

**CITY OF MILWAUKIE  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTES  
Milwaukie City Hall  
10722 SE Main Street  
TUESDAY, August 25, 2009  
6:30 PM**

**COMMISSIONERS PRESENT**

Jeff Klein, Chair  
Lisa Batey  
Teresa Bresaw  
Scott Churchill

**STAFF PRESENT**

Katie Mangle, Planning Director  
Susan Shanks, Senior Planner  
Li Alligood, Assistant Planner  
Brad Albert, Civil Engineer  
Bill Monahan, City Attorney

**COMMISSIONERS ABSENT**

Dick Newman, Vice Chair  
Paulette Qutub  
Chris Wilson

**1.0 Call to Order – Procedural Matters**

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

**2.0 Planning Commission Minutes**

2.1 July 14, 2009

**Commissioner Bresaw moved to approve the July 14, 2009 Planning Commission meeting minutes as presented. Commissioner Batey seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.**

**3.0 Information Items–None.**

**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**

5.1 Summary: Harmony Rd Office Annexation  
Applicant/Owner: Paul Norr/Anson Baker  
Address: 5885 SE Harmony Rd  
File: A-09-01  
Staff Person: Li Alligood

**Chair Klein** called the hearing to order and read the major quasi-judicial hearing format into the record.

**Li Alligood, Assistant Planner**, cited the applicable approval criteria of the Milwaukie Municipal Code (MMC) as found on 5.1 Page 4 of the packet, which was entered into the record. Copies of the report were made available at the sign-in table.

**Chair Klein** asked if any Commissioners had any ex parte contacts to declare. There were none. Chair Klein, Commissioners Bresaw and Churchill visited the site, but no

Commissioner declared a conflict of interest, bias, or conclusion from a site visit. No Commissioner's participation was challenged by any member of the audience.

**Ms. Alligood** presented the staff report via PowerPoint. She explained she was not extensively familiar with County zoning and could not explain differences between Industrial Zones I2 and I3, which were both designated Light Industrial Uses.

**Commissioner Batey:**

- Asked if the existing driveway on Harmony Rd would be usable.
  - **Brad Albert, Civil Engineer**, responded that the zone change triggered a traffic study of the site. One recommended condition of approval required the Applicant to close the access to reduce accesses on Harmony Rd, and take access from the business park driveway directly to the west, which was already restricted to right in-right out only.
  - The driveway shared with the mini storage off Harmony Rd was proposed for expansion and would also be right in-right out.
- Asked for clarification about the Title 4 comments.
  - **Ms. Alligood** explained that staff focused on the Johnson Creek Title 4 Employment Lands because it was the only area affected by the zoning amendment. Title 4 Employment Lands were scattered throughout the Manufacturing (M) and Business Industrial (BI) Zones so were not indicated on the map.

**Commissioner Churchill** agreed he was curious as well about how the Applicant's tiny parcel got Title 4 designation when the adjacent parcels, which would have similar zoning in the end, did not.

- **Ms. Alligood** responded that it was not necessarily singled out, but more that it expanded primarily into the County. The tail end of the Title 4 area was in the City, but a large swath continued to the southeast in the county. She indicated on the map that the area surrounding the subject site was Title 4. She believed the area was Title 4 due to existing conditions, but was uncertain why the area was laid out as it was.

**Chair Klein** asked how big of a structure could be built on the subject site.

- **Ms. Alligood** replied that buildings were sized according to lot coverage and setback standards in the BI Zone.
- **Katie Mangle, Planning Director**, offered to look up the information and report later in the meeting.

**Commissioner Bresaw** said that based on the pictures, the Applicant proposed parking behind the building.

- **Ms. Alligood** responded that was the proposal. If the Applicant did come in with an actual development proposal, then staff would work with them to refine the site plan.

