

**Design Commission Meeting
Gresham City Hall, Oregon Trail Room
July 17, 2019, 6:30 pm**

I. Opening

A regular session of the Gresham Design Commission was called to order on the 17 of July 2019, at 6:30 pm in Gresham City Hall, Oregon Trail Room, located at 1333 NW Eastman Parkway, Gresham Oregon. The meeting was recorded by staff and scribed by Laurie Ortloff.

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Camilla Cok
Rob Cook
Robert Hayden
Pat Lando
Mike McKeel
Tom Orth
Matthew Sugarbaker

COUNCILOR PRESENT: David Widmark

STAFF: David Berniker, Urban Design & Planning
Kevin McConnell, City Attorney’s Office
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. Stark Street Apartments ODCC: Southeast Corner of SE 217th Avenue and SE Stark Street

Project Presentations

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

- Taylor Kaplan, Gibbons Kaplan Development
- Diana Mooseman, MWA Architects
- Jessel Champoux, Shapiro Didway

Design Commission and Applicant Discussion

Question 1: Section 7.0103(A)(4)(d)(3) - Children’s Play Area

The applicant requested feedback on the proposed children's play area, which will be 3,000 square feet and 62 feet in diameter, meeting the minimum size requirements. The play area includes natural play elements and is not enclosed. Two benches are provided across the adjacent walkway. It was noted that the standard calls for three types of play equipment and for play areas to be enclosed by features such as planters, decorative fences, and benches.

Commission Comments

- The Commission was in favor of keeping the children's play area open to the surrounding common space but buffering it from the parking lot.
- The Commission encouraged natural play features, particularly the use of landforms, integrating the community garden area into the central open space, and rethinking the location of the dog exercise area.
- The open space feels underdeveloped.
- With the application submittal, detailed plans and sections of the play area should be submitted.
- The Commissioners concurred with staff that additional seating located around the play area would be helpful.

Question 2: Section 7.0103(A)(2)(D)(5) - Sustainable Site Furnishing

Can natural play elements be considered for meeting the sustainable site furnishings standard?

Commission Comments

The sustainable site furnishings standard stipulates that site furnishings be constructed with 20 percent sustainably harvested or locally sourced materials. The Commissioners were supportive of natural play elements qualifying as sustainable site furnishings; however, it was reiterated that additional details are needed so the proposed elements can be adequately evaluated with the design review.

Question 3: Section 7.0103(B)(2)(D)(3) - Window Reveal

The applicant requested to discuss the window reveal standard with the Commission. The Code standard requires a 2-inch window reveal. The submitted elevations show vertical Hardie panels adjacent to the majority of windows on the second and third floors. Window details were not submitted, so the character of the window design is unclear.

Commission Comments

- The Commission encouraged the applicant to meet or exceed the 2-inch window reveal standard and to propose a creative window design.
- Generally, the Commission felt that the design needs one or two strong architectural gestures, such as deep window recesses.

- Acceptance of the proposed window detail would be dependent upon the evolution of the façade composition, such as the façade and entry areas.
- The Commission was amenable to the use of metal trim on a deep window reveal.

Question 4: Section 7.0103(B)(2)(D)(4) - Street-facing Transparency

Is the quantity of street-facing transparency sufficient?

Commission Comments

- The Commission stated that the quantity of transparency that will be accepted is based on the quality of the façade composition and the reasons for the window sizes and locations.
- The Commission was generally comfortable with the quantity of transparency on Building 1's north façade (14 percent) and Building 2A's west façade (7 percent) because these elevations are set back from the street, but requested an increase in transparency on the north elevation of Building 3 (currently 11 percent transparency).

Question 5 & 6: Section 7.0103(B)(1)(D)(3) - Building Base and Section 7.0103(B)(2)(D)(1) Street-Facing Wall Planes

Horizontal Hardie plank lap siding with a 6-inch exposure is used up to the top of the ground level windows. The exposure narrows to 4 inches above this datum. Is this a sufficient building base? Also, are the proposed street-facing wall planes an acceptable size?

Commission Comments

- The applicant was encouraged to evaluate how the first floor can better engage the street without an increase in ground-level transparency, and how the ground floor design assists with creating a sense of interest and safety.
- The Commission observed that relying on a change in exposure dimension (in the fiber reinforced cement lap siding) to emphasize the base of the building is problematic.
- The Commissioners would like to see a subtle, richer, more textural base material than proposed.
 - Staff suggested increasing the ground level height, and the Commission concurred.
- Concern with the breezeway design was expressed.
 - The breezeways serve as a cut between the adjacent facades; this gesture could be stronger and more diagrammatic.
 - The cut could extend vertically to the roof to improve the massing.

Question 7: Section 7.0103(B)(4)(D)(1) - Energy Conservation: Sunshades

The applicant requested feedback on the conservation strategies proposed.

Commission Comments

- The use of sunshades is included in the energy conservation standard; however, sunshades are not proposed by the applicant.
- The Commission was agreeable to alternative energy conservation methods, such as additional insulation.
- The applicant suggested increasing the air sealing, and the Commission expressed that this may be an acceptable strategy.

Question 8: Section 9.0110(G)(2) - Alternative Buffer & Multiuse Path

Is the multi-use path acceptable in lieu of the standard buffer requirement?

Commission Comments

In lieu of a north-south street or one-half of a Type C buffer parallel to the east property line, a multiuse path is proposed. The design is anticipated to include a 5-foot transition area (from the adjacent drive aisle), a 10-foot multiuse path, and a 10-foot landscaped area. This conceptual plan was agreeable to the Commissioners.

General Commission Comments

The Commissioners had the following general feedback for the applicant's consideration as the design develops:

- Focus on crisp, clean detailing for features such as hiding downspouts and side wall penetrations.
- The stairwells could be used to enhance the design; changing the stairwell materials or color are options.
- Building 3's roof form was discussed. The applicant's updated images introduce breaks in the roof plane, which were supported.
- Building 1 steps down from three to two stories at its southeast corner. The applicant was encouraged to re-evaluate this gesture as it detracts from the overall design.
- The applicant was asked to align the east accessible parking loading area with the adjacent walkway.
- The depth of the proposed roof overhang is 2 feet. This detail is an asset and the Commission would like to see it retained.
- At least 24 square feet of storage area for outdoor items is proposed for each unit; this quantity was supported.
- A richness in plantings is encouraged.

III. Vice-chair Elections

The role and duties of the vice chair position was reviewed for the Commission prior to the vice chair election.

Commissioner Cok volunteered for the vice chair position. Commissioners Lando and Hayden seconded the motion. The Commission voted unanimously for Commissioner Cok to become vice chair.

IV. Other Commission Business

The next Design Commission meeting is scheduled for August 7, 2019 and will include one hearing and one design consult.

May 29, 2019 Design Commission Minutes

Commissioner Orth moved to approve the May 29, 2019 Design Commission minutes. The Design Commission voted unanimously to pass the minutes.

V. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 8:05 pm.

Chair

Recording Secretary

Date

Date

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