

**CITY OF MILWAUKIE  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTES  
Milwaukie City Hall  
10722 SE Main Street  
TUESDAY, August 27, 2013  
6:30 PM**

**COMMISSIONERS PRESENT**

Lisa Batey, Chair  
Clare Fuchs, Vice Chair  
Scott Barbur  
Sine Bone  
Shaun Lowcock  
Wilda Parks  
Gabe Storm

**STAFF PRESENT**

Stephen C. Butler, Planning Director  
Brett Kelter, Associate Planner  
Peter Watts, City Attorney

**1.0 Call to Order – Procedural Matters\***

**Chair Batey** called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and read the conduct of meeting format into the record.

***Note:** The information presented constitutes summarized minutes only. The meeting video is available by clicking the Video link at <http://www.ci.milwaukie.or.us/meetings>.*

**2.0 Planning Commission Minutes**

2.1 April 9, 2013

**It was moved by Commissioner Parks and seconded by Commissioner Storm to approve the April 9, 2013 Planning Commission minutes, as amended to remove Chris Wilson from the attendance list. The motion passed with Vice Chair Fuchs and Commissioner Barbur abstaining.**

2.2 April 23, 2013

**It was moved by Commissioner Parks and seconded by Vice Chair Fuchs to approve the April 23, 2013, Planning Commission minutes, as written. The motion passed with Commissioners Bone (Adams) and Barbur abstaining.**

**3.0 Information Items**

**Steve Butler, Planning Director**, stated that the Commercial Core Enhancement Program (CCEP) project was renamed to Moving Forward Milwaukie: Enhancing Our Commercial Districts. The project advisory committee (PAC) needed a representative from the Planning Commission. The first public meeting for the project was tentatively scheduled for October 7, 2013. The first PAC meetings were scheduled for September 23 and October 21, 2013.

**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 Hearings** – None

## **6.0 Worksession Items**

### **6.1 Summary: Discussion about Transportation-Related Educational Webinar/Videos Staff: Steve Butler**

**Mr. Butler** requested the Commission watch two videos prior to the meeting; one was a webinar on right-sizing streets, and the other was a presentation by Jeffrey Tumlin on “Walkable Urbanism” which focused on ways to downsize streets, increase walkability, and improve traffic conditions.

**The Commission** discussed the videos.

- **Commissioner Parks** appreciated Tumlin’s philosophical and societal-oriented points of view.
- **Commissioner Parks** saw some opportunities for “road diets” in Milwaukie, and agreed with the video’s sentiment and wanted Milwaukie to be a memorable and comfortable place.
- **Chair Batey** said the single most important thing was to make walking more attractive to everyone.
- **Commissioner Sine** said the best transportation plan was to have a good land use plan. In Milwaukie, parking was an issue; the City should consider pricing parking.
- **Commissioner Lowcock** disagreed with Tumlin and did not see Vancouver as a good example of transportation. He believed Portland should be used as a good transportation example.
- **Chair Batey** noted that the webinar on right-sizing streets was not as relevant to Milwaukie as the Tumlin presentation, although some statistics were worthwhile and may be relevant.
- **Commissioner Bone** felt that streets should not be design to accommodate big cars or high speeds. Focus should be on creating traffic calming and if there is no money for curbing and sidewalks, other solutions should be considered, e.g. striping.

### **6.2 Summary: Transportation System Plan (TSP) Update preparation Staff: Brett Kelter**

**Mr. Butler** recognized **Jason Rice, Engineering Director**, and **Jamin Kimmel, Planning Intern**, in the audience.

**Brett Kelter, Associate Planner**, presented the staff report. He noted that the TSP was an ancillary document to the Comprehensive Plan and therefore any changes required a legislative process for adoption. He reviewed the purpose of the TSP and noted the update was required to comply with Metro’s Regional Transportation Plan. The update was also to adjust the forecast horizon from 2030 to 2035 and to update project priorities.

