



MILWAUKIE

Dogwood City of the West

To: Design and Landmarks Committee
From: Li Alligood, Assistant Planner and DLC Liaison
Date: January 19, 2010
Subject: Preparation for January 27, 2010, Meeting

Greetings! We will be in the **Community Room at the Public Safety Building** for next Wednesday's meeting at **6:30 p.m.** Please note the return to our regular location. The agenda is enclosed (see Enclosure 1).

Riverfront Park Meeting

At its November 9, 2009, meeting the DLC reviewed the Riverfront Park design and voted to recommend approval of the design to the Planning Commission. Since this was the first of several upcoming design reviews, we will take a few moments during this meeting to debrief about the hearing; staff would like your feedback about what worked well and what could work better, and we will have some feedback to help you prepare for your next application review.

Historic Photo Project

Patty Wisner has been working to finish up the Historic Photo Project by the end of February 2010. Various DLC members are taking pictures to fill in the gaps in the photo slide show. I will be presenting a draft of the "Basic Version" of the historic photo slide show at the meeting; Patty is hard at work on the "Deluxe Version" of the slide show and has requested assistance to locate historic photos at the Milwaukie Museum.

Portland-to-Milwaukie Light Rail

The Portland-to-Milwaukie Light Rail project will include a new set of tracks, several street crossings, one station, and a new bridge in downtown. The project is approaching 25% design, and staff has been working hard to ensure that the project is designed to Milwaukie's high standards. One of the ways the City will ensure this outcome is to take some aspects of the project through Design Review with the DLC. During this meeting, Kenny Asher, Community Development and Public Works Director, will come to talk informally with the committee about the project, key aspects of its design, and the DLC's role in its review.

Joint Meeting with Planning Commission

A joint meeting with the DLC and the Planning Commission is tentatively scheduled for March 9, 2010, at 6:30 PM, in order to begin preparing for permitting the Portland-to-Milwaukie Light Rail project. The DLC may opt to replace the regular February or March meeting with this joint session or hold the joint session in addition to the regular meetings.

Let me know if you have any questions. See you next Wednesday at 6:30 p.m.!

Enclosures

1. January 27, 2010, meeting agenda
2. November 9, 2009, minutes



MILWAUKIE

Dogwood City of the West

Design and Landmarks Committee Meeting Agenda

**Public Safety Building, Community Room
3200 SE Harrison St**

6:30 p.m., Wednesday, January 27, 2010

- 1. CALL TO ORDER**
- 2. MEETING MINUTES** **5 min.**
 - a. November 9, 2009**
- 3. INFORMATION ITEMS—None**
- 4. WORKSESSION ITEMS** **85 min.**
 - a. Debrief on Riverfront Park meeting (30 min.)**
 - b. Historic Photo Project update (10 min.)**
 - c. Light Rail project discussion (45 min.)**
- 5. APPLICATION REVIEW ITEMS—None**
- 6. OTHER BUSINESS** **5 min.**
 - a. DLC Notebook page updates**
 - b. Next meeting**
- 7. ADJOURN**

***NOTE:** If you will be late or are unable to attend, please call the Planning Department cell phone at (503) 710-2187.

1 **Design and Landmarks Committee**
2 **Meeting Minutes**
3 **Wednesday, November 9, 2009**

4 Rescheduled from October 28, 2009
5

6 **Members Present**

7 Becky Ives, Chair
8 Siri Bernard, Vice Chair
9 Greg Hemer
10 Patty Wisner

11 **Members Absent**

12 Sarah Knaup

13 **Staff Present**

14 Katie Mangle, Planning Director
15 Brett Kelper, Associate Planner
16 Ryan Marquardt, Associate Planner
17 Damien Hall, City Attorney
18 JoAnn Herrigel, Community Services Director

19 **1. CALL TO ORDER**

20 **Chair Ives** called the Design and Landmarks Committee (DLC) meeting to order at 6:34 p.m.

21 **2. MEETING MINUTES**

22 **a. September 23, 2009**

23 **DLC Member Hemer moved to approve the September 23, 2009, DLC meeting minutes**
24 **as presented. Vice Chair Bernard seconded the motion, which passed 3 to 0 to 1 with**
25 **Chair Ives abstaining.**

26 **3. INFORMATION ITEMS—None**

27 **4. WORKSESSION ITEM—None**

28 **5. APPLICATION REVIEW ITEMS**

29 **a. Recommendation on Design Review for Riverfront Park**

30 **Applicant:** City of Milwaukie, represented by JoAnn Herrigel, Community Services Director

31 **Owner:** City of Milwaukie

32 **Address:** Milwaukie Riverfront Park

33 **File:** DR-09-01

34 **Damien Hall, City Attorney**, reviewed the Design Review process, noting that the DLC
35 meeting was not a formal public hearing, but a public meeting open for public comment as part
36 of the overall land use review of the minor quasi-judicial application. He described the meeting
37 procedure, concluding that the goal was for the DLC to arrive at a consensus about a specific
38 recommendation to the Planning Commission.

39 All DLC members declared that they had visited the site. However, no DLC member declared
40 a conflict of interest, bias, or conclusion from a site visit. No DLC member declared an ex parte
41 contact related to the application.

42 **Ryan Marquardt, Associate Planner**, presented the staff report via PowerPoint. He clarified
43 that the term “water fountain” referred to the water feature and not to drinking fountains. He
44 deferred a question about the accuracy of the restroom building photographs to the Applicant.

45 **JoAnn Herrigel, Community Services Director**, reviewed the history, timeline, and
46 progression of the Riverfront Park project via PowerPoint. The Riverfront Board held
47 workshops with boat ramp designers and operators, toured other riverfront facilities, held open
48 houses, and conducted a public survey in which 11% of Milwaukie’s population provided input
49 about the park’s uses and design. The proposed project integrated concepts preferred by the
50 community, but noted that incorporating the community’s many needs and ideas was
51 challenging. She also noted the many restraints that affected the development and design of
52 the small site, including several permitting agencies’ requirements. These various restraints
53 had influenced the deliberate placement of the needed uses and assorted park elements. The
54 selection of elements was fairly inclusive so far, and more people would weigh in on the
55 design as the application went through the DLC and Planning Commission processes. The
56 site’s history and geology also influenced the park’s design, as well as the choice of materials
57 which did not detract from the surroundings.

