

**Design Commission Meeting
City Council Chambers
September 18, 2019, 6:30 p.m.**

I. Opening/Citizen Comment

A regular session of the Gresham Design Commission was called to order on the 18 of September, 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
Mike McKeel
Matthew Sugarbaker

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: Robert Hayden
Pat Lando
Tom Orth

COUNCILOR PRESENT: David Widmark

STAFF: David Berniker, Urban Design & Planning
Kevin McConnell, City Attorney’s Office
Ken Onyima, Urban Design & Planning
Jamie Thomes, Urban Design & Planning
Terra Wilcoxson, Urban Design & Planning
Joshua 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. Elliott Street Townhomes Hearing: 550 NE 5th St.

Order of Procedure

Application DRE/SD 19-26000011 is an application for Design Review for a proposed Type III Design Review E for the construction of one, three-story building with five single-family attached homes with associated site improvements and a Type II five-lot subdivision.

- When asked if any member of the Design Commission wished to make any disclosure or abstain from participating or voting on the application, Commissioner McKeel noted he owned property just east of the project site.

- 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 outside of staff concerning the subject of the hearing.
- Chair Cook and Commissioner McKeel 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:

- 4.1151(A)(1)(c)(1) and 4.1151(A)(1)(d)(1) - Building Frontage
- 4.1151(A)(1)(c)(23) and 4.1151(A)(1)(d)(23)(i) - Street Frontage and Building Orientation, 4.1151(B)(2)(c)(26) and 4.1151(A)(2)(d)(26) - Garage Facades, 4.1151(B)(2)(c)(27) and 4.1151(B)(2)(d)(27) - Maximum Width of Street-Facing Garages, and 4.1151(A)(1)(c)(24) and 4.1151(A)(1)(d)(24)(e) - Driveways and Unit Access
- 4.1151(A)(5)(c)(1) and 4.1151(A)(5)(d)(1) - Professional Landscape Architect
- 4.1151(B)(2)(c)(17) and 4.1151(B)(2)(d)(17) - Dwelling Unit Offset
- 4.1151(B)(2)(c)(18) and 4.1151(B)(2)(d)(18) - Entry Covered Porch or Portico
- 4.1151(B)(2)(c)(20) and 4.1151(B)(2)(d)(20) - Window Trim
- 4.1151(B)(2)(c)(24) and 4.1151(B)(2)(d)(24) - Unique Corner Feature
- 4.1151(B)(2)(c)(28) and 4.1151(B)(2)(d)(28) - Minimum Transparency for Street Facing Facades and 4.1151(B)(5)(c)(2) and 4.1151(B)(5)(d)(2) - Ground-Floor Transparency by Street Type
- 4.1151(B)(9)(c)(1) and 4.1151(B)(9)(d)(1) - Building Façade Primary Materials

The Commission discussed the following with staff:

- Shading elements or awnings are not required.
- Staff clarified what was being recommended in terms of the walkway and driveway widths.
- Landscape trees and their location relevant to the building. Staff noted that columnar trees are being considered with the building permit submittal.

Applicant Presentation

The applicant described the proposal. Representatives included:

- Brandon Yoder, Builder's Design
- Spiro Sassaloss, SKS Development

Commission Comments

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

- 4.1151(B)(2)(c)(17) and 4.1151(B)(2)(d)(17) - Dwelling Unit Offset
 - The Commission was generally in favor of the privacy screens for the Level 2 balconies on Units 3 and 4 being adjusted so they terminate flush with the adjacent façade plane of Level 3. The Commission was also agreeable to the applicant having the option to push the Unit 3 and 4 balconies and wall planes back 1-foot.
 - By pushing both elements back into the building, the balconies will retain a 4-foot depth.
 - This solution would resolve the misalignment of the privacy screens and the Level 3 wall planes as well as create a calmer composition.
- 4.1151(B)(2)(c)(28) and 4.1151(B)(2)(d)(28) - Minimum Transparency for Street Facing Facades and 4.1151(B)(5)(c)(2) and 4.1151(B)(5)(d)(2) - Ground-Floor Transparency by Street Type
 - The Commission concurred with staff's recommendation to enlarge the windows on the north façade.
 - The Commission suggested that on the north façade the applicant repeat the larger window type that is proposed on the east façade.
- 4.1151(B)(9)(c)(1) and 4.1151(B)(9)(d)(1) - Building Façade Primary Materials
 - The Commission expressed concern with the material color selection as all seemed very similar in tone.
 - The Commission preferred that contrasting and complimentary materials and colors were selected.
 - The final renderings submitted at building permit review must depict the proposed colors and illustrate that adequate contrast is being achieved.
 - The Commission agreed with staff that the number of materials utilized should be reduced.

General Commission comments included:

- The Commission was not in favor of the roof element parallel to NE Elliott Avenue, set slightly back from the north/south eave facing NE Elliott Avenue, as it did not seem to enhance the overall design of the development.
 - The roof element seems thin and contemporary but does not work with the massing of the building.
 - The suggestion was made to consider replacing the element with a parapet condition or adjusting the location of the eave.

- In general, the Commission felt that the design should be modified so that one continuous shed roof is utilized.
- Landscaping was discussed, including methods to enhance the landscape as well as ensuring for plant survival.
- Fencing materials must be durable.
- The Commission noted that the brick element on the east façade does not wrap to the south façade.
 - To better articulate the corner, the Design Commission recommended that the brick wrap the corner from the east to the south façade, especially since part of the south façade will be visible from the street.

Public Comment

Sidney Hubbell

Mr. Hubbell expressed concerns about how rainwater runoff would be managed as well as the anticipated end condition of NE Elliott Avenue. Mr. Hubbell explained that his property abuts the proposed development and noted that a section of his property appears lower than the project parcel and is often damp. Mr. Hubbell asked what would be done to ensure that his property not become a wetland.

