in the City’s development of its various “opportunity sites,” including Block 14 on Main St between Harrison St and Jackson St, as well as the Coho Point site at Washington St and McLoughlin Blvd.
3. Take advantage of relevant training opportunities as they arise.