

**Design Commission Meeting
City Council Chambers
August 7, 2019, 6:30 p.m.**

I. Opening

A meeting of the Gresham Design Commission was called to order on the 7 of August, 2019 at 6:30 pm in City Council Chambers, located at 1333 NW Eastman Parkway, Gresham Oregon. The meeting was recorded and scribed by Jamie Thomes.

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Camilla Cok
Rob Cook
Pat Lando
Mike McKeel
Matthew Sugarbaker

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: Robert Hayden
Tom Orth

COUNCILOR PRESENT: David Widmark

STAFF: David Berniker, Urban Design & Planning
John Heili, Urban Design & Planning
Kevin McConnell, City Attorney’s Office
Jamie Thomes, Urban Design & Planning
Terra Wilcoxson, Urban Design & Planning
Josh Williams, Urban Design & Planning

Chair Cook introduced staff and members of the Commission that were present as well as described how public comments could be provided.

II. Hearing Opening Statement

Chair Cook reviewed the opening statement.

III. East Burnside Apartments Hearing: 17526 E Burnside St.

Order of Procedure

Application DRE/TR 19-26000014 is an application for Design Review for the construction of one multifamily building with three stories and associated parking and site improvements, and Type II Tree Removal for the removal of 31 regulated trees.

- No member of the Design Commission wished to make any disclosure or abstain from participating or voting on the application.

- No member of the Commission needed to declare any contact, written, oral or otherwise, prior to the hearing with the applicant, any other party involved in the hearing, or any other source of information, such as newspaper articles, outside of staff concerning the subject of the hearing.
- Chair Cook and Commissioners Cok, McKeel and Lando had visited the site.
- No person wished to object to the jurisdiction of the Commission to hear the matter.

Staff Presentation

Staff gave a presentation that included the following discretionary review items:

- 7.0503(A)(4)(c)(1) and 7.0503(A)(4)(d)(1) - Building Entry Orientation and 7.0103(A)(7)(c)(3) and 7.0103(A)(7)(d)(3) - Transit Connections
- 7.0103(A)(1)(c)(3) and 7.0103(A)(1)(d)(3) - Outdoor Private Space
- 7.0103(A)(4)(c)(3) and 7.0103(A)(4)(d)(3) - Children’s Play Area
- 7.0503(A)(8)(c)(4) and 7.0503(A)(8)(d)(4) - Site Landscaping Percent and 7.0103(A)(5)(c)(2) and 7.0103(A)(5)(d)(2) - Minimum Landscape Area
- 7.0503(A)(8)(c)(5) and 7.0503(A)(8)(d)(5) - Landscaping of Parking Lots
- 7.0103(A)(5)(c)(6) and 7.0103(A)(5)(d)(6) - Setback Trees
- 7.0503(B)(3)(c)(7) and 7.0503(B)(3)(d)(7) - Ground-Floor Elevation
- 7.0503(B)(4)(c)(1) and 7.0503(B)(4)(d)(1) - Window Recess
- 7.0103(B)(1)(c)(2) and 7.0103(B)(1)(d)(2) - Building Length
- 7.0103(B)(1)(c)(4) and 7.0103(B)(1)(d)(4) - Storage
- 7.0503(C)(1)(c)(1) and 7.0503(C)(1)(d)(1) - Tree Retention
- 7.0103(A)(2)(c)(6) and 7.0103(A)(2)(d)(6) - Recycled Hardscape Materials and 7.0103(B)(4)(c)(2) and 7.0103(B)(4)(d)(2) - Sustainable Materials
- 7.0103(A)(2)(c)(1) and 7.0103(A)(2)(d)(1) - Energy Conservation

The Commission discussed with staff drawings Sheets T1.0 and T1.1 in terms of the proposed vehicle turning analysis.

Applicant Presentation

The applicant provided a presentation of the proposal. Representatives included:

- Robert Leeb, Leeb Architects

Commission Comments

The Commission, staff, and the applicant discussed the following items:

7.0103(A)(4)(c)(3) and 7.0103(A)(4)(d)(3) - Children's Play Area

- The Commission was generally in favor of the combination of an open space and children's play area to create a more universally usable space.
- The Commission and applicant discussed the proposed sand shelf and how it interacts with the area.

General

- The Commission discussed the proposed parking lot layout, specifically its impact on landscaping and the turnaround.
 - It was noted that a condition of approval allows for the reduction of a landscape island in order to meet the 24-foot drive aisle width requirement.
- The applicant must verify the drought tolerant plants, both in number and species, with the building permit submittal.
- The applicant must verify the amount of shade being provided by the proposed trees.
- The Commission discussed the northeast ground floor unit and noted the bedroom does not appear to have a window.
 - The suggestion was made to consider recessing the wall and including a planter bed to create a buffer.
- The Commission was supportive of staff's recommendation to locate balconies on the street-facing façade. The Commission was in favor of also retaining the balconies on the east and west elevations of the street-facing units.
 - The applicant was encouraged to consider what options can be implemented to retain the balconies.

Public Comment

Catherine Nicewood

Ms. Nicewood noted that during the early neighborhood notification meeting with the applicant, three owners on SE 176th Place were pleased with project and thought it would improve the quality of the neighborhood.

Ms. Nicewood expressed support for the play area/open space combination and noted that during the early neighborhood notification meeting, the applicant had described the space as a community area and gathering space for the complex. Ms. Nicewood also agreed with the applicant that, with the proximity of other public amenities, the play area/open space combination would be sufficient for the development.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommended approval with conditions of the Type III Design Review E for the construction of one three-story apartment building with a total of 24 units, associated parking

and site improvements, and a Type II Tree Removal with the following modifications to the conditions of approval:

- Add a condition of approval that reads as follows:
 - Submit revised landscape plans identifying the specific drought tolerant plantings.
- Convert Recommendation A to a condition of approval which will read:
 - Submit revised plans and elevations that demonstrate covered balconies on Levels 2 and 3 of the north façade of the building. The design is subject to Manager approval.