58 **Gil Williams, David Evans & Associates**, presented more detailed information about the
59 Riverfront Park project via PowerPoint. He prefaced that the graphic software did not
60 accurately reflect the intended design. His additional comments and responses to questions
61 from the DLC were as follows:

- 62 • He reiterated the desire to connect downtown Milwaukie to the Willamette River, noting
63 the challenge of crossing McLoughlin Blvd which presented a huge barrier in many ways.
64 Initially, a visual connection would be made by enhancing the view along McLoughlin Blvd
65 and providing more visual access to the river.

- 66
- 67
- 68
- 69
- 70
- 71
- 72
- 73
- 74
- 75
- 76
- 77
- 78
- 79
- 80
- 81
- 82
- 83
- 84
- 85
- 86
- 87
- 88
- 89
- 90
- 91
- 92
- 93
- 94
- 95
- 96
- The Applicant tried to create and divide the park space into specific uses, for both function and form. Pedestrians and automobiles would be separated, for example, and both active and passive recreation areas were created as well as more contemplative areas.
 - The Ipe wood proposed for the railing was a very hard, durable wood that would last 50+ years in this type of outdoor, public use facility. Ipe is a plantation grown, South American hardwood that is certified sustainably harvested.
 - The water quality swales shown in the PowerPoint copy distributed to the DLC would be planted and provide maintenance of stormwater and runoff from the parking areas. The City preferred the stormwater be filtrated on site; therefore at-grade planters would catch much of the runoff from the parking areas, then filtrate and clean the stormwater. The planters would also provide some physical separation between vehicles and pedestrians.
 - The extensive revegetation of the riverbank was required by federal law.
 - The Applicant decided a small secondary restroom facility near the boat ramp would be appropriate and would serve people using the boat ramp as well as those at the overlook.
 - He described how the transient dock would move with the river's water level using pilings.
 - The plaza areas were separated from downtown by vegetation running parallel to McLoughlin Blvd as well as a decrease in elevation. Both elements helped provide sound buffering. Expansive views of the river were created from the plaza areas.
 - The main water feature was designed to draw people away from McLoughlin Blvd, through the park and down to the Willamette River. The water would be very shallow to safely allow people and children to get in the fountain and interact with the water feature.
 - Columnar basalt and stone would be used for the water feature and would most likely be quarried locally. Sheets of water would fall erratically over the various levels in an effort to breakdown the formality of the city. Integrating a very natural water feature into the formal plaza would provide a very natural feel. Large basalt slabs would be laid on end and etched on the top to channel the water to flow over the top. The fountain would be constructed of all natural materials, unlike the Ira Keller Fountain, which was all concrete.
 - He noted 2 water quality facilities that would separate vehicle areas from pedestrian spaces and lawn areas, and also provide additional water quality treatment for stormwater not cleaned in the plaza or parking lot swales.

- 97 • The festival lawn was slightly sloped for drainage purposes and would slope from the
98 plaza down to the river. The area would be flat enough for festival booths and tables.
- 99 • Klein Point would be the more natural area of the park. Subtle mounding in the open
100 areas would create added separation between McLoughlin Blvd and people in the park.
- 101 • The only beach-type area that existed on the riverfront would be cleaned up. Informal
102 access would continue to be provided to the beach to prevent pedestrians from walking
103 through the vegetation. By law, the area would be more heavily vegetated than shown in
104 the slides.
- 105 • The intention of having heavier vegetation was to keep the area looking more wild but not
106 overgrown. The Applicant would be working with the Johnson Creek Watershed Council to
107 revegetate the area with native plants and to create a palette of plants that would be
108 appropriate for the riverbank.

109 **Todd Marcum, David Evans & Associates**, reviewed various elevations and architectural
110 elements of the proposed restrooms via PowerPoint.

111 The Applicants responded to comments and questions from DLC members as follows:

- 112 • Only the family restrooms would remain open during the winter months to avoid heating
113 the entire facility for freeze protection.
- 114 • Discussions about securing the restroom facility and controlling lighting were still taking
115 place. Options were available to install automatic locks in the restrooms, if the facilities
116 needed to be locked down at a certain time. One option would be to leave the family
117 bathrooms open 24 hours, but lock the main bathrooms at a certain time.
- 118 • The large festival lawn area provided an opportunity for people to gather to view movies.
119 A screen could be hung temporarily from the side of the restroom facing the festival area.
120 The movies were more of a program element and would provide flexibility to the city.
 - 121 • A previous design included a large, white fin wall where movies could be directly
122 projected onto; however, the wall would not block the view to the river when not in
123 use. Instead, the columns on the restroom wall would support a temporary structure
124 for showing movies.
- 125 • The cut stone used on the Riverfront Park sign would not be repeated on the concrete of
126 the restroom. The concrete treatment would reflect the simple horizontal nature of the
127 retaining walls, which would all be concrete. This would emphasize the juxtaposition

128 between the natural basalt columns and the hardscape of the concrete. The detailed
129 stone look only existed near the sign. The goal of the restroom facility's design was to
130 make it simple and clean, and not include details that would draw attention to it, such as a
131 cut stone sign.

132 • **Mr. Williams** added the desire was not to lose the water feature amongst the basalt. The
133 water feature needed to stand out as a prime spine perpendicular to McLoughlin Blvd that
134 would draw people through the park. Making the basalt water feature a single element in
135 contrast to the concrete structures located on either side would help the water feature
136 stand out and become the prime focal point of the park.