**Mr. Kelter** noted that the following questions and topics have come up through public involvement and may be heard during future public hearings:

- How does the TSP relate to maintenance of the current street infrastructure? He clarified that the TSP was not designed to address paving and general street maintenance issues; those issues were managed through the Street Surface Maintenance Program (SSMP).
- How does the TSP address the light rail? He explained that the TSP focused on studying the system and infrastructure in place; once light rail was operating and an active part of the system, it would be included in future analysis of the whole system. An example of a new

issue that might need future study was the need to better connect the various neighborhoods to light rail.

- Downtown Parking – How would light rail affect parking downtown and in the neighborhoods near the stations? He noted that even before the light rail project, there have been questions about how downtown parking functions, how it is managed, how is it enforced, etc. The 2007 TSP included language outlining the existing process for establishing residential parking permit programs. Staff conducts an annual inventory of downtown parking utilization, but perhaps there should be a comprehensive study of downtown parking outside of the TSP.
- Can large projects be broken into smaller segments to increase the chances of getting funding? He explained that the listing of large projects would not prevent them from being tackled in smaller segments if partial funding became available.
- A lot of sidewalk projects were described as “build sidewalk on both sides of the street.” Why not start by building a sidewalk on just one side of the street? He noted that, like large projects being funded in smaller pieces, a project’s full description would not prevent the City from constructing only part of it in order to save money to use for other projects.
- There has been a suggestion to show projects by neighborhood. He said that could be addressed with some new appendix materials.
- Some people have wanted more opportunities for public involvement. He indicated that the scope of the update project had not allowed for as much public involvement as some would have liked but that there had been effective public input received through several open houses and public meetings. He explained that he had tried to identify which issues or suggestions could be addressed through the update process and which ones would be more effectively handled in some other way.

**Chair Batey** would like to explore the City’s ability to lower the speed limit on some residential streets to 15 mph.

**Mr. Kelver** indicated that the Neighborhood Traffic Management chapter might be a place to address that issue.

**Mr. Rice** explained that the House bill allowing speeds down to 20 mph on neighborhood greenways may only be implemented in cities with populations over 100,000 citizens. However, he would look into seeing if the City could lower the speed limit to 15 mph on streets with a paved width of 18 ft or less.

**Mr. Kelver** outlined the timeline for adoption of the TSP updates. Public hearings with the Commission would be in September, with a worksession and hearings at City Council to follow in October.

**Mr. Butler** encouraged the Commissioners to take advantage of the evening’s session to ask questions and prepare for the upcoming public hearing. He noted the overall project deadline from Metro was for the end of 2013 and suggested that the sooner the TSP updates could be adopted, the sooner the City could turn its attention to implementing some actual TSP projects.

**Mr. Kelver** explained the format of the proposed TSP amendments and then highlighted the key proposed changes, chapter by chapter.

**Chair Batey** encouraged Commissioners to continue reading the TSP and contact staff if a question arises.

## **7.0 Planning Department Other Business/Updates**

### **7.1 Planning Commission Notebook Update Pages**

**Mr. Butler** noted there was a TSP open house and public meeting scheduled for September 5, 2013.

**Mr. Butler** and the Commission also discussed the Moving Forward Milwaukie Project Advisory Committee (PAC). The PAC would consist of members of the Commission and Design and Landmarks Committee, downtown business owners, and other stakeholders. **Commissioner Bone** was interested in participating and **Commissioner Barbur** offered to consider being an alternate.

## **8.0 Planning Commission Discussion Items**

**Chair Batey** talked about a large garage expansion being built in Island Station. She felt it should have been subject to the conditions of an accessory structure; but because there was an insulated connection between the garage and the existing house, it was considered to be an expansion of the house and not an accessory structure or barn.

**Mr. Kelver** confirmed that the insulated connection made it an extension to the existing house.

**Commissioner Parks** asked if it was possible to look into clarifying the meaning of "connection" for future projects.

**Chair Batey** said the Code could be amended to address that.

## **9.0 Forecast for Future Meetings:**

September 10, 2013 1. Public Hearing: CPA-13-03 Transportation System Plan (TSP) Update

September 24, 2013 1. Public Hearing: CPA-13-03 Transportation System Plan (TSP) Update

Meeting adjourned at approximately 10:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Hannah Haugen, Administrative Specialist II, for  
Alicia Martin, Administrative Specialist II

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Lisa Batey, Chair