Further, Mr. Hubbell described the condition of NE Elliott Avenue, which is a gravel road. Maintenance of the road has been to incorporate additional gravel, which has increased the elevation of the overall road. Consequently, water drains from NE Elliott Avenue to Mr. Hubbell's property, which exacerbates the situation of water runoff to his property. Mr. Hubbell asked for more information pertaining to the final condition of NE Elliott Avenue.

The Commission noted that the proposal, if approved, will be required to complete half street improvements, including 20 feet of pavement along NE Elliott Avenue. At this time, staff was not aware of any other development along NE Elliott Avenue near the subject site; thus, no other improvements were known for the road. When the property across from the subject parcel develops, however, NE Elliott Avenue will be completely improved from NE 4th to NE 5th Streets. Mr. Hubbell was concerned that with half street improvements, the overall condition of the street may deteriorate, especially where the gravel will meet the pavement, and that potholes would begin to appear.

The Commission observed that the project will be required to conform to the City's stormwater management criteria, meaning that stormwater will not be allowed to drain to adjacent properties.

Staff will provide information about the proposed project, including access to the proposal through ePlan, the staff report for the proposal, as well as contact information for Development Engineering.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommended approval with conditions of the Type III Design Review E for the construction of one, three-story building with five single-family attached homes with associated site improvements and a Type II five-lot subdivision with the following modifications to the conditions of approval:

- Add a condition of approval to read: Provide revised plans and elevations which demonstrate a continuous shed roof.
- Add a condition of approval to read: Submit updated renderings that accurately reflect the proposed colors of the façade materials.
- Add a condition of approval to read: The brick base wraps the southeast corner of the building.

Motion

The Commission closed the hearing.

Vice-chair Cok moved that the Commission approve application number DRE/SD 19-26000011 based on the findings, conclusions, and recommendations stated in the September 11, 2019 Staff Report with the following modifications and/or additions:

- Add a condition of approval to read: Provide revised plans and elevations which demonstrate a continuous shed roof.
- Add a condition of approval to read: Submit updated renderings that accurately reflect the proposed colors of the façade materials.
- Add a condition of approval to read: The brick base wraps the southeast corner of the building.

Commissioner McKeel seconded the motion. The motion passed.

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

III. Waterside Apartments Discussion: 16533 NE Halsey St.

The applicant and staff provided presentations for the Commission pertaining to changes taking place with the project. Applicant representatives included Chad Antonsen.

The project, DRE 16-26000208, was approved by the Design Commission on February 15, 2017. During a required framing inspection on July 31, 2019, staff noted inconsistencies pertaining to the placement and number of windows on the west façade of Buildings A and B. Specifically,

the approved plans demonstrated eight large windows surrounded by eight smaller windows. During the site inspection, staff observed that the smaller windows had been removed. The applicant had explained to staff that the windows were removed due to the interior layout of the bathroom.

Staff had also noted the introduction of a belly band at the top of the third floor on all facades of both buildings. The applicant had explained that the belly band will work to screen through wall penetrations for vents.

Design Commission and Applicant Discussion

The applicant explained that the architect had designed a 2-foot by 4-foot window above the fiberglass shower unit, which is not feasible with the shower header. The solution proposed was to install blackout windows. From the outside, the windows will appear as normal windows with the same vinyl frame, but they will not be able to open, and will not be seen from the inside of the unit as the wall of the unit will be behind the glass. This would allow for the architectural detail and relief provided by the original window. The applicant further argued that bathroom windows in rental properties are problematic in terms of maintenance and are difficult to seal upon installation. Photos were provided to the Commission that depicted the use of blackout windows.

The Commission was not agreeable to the use of blackout windows. Overall, the Commission felt that utilizing a window in the bathroom would be beneficial, both for air movement and architectural design.

The suggestion was made for the applicant to add high windows on the master suite facades that would mimic the windows that would have been installed in the bathrooms. The applicant noted this was not possible due to shear walls in those areas of the structure.

The Commission also suggested that the fiberglass shower could be replaced with a tub to provide the opportunity for window installation as originally approved. The applicant was concerned with maintenance of a tub versus the use of a fiberglass shower.

Another suggestion was to rotate the shower to the other side of the room. The applicant noted that the units had already been plumbed and some units were specifically for ADA compliance, so rotating the location of the shower may be difficult.

The applicant agreed to incorporate the windows in the bathroom that had been removed, and to replace the fiberglass shower with a tub to allow for the installation and use of the windows.

The applicant also explained that, while venting had been anticipated for the development, the conditions inside the structure were unexpectedly difficult and resulted in the vents not being installed as originally intended. The proposed belly band with the second belly band will appear as one belly band. Further, the lower belly band will protrude 4 inches from the façade and adequately screen the vents.

The Commission was agreeable to the use of the belly bands as proposed and described by the applicant.

IV. Other Commission Business

Staff reviewed the Design Commission schedule, including the October 2 hearing for the Civic Drive Southwest Apartments project. It was noted that the October 2 hearing can be continued to October 16, if necessary, given the large scope of the project. The Commission was encouraged to notify staff if they cannot attend the October 2 meeting.

The Commission and staff also discussed possible rowhouse façade changes that could occur within the Downtown for a certain development. This included noting that it is unclear at this time what, if anything, will occur as well as a discussion as to what Code review would be applied should façade changes be pursued. A brief outline of the discretionary review process was provided for the Commission.

August 7, 2019 Design Commission Minutes

Commissioner McKeel moved to approve the August 7, 2019 minutes. Commissioner Cok seconded the motion. The motion was passed.

V. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 8:09 pm.

Chair

Recording Secretary

Date

Date

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