**Ms. Alligood** confirmed that no further public comments had been received.

**Chair Klein** called for the Applicant's testimony.

**Paul Norr, Attorney at Law, 5550 SW Macadam Ave, Suite 330, Portland, OR**, presented the Applicant's testimony as follows:

- He distributed two handouts that were entered into the record as follows:
  - Exhibit 1: Site area map indicating City of Milwaukie Zoning and Title 4 Employment Lands surrounding the subject site.
  - Exhibit 2: Proposed building elevations by Mitch G. Gilbert, Architect, for TRG Logistics office remodel, dated December 16, 2008.
- He commended staff for their help in educating the Applicant and focusing on what was needed for a successful application.
- The application was to bring the property into the City so that City services could be provided, allowing for redevelopment of the site.
- Regarding zoning, he utilized Exhibit 1 to show that the site was entirely surrounded by BI zoning, which was really the only zone that made sense and allowed for use of such a small site in an appropriate manner.

**Mitch Gilbert, Architect, 239 NW 13th Ave, Suite 207, Portland, OR**, presented PowerPoint slides showing building elevations and stated that the plan was to convert the existing house into an office, giving it a complete facelift to improve the look.

- The carport on the end would be removed, the garage would be incorporated into the building, and a 26 ft by 26 ft storage space would be added on the other end. Though the displayed picture showed shingles, a metal roof was now proposed and board and batten siding with a stone veneer wainscot all the way around was being considered.
- A proposed timber frame porch would focus onto Harmony Rd, although it would not be the main entrance because parking was located at the rear of the building. The Applicant wanted to have a nice street presence. The cedar trees in front would be trimmed to open up the front.

**Commissioner Bresaw** thanked the Applicant for making a nice plan. She appreciated the efforts made to improve the front of the building, making it presentable to the street.

**Chair Klein** commented that the street side of the building appeared to be the rear of the building based on utilization.

- **Mr. Gilbert** agreed that most people probably would not walk up to the street side of the building, but perhaps the business would direct visitors around to the front entrance of the building. Traffic engineering required that the driveway be farther from Harmony Rd.

**Commissioner Bresaw** commented that the building had a good percentage of windows but noted no windows existed on the west elevation. She asked if that side was visible to anyone other than the neighbors.

- **Mr. Gilbert** replied that an existing wood fence faced the industrial parking lot. The west elevation of the building was not really visible from the street.

**Commissioner Batey** asked if the Applicant anticipated that the property would remain fenced.

- **Mr. Gilbert** believed the Applicant wanted to keep it fenced, but the fence type and materials had not been chosen. They wanted to open it up to traffic and allow visibility while also providing some security.

**Mr. Norr** noted that a preliminary traffic analysis had been completed. A more formal review based on the actual site plan would be done as part of the development review.

- Two concerns the Applicant had heard to date regarded closing the driveway to Harmony Rd and sharing access, and moving the access point to the parking lot behind the building, as far from Harmony Rd as possible, to avoid queuing conflicts.

**Commissioner Bresaw** commented the Commission often saw site plans and pictures, but sometimes the builder or owner ran out of money and started cutting corners. The visual effects and nice materials were the first to go. However, the proposed plans looked very nice as presented.

There were no further questions for the Applicant.

**Chair Klein** called for public testimony in favor of, neutral, and opposed to the application. There was none.

**Ms. Mangle** responded to Chair Klein's earlier question about the building size allowed. In the BI Zone, the height limit was 3 stories or 45 ft, whichever was less. There were no lot coverage standards, but 15% of the site had to be landscaped. Both standards were similar to what was also required in the M Zone, but the BI Zone had some design standards regarding materials and development of the buildings at the staff level development review.

**Commissioner Churchill** asked if the map on Exhibit 1 showing Title 4 zones was consistent with what staff recognized.

- **Ms. Alligood** clarified that the map was prepared for the Applicant to demonstrate that the BI Zone surrounded the site. Title 4 zones were to the south of the BI Zone.

**Chair Klein** closed public testimony for A-09-01 at 7:02 p.m.

**Commissioner Churchill moved to recommend A-09-01 as presented with Attachment 1 to City Council for approval. Commissioner Batey seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.**

**Chair Klein** announced that he liked the Applicant's design, but if they turned it into a tilt-up, bulk building, tagging would occur. He hoped the presented design would be what was actually completed.

