

**CITY OF MILWAUKIE
PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES
Milwaukie City Hall
10722 SE Main Street
TUESDAY, October 28, 2014
6:30 PM**

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT

Sine Bone, Chair
Wilda Parks, Vice Chair
Shannah Anderson
Scott Barbur
Greg Hemer
Shaun Lowcock

STAFF PRESENT

Denny Egner, Planning Director
Li Alligood, Senior Planner

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT

Gabe Storm

1.0 Call to Order – Procedural Matters*

Chair Bone 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

3.0 Information Items

Denny Egner, Planning Director, noted an open house for the Monroe Street Neighborhood Greenway Concept Plan project was scheduled for December 3, 2014 at the Public Safety Building.

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

6.0 Worksession Items

- 6.1 Summary: Moving Forward Milwaukie Downtown Plan and Code Amendments – Proposed Design Standards
Staff: Li Alligood and Denny Egner

Li Alligood, Senior Planner, presented the staff report via PowerPoint. She noted this was the ninth worksession for the project with the Planning Commission and this worksession would focus on Downtown Design Standards. She reviewed the project's timeline and goals with regard to the Downtown Vision. Implementation of the goals involved providing more clarity and flexibility for development, ensuring attractive and pedestrian-friendly development, and to streamline the review process.

Ms. Alligood summarized the proposed revisions to the Design Standards that would ensure guidelines were codified for a clear and quantifiable review process, provide clarity of the community's expectations, ensure new development was pedestrian-friendly, and provide flexibility for a streamlined review option.

Ms. Alligood reviewed the design standards specifics including the intent, related guidelines, and the existing and proposed standards, and showed examples of buildings that met and did not meet the proposed standards:

Building Façade Details:

- Intent was to provide cohesive and interesting facades using scale-defining devices to create a comfortable and interesting street edge/street wall.
- The existing standard only called for minimal base and top treatments, and the proposed standards would require a tripartite façade with a base, middle, and top. Staff would be 'test-driving' the proposed standards and the standards would also need to be correlated with the development standards.
- **Ms. Alligood** reiterated that these proposals were just proposals at this point and the details would need to be clarified through this process.
- Middle treatment could include stepbacks or balconies.
- Top treatments could allow different types of roof treatments. The current standards called for flat roofs and a prohibition of decorative roofs, although that definition was unclear. The proposal would make the standard more explicit with some finish to the roof with cornices or eaves.
- Buildings over 150ft in length would be required to have a significant break, either into two buildings or have a setback. **Ms. Alligood** reminded that these were options for the proposals and it was up to the Commission if a full-block building with enough articulation was acceptable without needing a break in the building.

Residential Buildings:

- **Ms. Alligood** reminded the Commission of the Residential Development Standards project a few years ago where the first design standards for multifamily residential buildings were adopted.
- The intent was to clarify which standards should apply to stand-alone residential buildings and the residential portion of mixed-use buildings.
- Currently there were no standards that applied to stand-alone residential buildings in downtown. The proposal would be for multifamily standards that were adopted for the rest of the city to also apply to stand-alone residential buildings in downtown.
- **Commissioner Hemer** asked about requiring off-street parking and garages for rowhouses in downtown
- **Ms. Alligood** responded that that could be an option but perhaps not to be too restrictive on how that would look.
- **Mr. Egner** reminded the Commission to keep in mind how many driveway cuts would be wanted in downtown when a pedestrian-friendly environment was the goal. Parking should be behind the street frontage.

Corners:

- The intent was to reinforce intersections as important places for people to gather. The related guideline was to locate entry doors on the corners of commercial/retail buildings where possible.

- There was no current design standard for corners and the proposal was to require entrances at corners when possible and to reinforce the prominence of the corner.
- **Chair Bone** asked if other codes required how deep the corners were, etc.
- **Ms. Alligood** responded that she hadn't seen that but other aspects to keep in mind were weather protection requirements like awnings or canopies, etc.
- **Ms. Alligood** noted that there were four options for enhancing the corner and a new building would have to incorporate two of those options. These included locating the primary entrance at the corner, cutting the corner at a 45 degree angle or the like, including prominent architectural elements, and using a combination of materials, furnishings, and plantings where appropriate.
- Standards would require entrances on Main St and when possible, for the entrances to be on the corner of the Main St frontage.