Motion

The Commission closed the hearing.

Commissioner Lando moved that the Commission approve application number DRE/TR 19-26000014 based on the findings, conclusions, and recommendations stated in the July 31, 2019 Staff Report with the following modifications and/or additions:

- Add a condition of approval that reads as follows:
 - Submit revised landscape plans identifying the specific drought tolerant plantings.
- Convert Recommendation A to a condition of approval which will read:
 - Submit revised plans and elevations that demonstrate covered balconies on Levels 2 and 3 of the north façade of the building. The design is subject to Manager approval.

Commissioner McKeel seconded the motion. The motion passed.

Vice-chair Cok	Yes
Chair Cook	Yes
Commissioner Hayden	Absent
Commissioner Lando	Yes
Commissioner McKeel	Yes
Commissioner Orth	Absent
Commissioner Sugarbaker	Yes

III. Eastside Timbers Futsal Center ODCC: 4710 SE 174th Ave.

Project Presentations

The applicant and staff provided presentations for the project. Applicant representatives included:

- Joanne Rimkeit, Soderstrom

- Dan Van Calcar, Soderstrom
- Butch Pollard, Eastside Timbers

Design Commission and Applicant Discussion

Question 1: Building Placement and Frontage

Can the current parking layout remain in lieu of replacing the lot to meet Corridor Design Guidelines and Standards for building placement and frontage requirements?

Commission Comments

The Commission was agreeable to the building being located off the frontage as proposed and retaining the parking in its current location.

- It was noted that the proposed building is unique, and that consideration will need to be given in terms of how to apply the required design standards given the uniqueness.
- The Commission discussed how the parking lot approval had occurred and why the lot was paved without development first occurring.
- The Commission and applicant discussed the adjacent Centennial property that is currently being utilized for bus parking.
 - The applicant has an agreement with the property owner allowing Eastside Timbers to use the lot for overflow parking.
 - The Centennial lot is located in the City of Portland while the Eastside Timbers lot is within the City of Gresham.
 - The Commission discussed what would be required for the lot to be both used and developed since it is located outside of Gresham.

Question 2: Parking Lot Layout and Landscaping

Can the current parking layout remain in lieu of revising the lot to meet Corridor Design Guidelines and Standards for parking area layout and landscaping?

Commission Comments

The Commission preferred that the applicant conform to the landscaping requirements as set forth in the Corridor Design Guidelines and Standards to the greatest extent possible.

- The Commission and staff discussed alternatives that would mitigate any deficiency in the Code, such as landscape rows.
- The Commission generally felt the parking lot should be brought up to current Code standards; however, this was not unanimous.
- The applicant will need to demonstrate the need for the facility and how the proposal will comply with the intent of the Code.

- The Commission generally supported retaining the current chain link fence.

Question 3: Building Rhythm and Façade Articulation

Can the façade depth of the wall facing the street be achieved through other methods?

Commission Comments

The Commission did not object to the proposed 4-inch-wide metal reveal proposed to satisfy the façade articulation criteria.

The Design Commission felt that further articulation is needed at the entry. Also, the applicant should consider off set wall planes and the use of a different material, such as wood, at the entry.

The applicant could also increase the glazing on the south façade for the meeting room and CrossFit facility. Further, sunshades could be added to the south façade to increase articulation as well as provide for solar shading.

The Commission also suggested the applicant reconsider the incorporation of the gable feature on the south end of the building.

Question 4: Building Rhythm and Façade Articulation

Can the ground floor height be 12 feet from the ground level to the mezzanine level?

Commission Comments

Staff noted that the ground floor height is not an issue in terms of Code compliance as the proposal meets the Code standard.

Question 5: Transparency

Can the enhanced transparency zone be reduced as it does not follow the rhythm of the building?

Commission Comments

The Commission felt that the entry is compressed with regard to the overall building. The Commission urged the applicant to consider enlarging the lobby and enhancing the entry, especially in terms of what can be used as entry feature elements and how the façade may be treated to create a stronger entry.

- For instance, the south wall could be pushed out to provide additional room for the stairway.
- Deviation from the standards would be better supported with the incorporation of a stronger entry design.

Question 6: Alternate Buffer

Can the clear distance from the building to the property line on the east side (abutting a Transit Low Density Residential (TLDR) district) and on the north side (abutting the Centennial property) be less than 15 feet?

Commission Comments

The applicant should comply with the alternative buffer standards, especially in terms of noise attenuation into the residential neighborhood located to the east of the proposed facility. In addition, while not a component of the buffer standards, the applicant shall consider means to eliminate or significantly reduce light spill from the wall openings on the east facing façade into the abutting residential properties along the east property line, and felt the applicant’s proposal to tint the acrylic panels might be a solution.

- There needs to be a firm separation between the facility and the adjacent residential neighborhood as the site is transitioning from a General Industrial to a Commercial use.
- In general, deviation from the Code is better supported when mitigated such that the intent of the Code is met.

General Discussion

- The Commission asked about the future street plan that will be considered during the overall design review.
 - It was noted that the applicant had deferred the final approval for removing the future street plan so that it could be conditioned on the building being built.
- The Commission also discussed the street improvements that will occur as well as the standards that will need to be met when those improvements are built.

IV. Other Commission Business

Staff reviewed the Design Commission schedule for upcoming meetings and hearing.

V. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 8:47 pm.

Chair

Recording Secretary

Date

Date

For more information, please visit: www.GreshamOregon.gov/DesignCommission.