**Ms. Mangle** said the Applicant first presented the plans to the County, who sent them to the City of Milwaukie because County staff determined that the City would require annexation for more sewer service.

The Commission took a brief recess, reconvening at approximately 7:10 p.m.

## **6.0 Worksession Items**

- 6.1 Summary: Smart Development Code Assessment Action Plan draft  
Staff Person: Katie Mangle/Susan Shanks

**Susan Shanks, Senior Planner**, stated that the Smart Development Code audit was underway with the consultant and was near the end of Phase 1, which was funded by the State's Transportation Growth Management (TGM) Program. The funding followed the State's fiscal year, so staff hoped to receive funding for Phase 2 soon.

- She displayed an abbreviated version of the Milwaukie Action Plan table from the epacket that condensed the information gathered about the identified problems.
  - The table delineated six categories: Residential Design Standards with 3 sub categories; Housing Variety including accessory dwelling units, townhouses, and duplexes; Review Processes and Procedures; Downtown Zones; Manufacturing Zones; and Commercial Zones. Commercial Zones was a topic area added as a result of input from the Planning Commission.
  - The Code sections were identified for each area in the table, as well as the desired outcome and problem statements discussed in the longer memo from Angelo Planning Group. The table identified where existing Code language merely needed to be refined and where it was necessary to develop new language or a new Code.
- There were no Code guidelines regarding infill compatibility and multi-family residential design standards. Pursuing that as a project would entail development of new Code language. The guidelines for townhouses were referenced in different use zone sections, but were very confusing and not explicit. Clear direction and Code language regarding townhouses was missing and so could be considered a new Code language project.
- Commercial Design Standards were missing from the current Code and the Manufacturing Zone should perhaps be rewritten rather than tweaked.
- Next Steps in the table included Urban Design support, Additional Analysis and Research, City Council and Planning Commission Worksessions, and Public Outreach Effort.
  - Outside help was needed with Urban Design Support to develop graphics or study Code language for architectural design input.
  - Additional Analysis and Research were areas that required more than using and tweaking the model Code. The different options required evaluation regarding what would fit in Milwaukie.
  - The Public Outreach column indicated areas where the City needed input from the public.
- The Priority Column was staff's view of where each different Code project would fall based on what was heard from the Planning Commission and City Council. Tonight's discussion was about prioritizing issues because it was possible that funding would be limited or that staff would not be able to handle the workload.

**Commissioner Bresaw** stated that her neighbor's high priority was the fact that he could not build his detached garage with office above because the Code was too strict. He wanted his garage's roof to match the slope of his house's roof, which meant a taller structure because the garage had a wide footprint.

- **Ms. Shanks** responded that in 2002 the Accessory Structure Standards and Design Standards were radically altered in response to the pole barn scenario, limiting the footprint for detached accessory structures. Due to other development standards, if an accessory structure was too close to the property line or if there was already too much lot coverage, an accessory structure could not be altered.
- If Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) were included in the Code project, some key questions were: should ADUs be allowed as detached structures and should they be allowed as detached structures within existing detached structures, like garages. The design standards for detached accessory structures would need to be reviewed because 2 stories were not possible with a 15 ft maximum height.

**Ms. Mangle** noted that staff wanted to be sure they were characterizing projects correctly and hoped the Action Plan Table would be helpful for immediately guiding the grant application next month. For items that did not get immediate funding, the table would also be used as a template for expressing and defining other projects, like the Sign Code and Historic Resources, which were not captured by the grant. The Action Plan Table would help keep track of the different problems in the city. Feedback on that was also requested.