137 • The option always existed to introduce texture and color to the expansive, gray,
138 concrete plaza through staining, sandblasting, etc. Scoring was already planned to
139 break up the concrete, which would not be as white as shown. The concrete's color
140 would become more muted over time. The concrete could be stained, but the park's
141 focal point was the Willamette River, which meant keeping other elements very
142 simple and clean to keep people moving west toward the river.

143 • The Applicant tried to use a consistent palette of materials and colors throughout the
144 entire project, and the muted tans and grays of the concrete would not compete with
145 the landscaping or the river itself.

146 • The new restroom facility would provide about 2 times the function of the current restroom
147 located at the park. With the 2 family restrooms being added, the entire structure would be
148 about 3 times larger than the current facility. No code existed to dictate how many fixtures
149 were needed, so the number needed to accommodate the park's needs was a judgment
150 call. The experience of the restroom structure would change as one moved around it
151 because although the building looked much larger from the side, the facility was a long,
152 skinny structure that would look much smaller from the end and become less of a
153 component in the landscape.

154 • **DLC Member Wisner** asked if an opportunity existed to put any artistic elements on the
155 stark projecting wall panels that would be evocative of Milwaukie's sense of place. **Katie**
156 **Mangle, Planning Director**, asked why the projecting panels were so high and long.

157 • **Mr. Marcum** explained the wall was actually the back of the family restroom and did
158 have a functional purpose. The wall extended past the restroom to help carry the roof
159 and provide a covered seating area. A planter would wrap around the restroom and

160 vegetation could be introduced to break up the height of the building. Different options
161 could be considered to break up the large expanse of cedar wood.

- 162 • **Ms. Wisner** asked if there was a way to go from the apex of the wall and slope, or repeat
163 the angle of the roof coming down, to remove the stark, sharp-edged corners from the
164 protruding walls. The 90-degree angles of the wall seemed to be at odds with the slope of
165 the roof and some of the curves along the plaza.
- 166 • **Mr. Marcum** replied those changes could be possible in some areas, but would be
167 impossible in other areas. He reviewed the slopes that could and could not be
168 changed via PowerPoint.
- 169 • He did not want the building to have a residential feel. The restroom facility was not a
170 downtown commercial building, but also not a small shed. He wanted to add
171 elements that would bridge the commercial and residential experiences. One
172 example was how the commercial parapet condition intersected with a sloping roof
173 that extended through on the fourth side. He indicated the component where the
174 horizontal consistent element was penetrated with the roof coming out to introduce
175 some interest. Options always existed, such as extending the roof out to create an
176 overhang on that edge, instead of stopping the wall at that point.
- 177 • The design of the building was a balancing act, but reducing the sharp corners on the
178 intersecting walls was something that could be considered.
- 179 • The main power distribution panel for the park was located in the pipe chase between the
180 men's and women's restrooms. Power would be provided to the festival lawn area via
181 outlets along the plaza that vendors could access. The secondary, single-occupant
182 restroom at the top of the boat ramp would also be fed from the main distribution panel.
183 The main restroom facility would be important functionally because it provided power for
184 the entire park.
- 185 • At present, no need existed for 3-phase power; however, power needs would be
186 coordinated with the City to confirm that power coming into the site would be
187 appropriate for any intended uses. Some preliminary identification of loads and needs
188 had been studied. Adjusting for increased power would not require much space and
189 could easily be incorporated into the design.
- 190 • The family restroom would be ADA accessible and ADA accessible stalls would also be
191 located inside the multiple occupant restrooms.

- 192
- 193
- 194
- 195
- 196
- 197
- 198
- 199
- 200
- Stormwater from the roof would sheet flow off the edge of the roof onto a gravel area along the backside of the building. No pedestrian access existed there. Gutters and downspouts were added over the restroom entrances to keep water from falling on people using the facilities, so there was no need to cover the entrances with the roof. The entrances were designed based on the functional access to the space on both ends to ensure appropriate portions of the design were covered as needed. Covered entrances were not a driving criterion in dictating the roof's extension. Accommodations were made for any potential runoff with a gutter system. Beyond that, the function of the roof was to enclose the restroom facilities or provide a covered outdoor seating area.
- 201
- 202
- 203
- 204
- 205
- 206
- 207
- 208
- Installing a gutter system on the backside of the building where movies might be shown had been debated, but no end solution had been decided. A walkway did exist along the west side of the building, but not an entry. Mr. Marcum questioned if introducing a gutter on that side of the building would cause a loss in value and function. Challenges existed with the exposed rafters coming out on that side of the building. The structural members that were extended to create the trellis would prevent a gutter from being placed on the edge of the roof and created more of a challenge on how to address runoff on that side of the building.
- 209
- 210
- 211
- 212
- 213
- 214
- Runoff from the roof would not deteriorate the concrete, but the coloring would change where the water hit the concrete. Each of the various parapet walls delineated the components of the roof, causing them to operate independently. That roof area would only be about 15 ft by 25 ft, so even in a hard rain, a sheet of water would probably not be coming off the roof, though it would be different than if a gutter was installed.
- 215
- 216
- 217
- 218
- **Mr. Marcum** confirmed that the location and design of what was referred to as the sea wall was due to the layout of the 100-year floodplain. **Mr. Williams** added that the final elevation of the restroom structure would be 1 ft above the floodplain, which was the regulatory requirement.
- 219
- 220
- 221
- 222
- 223
- **Mr. Marcum** displayed picture samples of newly installed cedar siding that would be used on the proposed restroom facility. He explained the cedar would patina over time to become a dull grayish-brown color. The wood columns would be covered with furring strips that could be replaced individually instead of replacing the entire column if graffiti occurred. Anti-graffiti coatings could not be put on the materials because it affected the

