

**CITY OF MILWAUKIE
DESIGN AND LANDMARKS COMMITTEE
MINUTES
Milwaukie Public Safety Building
3200 SE Harrison Street
WEDNESDAY, August 24, 2011
6:30 PM**

DLC MEMBERS PRESENT

Greg Hemer, Chair
Jim Perrault, Vice Chair
Becky Ives
Patty Wisner
Chantelle Gamba

STAFF PRESENT

Li Alligood, Assistant Planner, (DLC Liaison)
Kenny Asher, Community Development Director
Katie Mangle, Planning Director
Susan Shanks, Senior Planner

MEMBERS ABSENT

None

1.0 Call to Order – Procedural Matters

Chair Greg Hemer called the meeting to order at 6:35 p.m. and read the conduct of meeting format into the record.

2.0 Design and Landmarks Committee Notes

2.1 July 27, 2011

DLC Member Chantelle Gamba moved to approve the July 27, 2011, DLC meeting notes as presented. DLC Vice Chair Jim Perrault seconded the motion. The minutes were approved unanimously.

3.0 Information Items

There were no information items.

4.0 Audience Participation –This is an opportunity for the public to comment on any item not on the agenda. There was none.

5.0 Public Meetings – None

6.0 Worksession Items

6.1 Summary: Kellogg Bridge Design
Staff Person: Susan Shanks, Senior Planner, and Jeb Doran, TriMet

Katie Mangle, Planning Director, informed the Committee that the land use application for the light rail bridge over Kellogg Lake had been submitted, and the worksession was a preview of the application and an opportunity to review the format of the design review public meeting. She

noted that TriMet had included many design elements as requested by the DLC and the community, although some requested design elements had not been included and would be explained during the worksession

Susan Shanks, Senior Planner, noted that the Design Review application process would follow the new design review procedures adopted with the tune-up project, and reviewed the different types of land use applications submitted.

- The DLC would be reviewing the Design Review application, which was scheduled for the September 28, 2011, meeting of the Committee. The DLC would review the application against the Downtown Design Guidelines.
- Due to the state-mandated 120-day timeline, staff was anticipating that the Planning Commission would need two public hearings, which would only allow for one regularly scheduled DLC meeting. However, there was an option to schedule a special meeting. Ms. Shanks was the staff person for the application and she requested that any concerns, questions, or comments be directed to her.

Jeb Doran, TriMet, noted the consolidated timeline and wanted to address some issues raised at the June joint DLC / Planning Commission meeting and touch base with the group. He reviewed the changes to the bridge design from the beginning of the process to now

- Presented a Powerpoint that reviewed the specifics of the changes and improvements to the design of the bridge, as well the limitations of the requests and feedback of the DLC and community, as followed:
 - The jumpspan and transition had a thinner profile, with the continuation of steel façade and rock face treatments to the abutment to match the tubs at the south end.
 - Safety concerns beneath the bridge were addressed through more lighting and openings for lighting, more railings, and improvements to visibility through the thinner profile.
 - Steel column wraps vs. concrete columns – There were structural concerns with the steel wraps with regard to inspections and repairs, particularly after seismic events. The steel wraps were also more susceptible to graffiti damage as the weathered steel treatment allows graffiti to absorb and cleaned graffiti shows as well. Concrete had better results for graffiti cleaning, and could incorporate design features that break up the look. Constructability was also a concern as with steel each pier would need individual forms, while concrete essentially needed one mold for all of the columns. Acid treatment for the concrete columns was an option for consideration.

DLC Member Becky Ives arrived at 7:00 p.m.

- Board form treatment options – Columns now had tapered I-beams with an open column cap and raised board form lines, which would control and channel water staining for aesthetics.
- For bird prevention the Audubon Society had a wire protection recommendation which TriMet was optimistic about.
- Pedestrian bridge – although currently not included in the project due to funding, TriMet was still looking for funding and working toward including it. The bridge structure was being designed with the assumption that the pedestrian bridge will be built in the future.
- Split versus single columns - split columns provided more support for the bridge. Problems with the single column option included an increase in column width with the bridge width, which would change the visual impact and ribbon effect, and cause issues with the pedestrian bridge.

- Noise - the noise analysis found the only issues were on the track and were being addressed by small walls along track/bridge. Most wall options would take away from ribbon effect. However, Paraglas was a transparent product that was durable, maintainable, met guidelines, and maintained transparency. He passed a sample around for examination.

Mr. Doran addressed questions and comments from the DLC:

- The only potential areas for accessibility to graffiti were the public access areas.
- Catenary poles would be black in downtown and galvanized steel along the rest of the Milwaukie alignment for cost and maintenance reasons. The variation of the poles would be softened once the trees filled in.
- The project was at 60% and well on the way to 90% without being over budget.
- A Tiger III grant and the ConnectOregon fund were being considered for funding options for the pedestrian bridge. The design team was working with a contractor on how to include the pedestrian bridge without increasing the costs for environmental permitting by planning the construction period during fish windows.
- Although structural angles were harder to soften due to functionality and clearances, board form treatments and design could continue to be looked at to soften the column patterns in order to look more natural rather than rigid and horizontal.