Weather Protection:

- The intent was that ground floor awnings and canopies protect pedestrians, encourage window shopping, and create visual interest. The related guideline was to protect pedestrians from weather.
- There was no current standard. The proposal was to require awnings, canopies, recesses, or similar above entrances and along 50% of the ground floor elevation.
- **Ms. Alligood** noted that the Commission would want to decide if some types of materials should be allowed or not allowed.
- **Ms. Alligood** added a conflict with creating standards was that there were some key elements that help to make a building successful, but there was also the matter of personal taste. It was difficult to regulate taste.
- **Chair Bone** asked the Commission if there should be standards that required some light through the awnings and if allowing different types of awnings would provide variability, or should one type be required.
 - **Commissioner Lowcock** felt that variety was more appealing to the eye; a full block of flat metal awnings would create a tunnel feeling.
 - **Vice Chair Parks** agreed with Commissioner Lowcock.
- **Ms. Alligood** reminded that there could be options and variables built into the standards.

Exterior Building Materials:

- The intent was to provide a sense of permanence and add articulation and visual interest through a variety of materials and designs. The related guideline was to use materials that create a sense of permanence.
- The current standard was only a list of prohibited materials with allowed materials understood by omission. The proposal was to expand the permitted list to establish primary, secondary, and accent materials for use on new development. The types would be broken out into percentages as some may not be appropriate for a primary material but work well for accent.
- **Mr. Egner** added that it was important to use materials that provided permanence rather than materials that would only last a short time and would need replacing or maintenance.
- **Commissioner Hemer** noted his concern about the proposal that would require removal of materials, paneling, and paint covering surfaces for significant façade renovations. He was concerned about the impact of removing paint in terms of mess, waterways, etc.
 - **Ms. Alligood** responded that the idea was to remove materials that had been layered up. Perhaps this should not apply to all cases, but for historic buildings and when it applied.

Chair Bone was concerned about developers just checking boxes and asked if staff had considered incentivizing exemplary design.

- **Ms. Alligood** responded not in a design-sense but agreed it was a good idea. However, incentives would more likely be in the form of such elements as building height or floor area ratio rather than design. Staff could prepare proposals to bring back to the Commission.
- **Commissioner Lowcock** noted that incentivizing taste would be difficult.
- **Chair Bone** noted that some options would be green building. She wanted developers to want to build better buildings so incentives were important.
- **Ms. Alligood** added that regardless of incentives, the standards needed to be high enough that checking boxes would result in what the community wanted and was buildable. The goal of the proposal was for a Type II review option to require more than minimum standards with a Type III option for proposals that may be more creative and needed more discretionary review.
- **Chair Bone** asked what the trigger would be to move an application from Type II to Type III review.
- **Ms. Alligood** responded that if a proposal did not meet at least one of the standards, it would move into Type III review which would be limited to the standard that was not being met.
- **Ms. Alligood** reminded the Commission that what was being presented was a starting point for discussion – nothing was set in stone yet. The first hearing for these amendments was scheduled for November 25, 2014, and there were a number of hearings scheduled to break them into sections.

Windows and Doors:

- The intent was to enhance street safety and provide a comfortable and interesting walking environment. The related guideline was to provide human scale and variety to the pedestrian environment.
- The current standard was only at least 50% glazing of the ground floor on certain sections of Main St. The proposal was to increase Main St to 60% and expand requirements to 30% for McLoughlin Blvd, 40 % for the remainder of downtown, and add 30% glazing to upper floors with 60% of that to be vertically-oriented.
- She asked the Commission for direction about the upper floor requirements. She noted that the windows would be measured by pane rather than by bank.
 - **The Commission** agreed that the overall vertical feel was more important than the orientation of the individual windows.
- **Ms. Alligood** noted that these standards would only apply to mixed-use or commercial buildings.