- 224 graying of the cedar. Individual pieces of siding could be replaced as needed, and would
225 patina fairly quickly.
- 226 • Introducing stone or sandblasting the base of the concrete on the restroom could be done
227 to soften the concrete's smooth, stark look and create some texture so the concrete better
228 matched the rustic look of the building. Formliners could be used to introduce a little
229 irregularity to the concrete. Anything was an option at this point in the project. However,
230 balancing the desire to keep the building simple, but not synonymous with stark and cold
231 was important. Introducing color could go a long way in addressing those concerns.
232 Scoring or reveals could also be introduced to provide some interest.
 - 233 • **Ms. Wisner** advised that the DLC had concerns about stark concrete in Milwaukie
234 due to some regrets on how stark concrete looked on past projects. The DLC was
235 always interested in seeing options that would enhance concrete surfaces and break
236 up how stark and plain the concrete was in the project.
 - 237 • **Mr. Williams** explained that sacking the fresh concrete would help with the shine, but
238 other finishes existed to make the concrete appear matte and muted so it would not
239 stand out as much. Having the plaza and restroom facility near each other would
240 present an area with a lot of concrete, and providing color on either the building
241 concrete or on the surface of the plaza would help lessen the intensity of so much
242 concrete in one area. All the concrete surfaces presented in the project would have a
243 sandblasted finish to take the shine off.
 - 244 • The restroom's roof would not be a flat, single-ply or membrane roof, but a standing-seam
245 metal roof that had a low slope so water would drain off. No tar would be used. Metal
246 parapet caps would exist at the top of the flat walls. The top and sides of the roof where it
247 met the wall would have flashing that turned up underneath the siding.
 - 248 • No skylights existed on the restroom facility. Minimizing all penetrations in the roof would
249 reduce maintenance requirements. Not having mechanical equipment or other things on
250 the roof would also improve the visual impact of the building.
 - 251 • **Mr. Williams** noted that the picture depicting trees in large cement containers near the top
252 of the stairway entering the secondary plaza was a misrepresentation. The planters would
253 follow the slope of the stairs at curb height. The planters were introduced as a
254 transitory element to the very broad stairway in the secondary plaza across from
255 Monroe St, rather than spilling directly into the amphitheater.

- 256
- 257
- 258
- 259
- 260
- 261
- 262
- 263
- 264
- 265
- 266
- 267
- 268
- 269
- 270
- 271
- 272
- 273
- 274
- 275
- 276
- 277
- 278
- 279
- 280
- 281
- 282
- 283
- 284
- 285
- 286
- 287
- Channels covered by manufactured grates were designed to run across the plaza, transferring water from one area of the plaza to another. The channel underneath would be lined with cobbles so one could hear water as it flowed, giving people some sense of the water being under their feet. The grates come in widths of 18 in and 24 in, which the Applicant was considering; but scale-wise, they might be reduced to the 18-in width.
 - Curving the railing would be contrary to the concept of the perpendicular line pulling people directly into the park from McLoughlin Blvd. The rails were not meant to be prime elements and were manufactured as rectangular, so getting them curvilinear would be a custom product.
 - The small squares depicted on the larger overall design were actually flat stone placed within the grass. The stones represented a transition from the concrete to the grass and would include a mix of concrete and basalt.
 - A Giant Dogwood tree was the signature tree for the park and would be placed adjacent to the fountain. Other smaller dogwood varieties would be placed throughout other areas of the park.
 - **Chair Ives** cautioned that the Eddie's White Wonder dogwood tree variety was a *florida nuttallii* cross, making it highly susceptible to anthracnose. She asked that a *kousa* variety of dogwood be used instead. Many of the Eddie's White Wonder trees had died out.
 - **Mr. Williams** was not certain that a *kousa* dogwood variety would get big enough, but he would explore other options.
 - Only one vehicular access was provided. The primary goal of the project was to reclaim as much of the small space as possible for pedestrians. The secondary goal was to provide a main entrance for the park and boat ramp, which was desired by the community. No other place existed to introduce a vehicular entrance into the park in order to get the boat ramp to fit with the sloping topography. Utilizing the existing Washington St intersection would have put the boat ramp in the middle of the park, and the grade change was too significant to put the vehicular entrance anywhere else. The park's design was bound by both program and topography.
 - The boat ramp width, parking, turnarounds, and the loading dock were all based on Oregon Marine Board standards. The turnaround area was designed with AutoTURN software to ensure it could accommodate large boats.

- 288
- 289
- 290
- 291
- 292
- The amphitheater could accommodate a fairly significant stage. The 12-ft wide sidewalk was primarily designed for maintenance and would accommodate an 8,000 Gross Vehicle Weight vehicle. The sidewalk could also be used for performers to get equipment to and from the amphitheater. Electricity in the amphitheater would be accessible via secured, at-grade vaults.
- 293
- Though the play area was only 60 ft from McLoughlin Blvd, the area was bermed and direct access existed to the bathroom. The Applicant had considered locating the play area on the other side of the amphitheater, but that area was smaller due to the water quality facility and could not accommodate any sort of play equipment. Having the play area on that side also did not fit flow-wise.
- 294
- 295
- 296
- 297

298 **Chair Ives** stated that the Juncus plant could be invasive and wished the plant could be taken
299 off the planting list. Even if contained in concrete planters, Juncus was self-seeding and the
300 seeds would blow everywhere. She suggested Iris plants.

301 **Ms. Wisner** said she was happy to see basalt used in the water feature, but questioned how
302 deeply Milwaukie's background with regard to water was explored when designing the water
303 feature; namely all the flowing water in the city, the characteristics of that water, and the
304 different ways it occurred and flowed through Milwaukie. She was curious what lead to the
305 proposed water feature.

- 306
- **Mr. Williams** replied he was aware of some exposed creeks in the area and the nature of
307 those creeks, but the concept of the creeks and other natural water features in Milwaukie
308 did not come into the design considerably. The idea of the water feature was to provide a
309 more natural element into a non-natural plaza, so the consideration was more about the
310 use of materials and water than thinking about how water flowed through the city. He
311 noted that a piped creek that flowed under the park was in line with where the water
312 feature would be placed.

