

**Design Commission Meeting
City Council Chambers
December 4, 2019, 6:30 p.m.**

I. Opening/Citizen Comment

A regular session of the Gresham Design Commission was called to order on the 4 of December, 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
Al Hagg, Department of Environmental Services
John Heili, Urban Design & Planning
Kevin McConnell, City Attorney’s Office
Noah Myhrum, Urban Design & Planning
Jamie Thomes, Urban Design & Planning
Jim Wheeler, 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. Stark Street Apartments Hearing: Southeast corner of SE 217th Avenue and SE Stark Street.

Order of Procedure

Application DRE/FSP 19-26000322 is an application for Design Review for the construction of a multifamily development with 82 units in four buildings, associated parking, site improvements, and a Type II Future Street Plan.

- 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 outside of staff concerning the subject of the hearing.
- Chair Cook and Commissioners McKeel, Sugarbaker, 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:

- 7.0103(A)(1)(c)(1) and 7.0103(A)(1)(d)(1)(a)(ii) - Building Orientation
- 7.0103(A)(3)(c)(2) and 7.0103(A)(3)(d)(2) - Outdoor Common Areas
- 7.0103(A)(4)(c)(3) and 7.0103(A)(4)(d)(3) - Children's Play Area
- 7.0103(A)(5)(c)(6) and 7.0103(A)(5)(d)(6) - Yard Setback and Landscaping Trees
- 7.0103(A)(5)(c)(11) and 7.0103(A)(5)(d)(11) - Plant Sizes
- 7.0103(B)(1)(c)(1) and 7.0103(B)(1)(d)(1) - Long, Monotonous, Uninterrupted Walls
- 7.0103(B)(1)(c)(3) and 7.0103(B)(1)(d)(3) - Building Base
- 7.0103(B)(1)(c)(4) and 7.0103(B)(1)(d)(4)(b) - Storage
- 7.0103(B)(2)(c)(1) and 7.0103(B)(2)(d)(1) - Street Facing Elevations
- 7.0103(B)(2)(c)(2) and 7.0103(B)(2)(d)(2) - Mechanical Equipment
- 7.0103(B)(2)(c)(4) and 7.0103(B)(2)(d)(4) - Street Facing Façade Windows
- 7.0103(B)(2)(c)(5) and 7.0103(B)(2)(d)(5) - Prohibition of Blank, Windowless Walls
- 7.0103(B)(3)(c)(3) and 7.0103(B)(3)(d)(3) - Entrance Elements
- 7.0103(B)(3)(c)(5) and 7.0103(B)(3)(d)(5) - Weather Protection
- 7.0103(B)(4)(c)(1) and 7.0103(B)(4)(d)(1) - Energy Efficiency

The Commission asked staff about ADA requirements through the breezeways. Staff noted that any ADA requirement would be per the Building Code.

Applicant Presentation

The applicant described the proposal. Representatives included:

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

The applicant outlined multiple conditions of approval for discussion, including:

- Condition of Approval #6a that requires 50 percent of units facing a common area must have a living room or kitchen window overlooking the area.
- Condition of Approval #6b, specifically an exception to the requirement so that the one-bedroom units can provide 17 square feet of storage rather than the 24 square feet required by Code.
- Condition of Approval #7a concerning a proposed berm that buffers the play area from the parking lot.
- Condition of Approval #7h that requires a hard-surfaced path from the breezeways of Building 3 to the multiuse path.
- Condition of Approval #5a, specifically a request that play area boulders be included as locally sourced materials.

Commission Comments

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

7.0103(A)(3)(c)(2) and 7.0103(A)(3)(d)(2) - Outdoor Common Areas

- The Commission was supportive of the proposal and did not feel a redesign was necessary.
- The Commission and applicant discussed switching a street facing entry to another location within the unit in order to create a visual connection to the common area; however, this would only be feasible with perhaps one unit, and it was noted that grading would impact the switch and that landscaping would need to be adjusted, so it was agreed that this was not a viable solution.

