

## NOTES

## JOINT MEETING OF CITY COUNCIL AND PLANNING COMMISSION

May 24, 1979

## In attendance:

John Spender	Jim Lotz
Cy Nims	Mark Landis
Jon Stein	Tom Bond
Allen Manuel	Tom Foeller
Anne Nickel	
Bob Ewald	
Joy Burgess	
Mel Paulson	

John Spencer opened the meeting saying that the Comp Plan is at the point now where it has been reviewed and revised several times and it now needs to go to the decision makers of the city so that they can make their revisions and approve the document. The contract with LCDC states the compliance date as September 1979. We are now in Phase III. He explained the time frame for completion of the Comp Plan and implementation ordinances, as well as public hearing dates. Meeting dates were discussed.

Ewald noted that through the Neighborhood Councils, the citizens of Milwaukie were apparently not very interested. It was remarked that citizens will only show for meetings when something is affecting them directly. Ideas about the future have little or no impact. Ewald was pointing out the importance of taking into consideration the weight of the comments being made.

John Spencer gave an overview of the Comp Plan Draft: its 4 divisions: Environment and Natural Resources; Community Development and Conservation; Transportation, Public Facilities, Energy Conservation; and City Growth and Relationship of City to County. The focus tonight is on the land use section. The comments reveal that people still do not want high density development in their neighborhoods; a number of agencies are saying that we might not be providing enough multi family development to meet state and regional goals. 1000 Friends and some commercial interests are saying that regional objectives for development over the next 20 years are that 50 percent of the residential construction in the area is going to be multi family and 50 percent is going to be single family. Regional objectives are therefore for all communities to bear that "burden," and should be providing for multi family development.

Tom Bond asked whether each community was expected to have this 50 percent multi family mix. Spencer noted that Milwaukie presently provides more than its share of multi family housing. John gave background information from the technical working papers regarding densities. Nickel asked what affect PUDs have on this plan. Spencer explained that the plan shows overall density allowed in certain areas and recommends housing types within the densities. PUD doesn't alter the underlying density but allows a flexible use of what types of housing will be allowed. The total number of units per acre has to be consistent with the density allowed; only the housing type may be altered. Its purpose is to build on less land to allow more open space rather than a regular subdivision. It was pointed out that the PUD issue is more of the type of ownership than housing type. The citizens are asking how can we have owner occupied multi family housing. The residents on Lake Road don't want to destroy the atmosphere and visual impact present at this time. It was suggested implementing an innovative performance standard which allows uses to tract densities and requires them to obey certain performance standards which are agreeable to the height (in essence having a design review which legislates quality of housing). It was noted by one council member that the exclusion of a PUD is very

Joint Meeting of City Council and Planning Commission  
May 24, 1979  
Page 2

unreasonable in terms of the cost. Spencer explained that what was needed was a performance criteria to insure that the conflict between multi family and single family is not that great. In addition, the city could say that for each density range it could be stipulated what types of housing would be allowed under PUD. He was not sure of the legality of doing this, however. Each neighborhood should establish guidelines for itself, not to be discriminatory, but to establish directives to a design review board for the type of community they would like to see in their neighborhood. A statement could be made in the Neighborhood Element to the effect that for different areas of the city there would be design criteria. It was the consensus that the language needs to be stronger in preserving the neighborhoods before it goes before public hearings.

On a budget standpoint, it was noted by Nickel that the city needs to have a design review board, and she hoped that the other council members, as Budget Committee members, would note the importance of having design review. Landis emphasized that this plan must address the needs of the future and that he felt we should be aware that society will be changing in the next few years.

Questions were asked relative to whether Milwaukie was going to remain a bedroom community with characteristics of Portland or whether it will strive to retain its own identity separate from Portland. The kind of a city this Comp Plan is going to design needs to be addressed.

It was felt that stronger statements might be made concerning senior housing, energy conservation, government efficiency in land use process, and light rail transportation.