313 **Chair Ives** called for public testimony.

314 **David Green, Chair, Riverfront Board**, stated that the water connectivity piece had been a
315 theme throughout the entire time he had been on the Riverfront Board (Board). That concept
316 included connectivity with all the waterways in Milwaukie, and focused on Kellogg Creek,
317 Johnson Creek, and the springs coming out of the hillside above the Waldorf School as
318 important natural areas that would define Riverfront Park. The Board had looked into feeding
319 the park's water features with water from the area's natural water sources, but doing so would

320 have been very expensive. He felt carrying the water feature through the center of the park
321 was an attempt to pick up on how important water, and the connection to it, was to Riverfront
322 Park.

323 On behalf of the Board, he thanked JoAnn Herrigel for her patience and willingness to work
324 with such a diverse group of Board members representing many different interests. He
325 believed the Board had done a good job representing the city of Milwaukie. Though the Board
326 did not always agree, the Board had reached some consensus. He also thanked Gil Williams
327 for representing the Board's diverse interests and fitting what he could into the very small
328 space. The Riverfront Park design reflected a lot of the input and changes suggested by Board
329 members over the years. Even in the last few weeks, the siding for the restroom had changed
330 and evolved.

331 He noted the project was only at 70% design, but assured the Board was committed to stay
332 involved with the project as the details of the design were refined. The Board met regularly
333 each month and lately the focus had been not only on the design, but also on the permitting
334 process which drove many of the design features as well.

335 He urged the DLC to make a strong recommendation to the Planning Commission to move the
336 design and permitting processes forward, adding any comments the DLC had on the project
337 because room still existed to incorporate that input into the design details. The Board wanted
338 to see the project's momentum continue.

339 **Ms. Herrigel** confirmed work had started on the park. The waterline was being relocated to
340 reconfigure the site for the park's design.

341 **Vice Chair Bernard** asked if the Board had requested that the restroom facility be designed
342 as stark and low as possible.

343 **Mr. Green** replied the Board did not tell the designers exactly what to do, but had wanted to
344 maintain the views from as many places in the park as possible. Removing the buildings along
345 McLoughlin Blvd opened up an incredible expanse of multi-million dollar views of the river for
346 the city. To maintain those views from McLoughlin Blvd and within the plaza areas, the Board
347 asked that the restroom have a low profile and that its visual impact be minimized.

348 **Ben Horner-Johnson, Lake Road Neighborhood District Association (NDA)**, confirmed
349 that the metal grates placed in the walkways over the water channels were ADA approved and
350 made specifically for sidewalks and walkways so they would pose no wheel hazard. He noted

351 two examples for people to see: the grass amphitheater at Mount Tabor and the large amount
352 of basalt and numerous water features at Esther Shore Park in Vancouver.

353 Many of the nice, old-style lights being used had bases that blocked light from going down and
354 sent a lot of light skyward. He preferred to have the light coming down.

355 He confirmed that the same Hwy 99E bridge would remain over Kellogg Creek and a new,
356 pedestrian-only bridge would be added where the existing fish ladder started under the old
357 bridge.

358 He clarified several items with the Applicant as follows:

- 359 • Solar panels on the west facing roof of the restroom facility would be eye-catching, but not
360 necessarily a bad option because it would be a sustainable approach to generate power.
361 However, the amount of power generated did not pencil out to cover the expense.
- 362 • At present, the building was freeze-protected only with heat tracing wire on the pipes and
363 forced air electric unit heaters. No heat pump would be used for cooling since it was a
364 small building.
- 365 • Water runoff from the smaller roofs of the restroom would be directed via downspouts to
366 planters near roof components with gutters. The runoff from the larger roof on the
367 McLoughlin Blvd side would go into the planter. Typically, a trenched, gravel catch area
368 would be installed to avoid degrading the dirt and the collected water would infiltrate into
369 the planter. Catch basins were limited on the site, so water from most of the flat areas
370 would flow into planters and into the soil.
- 371 • The water source for the water feature would be recirculating, non-potable water.

372 He concluded that he and his wife had responded to the survey, but they had not heard much
373 about the survey since. He believed the Applicant had done a good job and many of his
374 concerns had been addressed. He hoped the application would go forward.

375 **Gary Klein, Vice Chair, Riverfront Board**, thanked JoAnn Herrigel for being so helpful. He
376 stated that David Green, Michael Martin, and Mitch Wall were all original members of the
377 Board and had really stuck with the project and done a good job. Mr. Williams was with
378 another company when he began working with the Board on Riverfront Park prior to 2001 and
379 had brought in David Evans & Associates when he changed companies. He appreciated that
380 Mr. Williams had stuck with the project and had made everything work. He hoped the DLC
381 would vote to approve the application and pass it on to the Planning Commission.

382 **Chair Ives** closed public testimony.

383 The DLC took a brief recess at 9:15 p.m. and reconvened at 9:23 p.m.

384 **Mr. Hemer** stated one major concern was that vegetation used to block the building and noise
385 from the street would also block the view of the river from downtown. Perhaps dwarf trees or
386 shorter vegetation could be used to conceal the building from the street to avoid blocking the
387 river's view.

- 388 • Regarding the restroom building materials, he preferred using a fake stone to complement
389 the other stone features, and cement fiber siding, like Nichiha and Hardiplank. After 2
390 years, the cedar siding might not be taken care of due to budget restraints, especially
391 since the cedar would be attached to CMU walls. Cement fiber sidings could be painted in
392 tri-toned, stained colors to provide a natural look with a 25-year warranty on the paint.
- 393 • Small dome skylights provided a lot of light, so electric lights would not be needed during
394 the day. He wanted the facility to generate its own electricity if possible.
- 395 • A twin or triple wall type of polycarbonate could be used instead of a metal awning. The
396 awning could be a smoke color to provide shade, but would leave the area open and
397 translucent to the pedestrians underneath.
- 398 • Though uncertain how much water the roofs would actually collect, he was concerned
399 about the water flow off the roofs. He inquired if any drywells had been proposed onsite to
400 ensure the water did not create a mushy field after a rainy day. He asked about installing
401 rain drains underground to direct the flow of water into the sewer level since the site was
402 being torn up anyway.
- 403 • He was concerned about the maintenance involved with keeping the gutters clear of
404 leaves from the deciduous trees and of items people might throw on the roof.
- 405 • Overall, he really liked the park's design. The site was well thought out, and the park
406 would feature some real natural beauty. The Applicant had done a great job.

