

**CITY OF MILWAUKIE
DESIGN AND LANDMARKS COMMITTEE**

NOTES

**Milwaukie City Hall
10722 SE Harrison St
Monday, February 4, 2019
6:30 PM**

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT

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

STAFF PRESENT

Brett Kelter, Associate Planner (staff liaison)

OTHERS PRESENT

(None)

MEMBERS ABSENT

(None)

1.0 Call to Order – Procedural Matters

Chair Lauren Loosveldt called the meeting to order at 6:31 p.m.

2.0 Design and Landmarks Committee Notes

2.1 January 7, 2019

Chair Loosveldt called for any revisions to the notes; there were none, and the notes were approved unanimously.

3.0 Information Items

Associate Planner Brett Kelter informed the group of the City's annual volunteer appreciation dinner scheduled for April 30 at the Milwaukie Center. He was unclear about the start time but expected that a formal invitation would be going out soon.

Committee Member Mary Neustadter noted that she would miss the March 4 meeting.

Mr. Kelter announced that the design team for the Coho Point project (a City-facilitated redevelopment of the site at Washington St and McLoughlin Blvd) would like to get the committee's feedback on the preliminary design at the regular meeting on April 1. Based on the group's experience with the Axletree project, **Chair Loosveldt** suggested making a clear disclaimer about that not being a formal review. She wondered whether the members should make any comments at all, or rather simply take in the information and ask clarifying questions. The group agreed that it should be ok to provide some comments as long as it was made clear that it was simply a preliminary review and not the more detailed, formal review that would come later as part of an official Downtown Design Review application. *[Note: The Coho Point item was subsequently moved up to the March 4 agenda, to align better with a public open house on the topic later that same week.]*

4.0 Audience Participation – None

5.0 Public Meetings – None

6.0 Worksession Items

6.1 Downtown Design Review process (continued) Staff Person: Brett Kelter, Associate Planner

Returning to the list of outstanding questions and discussion items on the Design Review draft, **Mr. Kelter** handed out copies of a list of comments and notes from Planning Commissioner Joseph Edge for the group's reference. The group agreed to table discussion of Elements C through F (Exterior Building Materials, Façade Transparency, Doors & Entrance Locations, and Windows) until the March meeting, when Vice Chair Cynthia Schuster would bring images and make a visual presentation. Element H (Building Massing) should have its own focus on another date. The discussion returned to Element A (Site Frontage) and a look back at the figures showing locations for frontage occupancy requirements and build-to lines.

A. Site Frontage

- The group clarified that there should be no red line on Eagle St along the south side of the sewage treatment plant. There was a suggestion to figure out how to apply these design requirements to the treatment plant's frontage alongside the Trolley Trail, both for the build-to requirement and a 90% frontage occupancy. The group clarified that the frontage occupancy along McLoughlin Blvd should be 90%, with a 75% frontage occupancy requirement on the east-west streets downtown.
- **Vice Chair Schuster** asked whether there was a maximum block length downtown—would there ever be any new streets added downtown? There was a suggestion to set a 75% frontage occupancy requirement on Main St north of Scott St, and a 90% requirement on 21st Ave (instead of 75%). **Vice Chair Schuster** made a defense of the 75% requirement on 21st Ave since that street is more of a “back of house” location downtown. She also suggested an extension of the 75% requirement on 21st Ave north to include the City Hall block, with a 90% frontage occupancy requirement on Main St in front of City Hall.
- **Ms. Neustadter** noted that the Milwaukie Cleaners and Nautilus buildings (on Main St north of Scott St) could both be eligible for listing in the national historic register. The group was reminded that the current code still provided a process for demolition of historic properties, so it was important to think about potential redevelopment on most sites downtown. The members agreed that the frontage occupancy on Jackson St west of Main St should be 75%, that Jefferson St on both sides of Main St should be 75%, and that Scott St west of Main St should be left at 50%. **Vice Chair Schuster** suggested that the various diagrams should be marked up and shown to staff to see what they think; **Mr. Kelter** agreed to try to do this in time for the next meeting.