Residential Doors:

- For standalone residential buildings, doors that face a very active street should be separated from the street by a change of grade. The related guideline was to define a friendly transition between the public and private realm.
- Currently there were only dimension standards, but no requirement to provide front entry areas. A new transition area standard was proposed between the public street and ground floor units.
- A reason for this proposal was to couple with the proposal to allow multifamily residential development on the ground floor throughout downtown but for Main St south of Scott St.

Roofs and Rooftop Equipment:

- The intent was to create visual interest for the pedestrian experience and to integrate equipment into the design. The guidelines call for detail in the roofline and integration of equipment.
- Currently there were only requirements for cornices on flat roofs and no standards regarding equipment. The proposal was to clarify which types of roofs were permitted and treatment requirement, and to establish screening requirements for equipment.
- **Ms. Alligood** added that there were standards for sustainability-related accessory structures that would need to work with the proposed standards.

Open Space / Plazas:

- To provide amenities for downtown residents and promote livability. The guidelines were to provide safe and comfortable resting places, and spaces designed for a variety of activities.
- There were no standards for open spaces currently. The proposal called for projects larger than 20,000 sq ft to provide a minimum 400 sq ft open space, and for a minimum square footage of outdoor space per unit for residential units of four or more.
- **Chair Bone** noted that this was a section she thought to incentivize.

Ms. Alligood noted she would take into consideration the Commission's direction and questions and bring some updates back at the next meeting.

Chair Bone called for public comment.

David Aschenbrenner, Moving Forward Milwaukie (MFM) Project Advisory Committee (PCA) member, commented that as the proposals were written, it was confusing to have so many variations of standards and requirements for different streets and sections of downtown. He felt that the vision, desired character, and treatments should apply throughout downtown rather than only for Main St and those streets connecting to the riverfront.

- **Commissioner Hemer** asked, with regard to the specific building materials standard called for in the South Downtown Concept Plan which Mr. Aschenbrenner was involved with, why the list was so restrictive, and even more restrictive than these current proposals.
- **Ms. Alligood** reminded that there was a difference between the Pattern Language document and the adopted South Downtown Concept Plan.
- **Mark Gamba, City Councilor, MFM PAC member, and member of South Downtown group**, responded that the limited materials list was a part of the Pattern Language document. The goal of that list was for materials that reflected a northwest character with traditional northwest materials.
- **Ms. Alligood** responded that a goal of the project was to implement the adopted South Downtown Concept Plan which was a more refined document from the Pattern Language. She noted that there were some limitations to what was called for in the Pattern Language. Although these amendments addressed regulatory issues for implementing the Concept Plan, there were other elements that were needed to fully implement it. She added that the draft Downtown and Riverfront Land Use Framework Plan amendments referenced the Concept Plan but staff was working out how it should be referenced in terms of either the document or the image, etc.

7.0 Planning Department Other Business/Updates

- 7.1 Recommendation of a Planning Commission Representative to the Library Expansion Task Force

Mr. Egner asked for a volunteer for the Library Task Force.

Commissioner Barbur volunteered.

8.0 Planning Commission Discussion Items

9.0 Forecast for Future Meetings:

November 12, 2014 1. Worksession: Moving Forward Milwaukie Downtown Plan and Code Amendments – Downtown Design Review

Due to scheduling conflicts, it was moved to reschedule the meeting to November 13, 2014.


- November 25, 2014
1. Public Hearing: CPA-14-02 Moving Forward Milwaukie Downtown Plan and Code Amendments – Development Standards
 2. Public Hearing: ZA-14-03 Commercial-Limited Zone Update
 3. Public Hearing: VR-14-02 9925 SE 37th Ave Variance

Mr. Egner noted that there was a Moving Forward Milwaukie public open house the following evening, October 29, 2014, at the Masonic Lodge.

Meeting adjourned at approximately 8:49 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Alicia Martin, Administrative Specialist II



Sine Bone, Chair