407 **Chair Ives** assumed the gravel catch area would be 18 in to 2 ft wide and that the gravel
408 would be at least 18 in deep. She was still concerned about the concrete on the west side of
409 the building, but was unsure what options were available to keep rain from sheeting down,
410 even though it would not be very much. She believed people might run under the arbor portion
411 and that the concrete could become slippery since it was on the shady side of the building

412 **Mr. Hemer** explained that because the area was sloped, the water would flow toward the river
413 along the path of least resistance, which would be the walkway. The wall of the restroom and
414 the retaining wall would capture and cause the water to gather against the edge of the
415 walkway. If gutters were going to be installed, rain drains could be run underground to the
416 sewer pipe.

417 **Vice Chair Bernard** loved the proposed design. She was impressed how the Applicant was
418 able to work with all of the agencies involved. She recalled filling out the questionnaire and
419 wished the park could have less parking, but understood that requirements had to be met. She
420 liked that the rest of the park was made for pedestrians and had everything the community
421 requested.

422 Though the Applicant tried to make the restroom facility as unobtrusive as possible, she
423 believed the building would be a main focus or gateway because everyone would walk by and
424 see it. People would use it as shelter from the rain, and the movies would be projected onto it.
425 As such an important feature, she did not believe the facility met the Milwaukie Character
426 guideline because:

- 427 • The building did not convey a sense of place.
- 428 • The facility only integrated to the environment because the building was placed in the
429 middle of a lot of concrete and was made of more concrete and with some wood sticking
430 up.
- 431 • The guideline called for establishing strength in gateways, and the building would be a
432 gateway.
- 433 • Architectural contrast could be used wisely and art could be integrated to convey
434 something of Milwaukie into the design. Art could be placed on the walls or a design could
435 be imprinted into the concrete, such as waves or a stamped picture of the Lot Whitcomb
436 sidewheeler steamship.

437 According to Figure 9 in Appendix B of the application, though the restroom was at a lower
438 elevation, it would still be seen. Based on where the trees were depicted, the river could be
439 seen from the berm at the playground near the amphitheater and through the plaza.

440 Otherwise, the top of the restroom and the trees would be seen because the view of the river
441 would be blocked. Therefore it was important that the restroom building reflected Milwaukie.

442 **Ms. Wisner** commended and credited the Applicant for doing a tough assignment and
443 including all the key elements in the design. She had a couple of serious concerns, but overall

444 believed the design was successful, well done, and created a park that Milwaukie could look
445 forward to.

446 As a graphic designer, artist, and educator, she understood how specific criteria influenced
447 and impacted design, but also allowed the opportunity for creative solutions within those
448 specific parameters. She wanted to give the design team something more to consider.

449 Her main concerns regarded the design of the water feature and the restroom building, but
450 namely the water feature. As a member of the DLC, she felt honor-bound to follow and judge
451 everything based on the Design Guidelines. She read the following paragraphs from “The
452 History of Milwaukie, Oregon” issued by the Milwaukie Historical Society in 1965:

453 “The name Milwaukie derives from Milwaukee, Wisconsin. Thus, it is necessary to trace
454 its place-name through the origins of that Midwest city. Milwaukee is located on a bay on
455 the west shore of Lake Michigan where three rivers--the Milwaukie, the Menomonee,
456 and the Kinnickinnic--converge. The land nearby was inhabited by Indians of the
457 Pottawattamie tribe, among others, and it is from this group’s vernacular that the name
458 has come. Indian designations follow realistic descriptions of physical features, so
459 Milwaukie’s name started to grow from a word signifying ‘meeting place of waters.’

460 Lot Whitcomb’s admiration for the booming Wisconsin city, standing at the ‘meeting
461 place of waters,’ drove him to search for a dream location worthy of his ideal. The tiny
462 settlement on the banks of the Willamette seemed an answer to his yearnings and a
463 promise to his aspirations. Here within a short distance there entered the Willamette a
464 number of streams--Kellogg Creek, Johnson Creek, and may smaller branches fed by
465 the multiplicity of springs in the vicinity. The platted town-site became Milwaukee
466 ‘meeting place of waters.’ Justification of his choice came in the launching of the ‘Lot
467 Whitcomb’ and in the subsequent operations from this river port. Lot Whitcomb’s city
468 appeared on the way to becoming the boom city of the Oregon country. But, alas, the
469 dream was not to be realized and Destiny cast the town in a lesser role.”

470 She explained that she cited the document because every time a project came up she
471 believed it was a golden opportunity to say something about Milwaukie, and the Riverfront
472 Park project needed to say something specific about Milwaukie. The DLC was charged with
473 looking at the plans and scrutinize that aspect to ensure the design conveyed Milwaukie’s
474 sense of place.

475 Milwaukie had natural springs, creeks, and a river flowing from east to west. Ponds and places
476 where water cut streambeds and caused floods also existed. Milwaukie residents often had to
477 interact with water because water flowed throughout Milwaukie, sometimes out of control in a
478 wild way, and other times very gently. The springs meander through the city and bubble up in
479 peoples' yards and in historic ponds. They flow underneath Washington St over to the junior
480 high school and bubble up again through a waterfall and then back under someone's home.
481 Flowing waters were Milwaukie's story, and she was excited to see what a top design team
482 could do with that information. She did not feel that the life and history of the town was ever
483 really discussed in relation to the proposed project.