G. Corners

- Is Standard B-d specific enough? **Vice Chair Schuster** noted that the width of the sidewalk was a factor. **Chair Loosveldt** suggested zooming in on the corner of the graphic to provide more detail and expressed the opinion that special paving or scoring was not necessary. After some discussion, the group agreed that Standard B-d should be deleted. With Standard B-a already being deleted from the earlier review, that leaves just two standards as choices, so it may make sense to require an applicant to do only one of the two. **Vice Chair Schuster** suggested adding a third option of a providing a canopy and/or signage visible from two sides.
- Standard B-c should be adjusted to reflect the options of 45-degree angle, rounded/radius, stepped/notched, or faceted/scalloped. **Vice Chair Schuster** suggested

that the graphic could perhaps be enhanced to show these options for what could be done at a corner.

H. Building Massing

- For Standards C-c and C-d, **Mr. Kelter** noted that he would need to take a closer look, including at the issue of solar access and how it affects residential zones. **Vice Chair Schuster** agreed to look for more information about solar access as well. Someone remembered that Commissioner Edge had suggested that some kind of trade-off might be necessary to increase density.
- The question remains as to whether "Height" should be added to the title of this element.

I. Weather Protection

- For Guidance D, the group suggested that "high quality" might be understood to mean durable or low-maintenance. For example, canvas and treated wood could both be considered high quality materials.
- Regarding the specificity of Standard C, **Vice Chair Schuster** thought it needed more detail, including separate details for awnings versus canopies. Through some discussion, the group worked out the following 2 distinct sets of standards:
 - a) Awnings
 - can be canvas or sheet metal
 - shall not be backlit or vinyl
 - tenant signage is permitted only on the front face of the awning and is restricted on all sloped or horizontal elements
 - b) Canopies
 - can be metal, glass, or polycarbonate material
 - tenant signage is permitted only on top of or hung from the canopy
 - a guidance point would be that canopy lighting is allowed, if it highlights the building or illuminates the sidewalk

A note was made to follow up on whether a reference to the sign code is necessary.

The discussion wrapped up at this point, to be continued at the next meeting.

7.0 Other Business/Updates

Ms. Neustadter reported on her recent involvement with the Milwaukie Museum's effort to conduct a survey of historic properties in Milwaukie. She asked whether the committee was supposed to be coordinating with the museum on this; **Chair Loosveldt** confirmed there was no such requirement. **Ms. Neustadter** indicated that she would stay involved with the museum's effort and had offered to provide them with information on the federal, state, and local designation processes and could talk to them about the concept of historic conservation districts as well. She said she would send her draft of the local info to Mr. Kelter for his review prior to the museum's next meeting on February 11. She thought it would be important for the committee to stay tuned as the museum moved forward, including perhaps with an invitation to representatives from the State Historic Preservation Office to participate with the museum and also share some information with the committee.

8.0 Design and Landmarks Committee Discussion Items

Chair Loosveldt returned to an issue raised at the end of the January meeting about whether Committee Member Kyle Simukka was still willing and able to serve actively on the committee, understanding that his new baby at home likely presented new challenges. **Mr. Simukka** responded that he was in fact still wanting to be more involved with the group and that he would know more within the next couple of months about whether other things might be changing for him. **Mr. Kever** suggested that Mr. Simukka would be a good resource for helping to curate an interactive online discussion among group members when the next active draft of the Design Review document is ready for review.

Chair Loosveldt announced to the group that it was with very mixed feelings that she had accepted a position on the Planning Commission. The mayor had recruited her to the Commission to help support and finalize the Comprehensive Plan update process currently underway, though she felt torn to leave the ongoing work of the Design Review update. She was intent on being a strong advocate for the Design Review changes that the committee would be proposing in the coming months. She also announced that she was expecting, with a new baby due sometime in July—congratulations were shared. **Mr. Kever** indicated that Chair Loosveldt's first meeting as a new commissioner would not be until April 9, so it should be ok for her to make the April 1 committee meeting her last one and officially resign at the end.

Vice Chair Schuster asked whether it would be a conflict to have Chair Loosveldt participate in the Coho Point discussion at the April meeting. **Mr. Kever** responded that it might be clearest if Chair Loosveldt recused herself from that discussion, or if she asked only informational questions and did not make comments. She also might be fine to participate and then disclose her participation when the item comes before the Planning Commission for an official hearing. **Mr. Kever** agreed to talk with the Planning Director to provide the best advice and line out the options.

9.0 Forecast for Future Meetings

March 4, 2019	Regular meeting, with preliminary review of Coho Point project
April 1, 2019	Regular meeting
May 6, 2019	Regular meeting

Chair Loosveldt adjourned the meeting at 8:39 p.m.



Lauren Loosveldt, Chair

Respectfully submitted,
Brett Kever, Associate Planner