**Commissioner Churchill:**

- Assumed that prioritizing Downtown Design Standards as medium was because good controls were already in place.
  - **Ms. Shanks** clarified that some key questions were about whether the prohibited materials list was too restrictive. The Design Standards project also focused on what uses were not wanted versus what was wanted. The Design Standards were very subjective in general, so something was missing in terms of graphics, stating what was desired, and perhaps looking at the prohibited materials list because it did not keep up with the evolving materials available in construction today.
  - **Ms. Mangle** added that the City did have standards, but could do better because some areas had no standards. Feedback from the Commission indicated that they did not want to reduce the standards or use restrictions.
  - Downtown was a very high priority for City Council.
- Agreed that downtown was important, although there seemed to be a lot of downtown-centric focus at times. Fair standards were in place, but a restrictive list would be helpful.
- Noted that townhouses and duplexes were a lower priority on the list, but there could be some horrendous looking townhouses. Perhaps that should be a higher priority.

The Commission and staff continued with the following discussion points:

- Duplexes might not require many code changes, but townhouses were basically not in the Code and should be somehow tied to the multifamily residential design.
- Townhouses did not currently exist in the Code except explicitly in the downtown area, so townhouse questions were in part about design, but more about whether and where they should be allowed, and with what limitations.
  - **Ms. Shanks** explained that townhouses could be 2 attached homes on separate lots, so by definition did not become a multi-family residential development.
    - Staff had updated the Action Plan Table since preparing the version supplied in the epacket and included questions such as:
      - Should townhouses be outright or conditionally allowed in all residential zones or just some zones? What review process should be required? What lot sizes were appropriate? What were the best tools to ensure compatibility?
      - The Code currently implied that a townhouse lot could be much narrower in R5 and R7 zones, but perhaps that was not appropriate.
  - Townhouses added into a residential area just added density, and traffic had to be fed through the neighborhood to get to the transportation corridor. Townhouses could be located throughout the City, but should be in close proximity to major roads.
  - Some owner-occupied townhouses looked very nice, especially when builders put more money into the front and detail so they had better curb appeal.

- Building townhouses required balancing expensive development costs and making the buildings look nice. Generally, the lots were smaller and the land was less expensive, so perhaps higher design standards could be required to provide a quality development but also affordability.
- Along 9th Ave in San Francisco and the 122nd Ave area in Portland were a series of townhouses that would not be appropriate in density and mass in Milwaukie. Controls would be necessary if townhouses were considered as a project. The appropriate development type was needed for an appropriate density.
- **Ms. Mangle** clarified staff had wanted feedback about housing variety, not out of necessity, but to consider that a range of housing types was not allowed in Milwaukie. The issue was more about allowing a variety to provide housing for aging Milwaukie citizens and for those unable to afford houses on large lots.
  - It was not an urgent issue, but the available vacant lots were smaller and staff was receiving inquiries about allowable uses. There were not many inquiries from developers, but from citizens wanting to convert garages to ADUs.
  - **Commissioner Batey** believed the issue was important because it was silly that Norm Scott could not build 3 attached houses, which made more sense for his property layout than requiring 2 duplexes. Others had also commented that putting several townhouses on a lot was more desirable than another manufactured home. A line had to be drawn between having the flexibility to build 3 townhouses on a lot versus knocking down 3 houses and building 20 homes.
  - The corner lot across from Corbett Fish House in John's Landing had a nice series of townhouses with parking underneath that transitioned nicely with the surrounding single-family residential area. Townhouses could be done sensibly, yet atrocities were also seen even with the same restrictions in place.
- Two recent requests had been received for ADUs, but the process was too onerous.
- Huge lot size requirements existed for duplexes, essentially requiring another full lot.
- Commercial design standards and commercial uses were part of the General Commercial (CG) Zone for the 42<sup>nd</sup> Ave and King Rd area. The areas around Safeway were not all zoned commercial, but a commercial core was surrounded by residential. The commercial core was a good example of an area of concern because commercial zoning was so general. The Planning Commission and DLC had discussed the design standards for the area for a long time, but the uses were also important because the Code promoted strip mall development in that area, which would not best serve the community as a neighborhood center.
  - Periodic review to update the Comprehensive Plan was still a project that might take a year or two to proceed. The King Rd Neighborhood Center Master Plan was included in the Comprehensive Plan long ago. Periodic review and updating of that master plan was another way to tackle it because some issues might have more to do with brownfield redevelopment, site cleanup, and site acquisition, which were really not zoning code issues.
  - Sellwood was broken into 3 distinct, different areas: Tacoma, 13<sup>th</sup> St, and 17<sup>th</sup> Ave, and the chain of everything flowing in the area was nice. Milwaukie has not looked at other areas of the city, but instead focused on making the downtown area feasible when two-thirds of the population accessed the 42<sup>nd</sup> Ave and King Rd shopping center.
- One question on the Action Plan Table was whether there should be 6 different commercial zones when Milwaukie was not geographically a large city and did not have a lot of commercially-zoned land.