- 484 • The water feature was attractive, but it had not reached its full expressive potential for
485 being Milwaukie's main contemporary water feature in such a prominent place as the
486 Riverfront Park. She wanted the Applicant to develop alternate designs as a condition of
487 approval that showed water bubbling up, pooling, charging, meandering, and flowing in
488 many places throughout the town in that same space on the plaza. Rather than a straight,
489 rigidly confined water feature, she wanted a water feature characteristic of Milwaukie with
490 a contemporary flavor to fit within the plaza.
- 491 • The water feature should leave a legacy for Milwaukie's future residents. As people
492 walked through the park, the water feature's unique design should prompt people to ask
493 questions about the story behind its design. The water feature should express how water
494 had historically always been in Milwaukie; how water defined Milwaukie's name; and how
495 water had always impacted Milwaukie residents. She agreed the water feature should
496 draw people to the waterfront, but the straight, downward course of the water feature did
497 not describe the story of Milwaukie.

498 She liked the direction toward natural materials for the restroom, but was struggling with the
499 smooth concrete base, as well as with the section between the restroom, water feature, and
500 stairs. All the sharp corners and right angles in the design produced a feeling of created visual
501 tension.

- 502 • The park had nice, curving lines and she wondered about the departure to rigid
503 rectangles, water pools, planters, and stones. The park should be designed to facilitate
504 the need for people to relax, recreate, and get away from the stress and rigidity of urban
505 life.

- 506
- The restroom facility and surrounding concrete areas should be softened. The straight
507 planes of the building wall panels portrayed a sense of barriers that interrupted the view of
508 the river too much. The imposed rigid design elements conflicted with the flow and curve
509 of the waterfront, pathways, and amphitheater. A warmer, friendlier design was needed for
510 people to warm up to a bit more.

511 **Chair Ives** suggested moving the bathroom around the curve to the north, putting it closer to
512 the amphitheater and playground, and opening up the plaza on the south side a bit more. The
513 change might help separate the squareness of the stairs and bathroom. She also suggested
514 using 2 to 3 pumping stations to create a couple waterfalls as part of the water feature.
515 Though separate, the areas would visually look connected.

516 **Ms. Wisner** asked if some grass could be included near the water feature so kids and parents
517 could have an area to sit near the water. Having grass or plantings near part of the water
518 feature would soften the concrete look of the design and make the water feature more inviting.

519 **Chair Ives** replied that lawn may not be possible due to the extra maintenance required, but
520 believed planting pockets or ornamental grasses could be incorporated.

521 **Mr. Hemer** stated that he liked the base of the water feature because it would create a falling,
522 cascade type of waterfall. He asked if Ms. Wisner wanted the water feature to have a more
523 curved design to give a river kind of feel and so that it would not fall fast down the hill.

524 **Ms. Wisner** described her general vision of the water feature. Near the water feature's starting
525 point she would like to see multiple sources of water coming up; one could be bubbling, one
526 could be flowing, etc., and then meandering water channels could finger out into the concrete.
527 The water could then cascade down into a secondary level. The design should not be so
528 rigidly rectangular, but enable water to spill out as water did naturally. Water erodes river
529 banks, so the water could look like it was eroding the stairs and the shape would splay out and
530 continue in a curvilinear channeling water down to the third cascade, where it would do
531 different things again with more of a spilling out, meandering type of shape. The water could
532 then fall into organically-shaped pools, similar to a river's edge.

533 The stepping stones could be a combination of the rectangles in the stairway that become
534 more rounded and irregularly shaped, so devolution could be seen from rectangles to more
535 organic shapes.

536 She wanted planned irregularity. She liked how the bottom 2 steps in the design were different
537 from each other and not regimented, and she wanted to see more of that type of irregularity

538 throughout the design. She would also like to see more water-carved rock throughout to make
539 the water feature look less monolithic and rectangular and more naturally shaped.

540 **Chair Ives** commented that stones being picked for the project already had a worn look to
541 them. She suggested some bubbling fountains could be placed in the lower pond as well, and
542 noted that if the restroom was moved over, the trees could also move to open up a larger view
543 corridor.

544 **Ms. Mangle** noted she was not hearing any show stopper comments, only challenges about
545 what should be changed for the final design. She suggested crafting a new finding that
546 encouraged the Applicant to consider certain items when preparing for the post-approval
547 review. The Applicant had to return to the DLC for the water feature and restroom anyway.
548 She suggested taking a break so she and Mr. Marquardt could make a list of 5 or 6 items that
549 the DLC wanted the Applicant to address.

550 The Committee took a brief recess and reconvened at 10:06 p.m.

551 **Ms. Mangle** stated staff was proposing changes to both the conditions of approval and the
552 findings. On Addendum 1 dated November 9, 2009, staff proposed renumbering Finding 9 at
553 the bottom of page 11 to Finding 10 and creating a new Finding 9 to state:

554 “As the Applicant prepares the project for the project’s conditioned post-approval review
555 to comply with Condition 4, the Design Landmarks Committee has asked the Applicant
556 to consider how the following aspects of the design can better meet the Milwaukie
557 character Design Guidelines. The items to consider are: water flow from the roof of the
558 buildings; design the water feature to echo the meandering nature of water through the
559 site and incorporate less linear features; consider ways to incorporate Milwaukie’s
560 character in the details of the building; reduce the size and angular nature of the parapet
561 walls; proximity of the bathroom and the playground; and consider views from
562 downtown.”

563 **Ms. Wisner** clarified that the desired changes to the water feature were more about
564 considering how water flowed through Milwaukie and the park site. She wanted a design
565 concept that reflected how Milwaukie’s character was affected by the water that flowed
566 through the city via springs, creeks, and rivers; the nature of the water and how the town
567 related to it.

568 **Chair Ives** suggested changing the wording to have the Applicant address how the water that
569 flowed from the roof would be handled.