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

- The Commission was supportive of the updated landscape plan as presented by the applicant that incorporated a berm to enclose the children's play area.
- The applicant also queried the Commission as to the use of natural play boulders within the children's play area and if these boulders could be considered as locally sourced materials as required by the Code. The Commission was agreeable to the use of boulders and their consideration of locally sourced materials as proposed.

7.0103(A)(5)(c)(11) and 7.0103(A)(5)(d)(11) - Plant Sizes

- The Commission was generally agreeable to the proposed height of the plant materials. However, for the Douglas Fir and Hogan Cedar, it would be preferable to plant the trees at 8 feet in height rather than the proposed 6 feet.
 - The applicant explained that the trees and sizes were selected to achieve a staggered, natural appearance. Further, the applicant argued that obtaining plants at an 8-foot height is difficult.

7.0103(B)(1)(c)(1) and 7.0103(B)(1)(d)(1) - Long, Monotonous, Uninterrupted Walls

- The Design Commission was favorable to the approach as outlined by the applicant where downspout reveals would occur where gables meet and would be painted to match the building exterior.

7.0103(B)(1)(c)(4) and 7.0103(B)(1)(d)(4)(b) - Storage

- The Commission was supportive of the storage areas as proposed by the applicant, although the Commission urged the applicant to meet the Code requirement for storage to the greatest extent possible.

7.0103(B)(2)(c)(2) and 7.0103(B)(2)(d)(2) - Mechanical Equipment

- The Commission and applicant discussed the six vents located on the façade facing SE Stark Street.
 - The applicant confirmed that the six vents must be located facing SE Stark Street.
 - The Commission suggested the applicant group the vents where possible as creating one object (a group) is preferable to creating six individual objects, as proposed.

Soffit Material

- The applicant confirmed that the soffit material will be a painted hardy panel that will match the façade on which it is located.
 - It was noted that the applicant had not yet discussed all soffits, and that the color utilized will likely be white.

Trash Enclosure Height

- Condition of Approval #4c and the requirement for a 15-foot high trash enclosure was discussed.
 - The requirement is not within the purview of the Design Commission. Consequently, the Commission urged the applicant to work with staff to determine a solution if a 15-foot height could not be provided.

- Staff noted a deviation from the 15-foot requirement would require a Type II planning review.

7.0103(A)(1)(d)(2) - Pedestrian Circulation

- The requirement to incorporate a hard surfaced, minimum 5-foot wide walkway from each breezeway of Building 3 to the multiuse path, noted as Condition of Approval #7h, was discussed.
 - The applicant argued that the path does not promote a feeling of safety with its transition from a public space to individual private spaces.
 - Staff explained that the path provides an opportunity to build future connections.
 - Staff and the Commission discussed surrounding properties and how those properties could redevelop and possibly utilize such connections.
 - Any adjacent property that would redevelop would be subject to the same requirements as the current proposal.
 - Further, the path replaced a required future street connection.
 - The Commission discussed the requirement to connect the path to the breezeways, including the possible success, or lack thereof, of the connection.
 - Four of the five Commissioners were supportive of connecting the multiuse path to the Building 3 breezeways to promote security as well as activate the path.

Public Comment

No person wished to speak in favor of or in opposition to the proposal.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommended approval with conditions of the Type III Design Review E for the construction of a multifamily development with 82 units in four buildings, associated parking, site improvements, and a Type II Future Street Plan with the following modifications to the conditions of approval:

- Strike Condition of Approval #6a.
- Strike Condition of Approval #6b.
- Modify Condition of Approval #6d to state: Submit specification sheets for each window type demonstrating a minimum of U-0.26 insulation value.
- Modify Condition of Approval #6e to state: Submit revised elevations demonstrating that the color of the downspouts and downspout channels located at the roof valleys in the center of building facades match the building's window panels and trim. Downspouts and downspout channels in all other locations shall match the color of the adjacent siding

- Modify Condition of Approval #8 to state: Provide a certification from the insulation installer verifying that R-21 insulation is provided at the walls and R-60 insulation is provided at the roof.
- Add a condition of approval to state: Submit revised elevations and details demonstrating that where feasible vents penetrating through the exterior walls are ganged and further complement the façade design. The design is subject to Manager approval.