- **Ms. Shanks** asked if standards should be considered and developed that addressed the Comprehensive Plan's broader use and scale of use issues that were not currently embodied in the Code, and also develop those standards for other key districts in the City, including the Ardenwald neighborhood.
- The Neighborhood District Associations (NDAs) had been built on a 2-dimensional geographic plan rather than the synergy of true neighborhoods, such as their events, grocery stores, and restaurants. Such elements pull a neighborhood together, even if on the edge of an NDA area.
- At present, neighborhood services like yoga studios and martial arts schools were not allowed in some Milwaukie zones, so the Code was very outdated in that way.
- Safeway was not nearly as busy as it used to be. And now, without the ability to walk there safely, people get in their cars and could drive to other places, Fred Meyer's, New Seasons, Trader Joe's, or Safeway, and Safeway is low on that list. When people have more than groceries to buy, they will not go to Safeway.
  - **Commissioner Batey** explained that she would personally put commercial design standards as high and downtown uses as medium. She was uncertain about townhouses, but was inclined to put them as medium.
  - **Chair Klein** responded that in the grand scheme of where they were prioritized on the Action Plan Table, all of those other things were more important right now than certainly townhouses, duplexes, and ADUs. If he were to rank them 1 to 10, those would be toward the bottom of the list. Even though they're very important. He did not mind them being low, but they were important.
  - **Commissioner Bresaw** asked why the design standards for single-family architectural design and townhouses could not be addressed at the same time. She believed townhouses should be allowed.
    - **Ms. Shanks** clarified that the issue was not so much about design, but whether townhouses were even allowed and where. Single-family architectural design was really about design and would need to be addressed first.
- Adult foster care homes were built as massive single-family housing. None of the defined Code projects on the Action Plan Table would address adult foster care homes, but the massing and size could be addressed under design if it was a new construction. Converting an existing home was another matter.

**Commissioner Churchill** compared Milwaukie today with successful neighborhood forms such as Clinton St and Alberta St in Portland. Without a creative application of zoning and restrictions of use, Milwaukie would always be very segmented and remain a bedroom community to Portland. The richness and culture of the community had to be allowed to grow instead of using a very rigid layout from zone to zone.

- King Rd was too wide and not appropriate for any formation of the desired neighborhood form. In looking at the 6 key areas, he wondered how the culture and richness could be addressed.

**Chair Klein** stated it came back to how the City moved people through the area. The key was to draw people to the 42<sup>nd</sup> Ave and King Rd area through projects that added pedestrian access, safety, shade, and took people out of the mentality of driving wherever they wanted to go.

**Commissioner Bresaw** emphasized that landscaping was the key to softening the streetscape everywhere, including the asphalt corridor of King Rd.

**Commissioner Churchill** believed landscape was a portion of the solution, but also the scale and nature of the public, semi-private, and private spaces that made a streetscape work well. Parts of Hawthorne Blvd and Clinton St were good from a scale standpoint, but Hawthorne Blvd was a little dense at times, which was not appropriate for Milwaukie.

**Ms. Mangle** noted the question was how to promote a village feel that could work within the desired scale. The larger shopping centers could maybe be improved in the future through redevelopment, but would still be shopping centers along the highway. Pockets within town had the potential to better serve the neighborhoods, building the village feel that many Milwaukie citizens yearned for, particularly on the commercial side.