570 **Mr. Marcum** requested clarification about how to incorporate Milwaukie's character in the
571 details of the building.

572 **Vice Chair Bernard** replied a scene from Milwaukie's past could be imprinted into the cement,
573 or new and old artwork could be incorporated into the building. The Applicant could view some
574 existing murals throughout the city to get a better idea of Milwaukie's character. The artwork
575 did not have to be a literal interpretation of Milwaukie's character.

576 **Mr. Williams** asked if the DLC preferred a particular architectural style that already existed in
577 Milwaukie and could be incorporated into the restroom facility to resemble the rest of the city.

578 Comments from the DLC included:

- 579 • The DLC liked Craftsman styles and bungalows. The DLC did not like the flat concrete
580 unfinished look. Flat concrete might be what other cities have, but it would not happen in
581 Milwaukie anymore. Though many 1950s structures existed in Milwaukie, not many all-
582 concrete buildings existed in the city.
- 583 • Nothing was wrong with using actual pictures or artwork to incorporate the past into the
584 restroom facility. There were many ways for an artist to interpret the story of Milwaukie.
585 The 1996 Riverfront Planning Committee had talked about having something visual and
586 artistic along Milwaukie's walkways that told the historic timeline of the city. Perhaps
587 something similar could be incorporated at Riverfront Park so Milwaukie residents could
588 have a connection to Milwaukie's past.

589 **Ms. Wisner** said she was not wild about the building's shape, but seeing more natural
590 materials used on the building helped. She preferred warm, inviting architecture, like
591 Cascadian architecture. She also liked board and batten, river rock, and other natural,
592 touchable and welcoming types of rustic architecture and materials.

593 **Chair Ives** agreed such statements were fair to present to the Applicant, but discussion about
594 artwork was not really in the Applicant's realm. The DLC could place artwork on a wall of the
595 building.

596 **Mr. Hemer** clarified the DLC wanted something to cover up the concrete base and a design to
597 be integrated about the story of Milwaukie on the large, flat wall of the facility. He noted that he
598 did have an opinion about the cedar siding. He assumed interpretive signs would be placed in
599 the area to relate Milwaukie's story, but did not favor putting characters on buildings, for
600 example.

601 **Mr. Marquardt** explained that specific items did not necessarily need to be captured directly
602 into the wording of the findings because the Applicant needed some room to demonstrate
603 basic compliance with how the design was modified to be more compliant with Milwaukie's
604 character. The Applicant needed to think about how to incorporate the DLC's suggestions, but
605 not be dictated by a list.

606 **Ms. Herrigel** stated it was helpful that the DLC reviewed the modifications for covering the
607 cement base and found the cedar siding acceptable.

608 **Vice Chair Bernard** said she did not love the cedar siding, but if the Board was okay with the
609 siding, then she was too.

610 **Mr. Klein** replied the Board was happy with the cedar siding and since the bathroom would be
611 1 ft above the flood plain, a concrete base was a great idea.

612 **Ms. Wisner** clarified the concrete base was not being disputed, only the concrete's finish.

613 **Ms. Mangle** added "Reduce the cold feeling of concrete throughout the site and on the
614 building" to the new Finding 9.

615 **Chair Ives** clarified the concern was basically about the concrete on the building; the concrete
616 walks were acceptable.

617 **Ms. Mangle** amended the character portion of new Finding 9 to state, "Consider ways to
618 incorporate Milwaukie's character and history in the details of the project. This could include
619 incorporation of art elements, vernacular architecture, signage, or a choice of materials."

620 **Mr. Marcum** questioned the third item where a solution was being dictated, instead of
621 recommending a guideline of lowering and changing the design of the parapet walls. He asked
622 if the DLC wanted to leave that open for some interpretation, and what result did the DLC
623 desire.

624 **Chair Ives** agreed the item could be removed since the Applicant would be returning with an
625 entire package and the DLC should not dictate specific details of an overall design.

626 **Mr. Marquardt** explained that pursuant to the new finding, another sentence would be added
627 to the end of Condition 2 in Attachment 2 page 1 that would state, "Submit a narrative
628 explaining how the plans have addressed the items listed in Finding 9." This would direct the
629 Applicant to address the issues at the post-approval stage. A narrative would dictate a written
630 explanation, but the project would also return before the DLC for post-approval review.

631 **Ms. Mangle** added the DLC would be reviewing the plans, but in addition, staff was asking the
632 Applicant to explain how those plans addressed the concerns listed in Finding 9.

633 She noted that the list in Condition 4 of Attachment 2 also needed to be amended. Some items
634 that the DLC would look at again had been struck, including the restroom buildings. Given the
635 current conversation, staff recommended putting it back on the list so the DLC would review it
636 again.

637 **Mr. Hemer moved that the DLC recommend that the Planning Commission approve**
638 **application DR-09-01 with the recommended findings and conditions of approval as**
639 **amended found in Attachments 1 and 2. Vice Chair Bernard seconded the motion,**
640 **which passed unanimously.**

641 **6. OTHER BUSINESS**

642 **a. Jackson Street Bus Shelter project update**

643 **Ms. Mangle** stated she had prepared a draft of a letter of support that she hoped the DLC
644 could submit. TriMet was about to enter into a contract with the bus shelter manufacturer,
645 based on the DLC's recommendation, and TriMet requested a letter of support from the DLC.

646 The project was going well and most things the DLC asked for had been confirmed. The final
647 designs would be done in concert with the manufacturer, such as the final shape and structure
648 of the roof, the final colors, and the material to be used at the bottom of the structure. These
649 items could not be determined until TriMet entered into a contract with the manufacturer to
650 purchase the shelters. She read the letter for the DLC's consideration.

651 **Mr. Hemer moved to approve the letter of support for TriMet. Vice Chair Bernard**
652 **seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.**

653 **7. ADJOURN**

654 The meeting adjourned at 10:26 p.m.

655

656

657 Becky Ives, Chair