DLC Member Jim Perrault left at 7:30 p.m.

6.2 Summary: South Downtown Concept Plan
 Staff Person: Katie Mangle, Planning Director

Kenny Asher, Community Development and Public Works Director, noted the South Downtown Concept Plan was scheduled for the September 6, 2011, City Council meeting. Staff had asked Council to adopt the Concept Plan by resolution. He reviewed the history of the South Downtown Concept Plan, and described the potential of and special features surrounding the area around SE 21st Ave and SE Main St. A primary purpose of the Concept Plan was to connect downtown to neighborhoods and parks.

Ms. Mangle noted that the adopted Downtown and Riverfront Framework Plan and the South Downtown Concept Plan had many similar ideas and concepts, including the mixed-use, people-oriented development; connection to parks and creeks; etc. However, there were specific use and anchor ideas that were different in the South Downtown Concept Plan. She noted the Concept Plan was geared toward smaller scale development and activity rather than bigger scale campus-type development. The light rail project increased the sensitivity of circulation and accessibility of the area.

Mr. Asher reviewed the City's history with the Center for Environmental Structure (CES) beginning in 2008, and the humanist development philosophy they worked by. CES had worked with the "Group of 9" to create a Pattern Language for south downtown that highlighted the aspects of the area that the community wanted to celebrate and preserve.

- Due to communication issues, the City changed firms and partnered with Walker Macy to extract implementable ideas from the Pattern Language, and the project was now in Phase 4.
- He reviewed the South Downtown Concept Plan document and drawings, noting the public space circulation, plaza location, preserved views, and pedestrian connectivity with the light

rail station. The next step was to get direction from City Council, who had been asked to adopt the idea and vision by resolution.

Ms. Mangle reviewed Attachment 2 of the staff report and noted that Mr. Asher and she had reviewed the Pattern Language in depth to tease out the essentials and conflicts and determine the realities of implementation. She reminded the Committee that the DLC would be responsible for reviewing many of the aspects of the project as it moved forward, and encouraged their feedback and questions while reviewing the list.

Mr. Asher clarified that along with staff's request for Council to endorse the Concept Plan, a resolution would approve a work plan for the Planning and Community Development departments, which involved zoning code changes and other work to allow for the implementation of the Concept Plan and light rail station area plans. He reviewed the aspects of the Pattern Language that would be carried forward:

- The granularity and texture pattern allowed for development of the area over time with incremental changes, to make it more livable and comfortable. There would need to be a balance between flexibility and restrictions of development.
- The pattern that new construction is unregulated was inconsistent with other patterns and went too far. Although the City wanted to allow for faster transitions for development, there still needed to be some regulation.
- The scattered courtyards pattern was not possible due to space constraints.
- The pedestrian experience pattern was not mentioned specifically in the list, but was an important element. Pedestrian orientation to buildings should be added but the list was building-specific and did not address all of the Pattern Language; however, the pedestrian experience was in the Walker Macy documents.
- The colonnade feature was important, and the buildings themselves would create the pedestrian space and experience.
- The second level of the buildings needed to play into the plaza too, which could help create a human scale.
- Plazas worked best when there was an outdoor room feel. The pavilion would help create that feel and could be used for both public space, such as art, and the lower level can be used for storage for events and maintenance, etc.

Mr. Asher added that for early implementation, the Community Development Department understood that there needed to be more activity in that part of town. Some ideas to start using the area included adding a mid-week Farmers' Market, cleaning and painting buildings, adding food carts, closing the street for events, etc.

- Work for the light rail station and with property owners was still continuing.
- He reminded the Committee that design in the area would be very important and the DLC would have an important role. He assured the Committee that staff would return to the group with more ideas for implementation in the future.

Ms. Mangle verified that the DLC supported staff's direction on this project.

7.0 Other Business/Updates

7.1 DLC regular meeting schedule

Li Alligood, Assistant Planner, reminded the Committee that there were longstanding conflicts between the DLC meetings, Neighborhood District Association leader meetings, and internal scheduling issues for staff.

- She had reviewed the City calendar for potential meeting days, and suggested that any

schedule change would not take effect until after the September meeting.

The Committee agreed to change the regularly scheduling meetings to the first Monday of the month, beginning in November.

8.0 Design and Landmarks Committee Discussion Items – None

9.0 Forecast for Future Meetings:

- | | |
|--------------------|---|
| September 28, 2011 | 1. Public Meeting: Kellogg Bridge Design Review |
| | 2. Worksession: Façade Improvement Program application review |
| October 26, 2011 | 1. Worksession: Façade Improvement Program application review |
| | 2. Worksession: Light rail project update |

Meeting adjourned at approximately 8:38 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Alicia Stoutenburg, Administrative Specialist II



Greg Hemer, Chair