Key discussion points continued as follows:

- The Island Station business district was a key area that would be ripe for redevelopment with light rail because it was across from the station. Safe pedestrian access and successful businesses would be necessary there because neighbors would walk to get on light rail.
- Village neighborhood nodes were a combination of the streetscapes, public areas, and private areas. Hopefully, the Transportation Code Amendments (TCA) would provide more flexibility regarding design.
  - One TCA idea involved having the neighborhoods help identify and develop a design for key streets, so that a plan was in place when development occurred. Currently, a more reactive process took place when developers applied for permits. A proactive process was best so the neighborhood could have a streetscape design plan in place.
- A key challenge for redeveloping the Island Station business area was that the sites were small and most likely did not have conforming parking under the current standards. If the area was developed as more of a walk-to commercial node, then hopefully the parking standards could take that into consideration.
- The Code provided a laundry list of uses allowed in general commercial, and also addressed the scale and design of a business. The Code did not speak to newer business types like yoga studios and doggie daycares, which were revitalizing some neighborhood commercial areas in other parts of the region. Issues of concern included streetscape, parking, and the correct scale and use of new construction for the neighborhood. Single-operator businesses like tax accountants or chiropractors often inquired about small, affordable business spaces in commercial areas.
  - Allowing neighborhood commercial uses would cause changes throughout the neighborhood because people would want to move there, businesses would become more successful, and then more people would want to locate there.
- **Chair Klein** commented that considering and applying the 'big picture' planning concepts being discussed was what he always envisioned as the Planning Commission's job. It was time to apply different ideas to the community even though it would raise issues.
- Parking standards could kill good village nodes. For development in nodes, parking standards needed to be completely relieved. At 42<sup>nd</sup> Ave and King Rd, onsite parking requirements destroyed the great sense of neighborhood at the four corners of the node until it looked like a modified strip mall. The pedestrian neighborhood connection was also lost because driving to the location was encouraged. Developers were encouraged when they did not have to provide parking.

- On 42<sup>nd</sup> Ave north of King Rd, many of the lots were multi-family, but pedestrian access was not great. The Safeway parking lot was never full, indicating that the parking standard was set too high; too many parking spaces were required.
- It was difficult to find the perfect balance with multi-tenant sites where tenants moved in and out of buildings. A complicated calculation was utilized to arrive at what seemed an appropriate parking requirement for the Safeway site. However, if a property owner wanted to build another building at a later date, perhaps the parking requirements could be reevaluated with a parking study.
- Traffic codes looked at traffic generation as a part of a use, which was good information, but could perhaps be set aside when the density around a node was needed.
- As a discussion and learning tool, perhaps one or two nodes could be used as conceptual test sites for how the City might model nodes from a zoning standpoint. Transportation and development plans could be considered to lay out new policies and generate ideas for discussion regarding zoning flexibility. Key elements for successful nodes could be identified, such as no onsite parking, proximity to transit, etc.
  - University of Oregon graduate students might be interested in a conceptual test project that could be taken to the neighborhood to aid in creating policies.
  - Communities did not immediately accept change, so by conceptually applying a model to a node, the fallout could be observed from a zoning standpoint along with what it would take to achieve the plan at that node. The pros and cons could then be studied as a discussion tool.
  - Dieringer's Properties developed the Safeway property and might have feedback regarding the results of abiding by Milwaukie's Code.
    - Property developers like Dieringer's Properties did not necessarily understand the idea of nodes because they developed classic one-story developments with parking lots in front. For the richness of a neighborhood, another architectural firm with a different sense was needed.
    - **Chair Klein** understood Dieringer's Properties did have other plans in mind for the site.
  - Public meetings to present hypothetical projects to improve existing sites would help citizens understand changes needed to improve the city and start ideas flowing. The WinCo parking lot on SE 82<sup>nd</sup> Ave was an example of a badly organized parking lot.
  - Planning and architecture tools do not explain "richness." Along SE 22<sup>nd</sup> Ave south of SE Division St was a very rich node with a co-op grocery mini-node. Parking was on the street, but the area was successful. It was unlikely an entire neighborhood would accept the change required in bringing about such a node. Unfortunately, neighborhood buy-in would result in more of what existed.
    - If the richness of the node neighborhood was important to Milwaukie, it would have to be found in Portland and applied to Milwaukie. Property owners at the core of intersections would be affected, but those areas were typically commercially zoned already.
    - The Wichita Town Center was a commercial node at the edge of the city with drive-up and walk-up traffic.
  - Form and use were both important in using different neighborhood nodes to play out different scenarios in a combination of form-based and Euclidean zoning approaches with a particular zoning form in place and then put in appropriate uses.

**Ms. Mangle** explained that Commissioner Batey had suggested 2 proposed modifications to the Action Plan Table. She asked whether the entire Commission supported that change.

- Finalizing the plan would be discussed at the next meeting. A joint worksession with City Council would likely be held in late October.
- She clarified that lunch trucks were allowed in the City on private property as long as their wheels were kept on so they were considered vehicles, not structures. The vehicles could not take required spaces away from existing buildings. The City would not issue parking permits for City parking lots, but the lunch trucks' presence was allowed given certain caveats of the Zoning Code.
- She was intrigued by comments made about the Parking Code and would include them when staff returned with the Parking Code Amendments draft.

**Ms. Shanks** believed holding a worksession with City Council would be helpful so Council could hear directly from the Planning Commission about the commercial zones and other neighborhood nodes outside of downtown and why downtown was not considered a priority.

**7.0 Planning Department Other Business/Updates**—There was none.

### **8.0 Planning Commission Discussion Items**

**Chair Klein** noted that new Thai and Hawaiian restaurants were opening downtown.

- He noted Clinton St was a very successful business district as well as a bike corridor.

**Commissioner Batey** believed the 21<sup>st</sup> Ave and Clinton St, and 26<sup>th</sup> Ave and Clinton St areas provided better examples for Milwaukie than the New Seasons Seven Corners area because she did not envision supermarkets going into the nodes.

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

September 8, 2009 1. Worksession: Parking Code Amendments project briefing  
2. Worksession: Smart Code Assessment Action Plan draft II –*tentative*

September 22, 2009 1. Joint Session with Riverfront Board: Kellogg plant restoration design UO project –*tentative*  
2. Worksession: Parking Code Amendments project briefing II –*tentative*

**Ms. Mangle** reviewed the upcoming meetings, and confirmed the Commission wanted to discuss neighborhood nodes with regard to Parking Code Amendments at the September 8 meeting to keep the draft moving forward.

- The joint session with the Riverfront Board planned on September 22 was not for Riverfront Park. A University of Oregon architecture class did a design studio on designing big sites to work with nature as part of Title 13 Nature in Neighborhoods. Their academic test site was the Kellogg Creek Treatment plant and how it could be redeveloped in a way that was good for habitat and fed healthy ecosystems around the river.
  - She heard the project designs were very captivating, illustrating the issues and the potential for doing very exciting things on such challenging sites. Individuals

- were being collected for the Natural Resources Advisory Group for the Title 13 project, and they would be invited to attend the joint session as well.
- The Parking Code Amendments could be discussed in a worksession after the public meeting.
  - The Riverfront Park application was almost complete. A preparatory worksession with the Design and Landmarks Committee (DLC) was held 2 weeks ago to prepare for the Design Review hearing, hopefully at the end of September or (early?) October, so it could be heard by the Planning Commission in November.
    - The City was still seeking funding for the project, but all local, State, and national permits were being obtained, so that the project was shovel-ready and grants were easier to obtain.
  - The Downtown Milwaukie Station workshop for the Light Rail Project was scheduled for October 15, 2009.

**Chair Klein** believed the Commission should represent the Parking Code Amendments at City Council so that the Commission's ideas and comments did not get lost in the process.

Meeting adjourned at 8:32 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Paula Pinyerd, ABC Transcription Services, Inc. for  
Alicia Stoutenburg, Administrative Specialist II



Jeff Klein, Chair