Motion

The Commission closed the hearing.

Commissioner Cok moved that the Commission approve application number DRE/FSP 19-26000322 based on the findings, conclusions, and recommendations stated in the November 27, 2019 Staff Report with the following modifications and/or additions:

- Strike Condition of Approval #6a.
- Strike Condition of Approval #6b.
- Modify Condition of Approval #6d to state: Submit specification sheets for each window type demonstrating a minimum of U-0.26 insulation value.
- Modify Condition of Approval #6e to state: Submit revised elevations demonstrating that the color of the downspouts and downspout channels located at the roof valleys in the center of building facades match the building’s window panels and trim. Downspouts and downspout channels in all other locations shall match the color of the adjacent siding
- Modify Condition of Approval #8 to state: Provide a certification from the insulation installer verifying that R-21 insulation is provided at the walls and R-60 insulation is provided at the roof.
- Add a condition of approval to state: Submit revised elevations and details demonstrating that where feasible vents penetrating through the exterior walls are ganged and further complement the façade design. 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. Department of Human Services Facility ODCC: 22200 SE Stark St, and 603, 617-631, and 639-645 SE 223rd Ave.

Project Presentations

The applicant and staff provided presentations for the project, which is for a three-story, approximately 96,000 square-foot office building. Applicant representatives included:

- Mandy Butler, TVA Architects
- Nick Williams, TVA Architects

Design Commission and Applicant Discussion

Question 1: Sections 7.0603(A)(1)(D)(9) and 7.0603(A)(2)(D)(2)(A-J) - Parking Area Layout

The proposal has the parking lot broken down into a series of organized rows with landscape buffers dividing each parking module. A primary drive links main vehicle entry points to the east and north of the lot, and loops between the parking area and the building. The primary drives are 26 feet wide to accommodate fire apparatus and include a 5-foot sidewalk and a 5-foot amenity zone as prescribed by the standard. Further, the applicant also utilizes 90-degree parking or parallel parking along primary drives.

The applicant queried the Commission as to whether modifications to the parking along primary drives will be necessary. Staff explained that the proposal includes 26 percent site landscape coverage where 15 percent is the standard, and 25 percent parking area landscape coverage where 15 percent is the standard. The proposal includes 286 parking stalls where the required minimum parking is 277 stalls, including the Code allowed 10 percent reduction. The applicant has noted that the program requires 282 stalls at minimum. Of the 286 stalls provided, 103 are proposed compact where up to 143 spaces (or 50 percent of the total) is the maximum allowed by Code.

Commission Comments

- In general, the Commission was supportive of the wider drive aisles and overall parking layout as proposed. The Commissioners recognized the Code requirement that limits parking along primary drives to parallel or angled configurations was geared toward uses that experience higher parking turnover than would be expected for this facility.
- The applicant was encouraged to consider increasing the number of compact spaces or the use of angled parking to gain additional parking.
- The applicant was also encouraged to consider that DHS employees may utilize public transportation rather than individual vehicles, which could impact the number of parking stalls that would be necessary.
 - Further, the applicant could verify if there is a carpool incentive program to encourage carpooling.
- The applicant could also distinguish and identify areas for certain types of parking, such as those specific to staff and clients.

Question 2: Sections 7.0603(A)(3)(D)(1) & (3) and 7.0603(A)(5)(D)(1) - Building Frontage

The applicant states the building façade occupies approximately 51 percent of the site frontage on the primary street frontage. A publicly accessible open space (12 percent) has been provided to satisfy building frontage criteria and contribute toward prominent entry criteria.

SE Stark Street is a secondary frontage and serves as the second entrance to the development. Parking along this edge has been set back a minimum of 10 feet with appropriate landscaping and sidewalk amenities.

The proposal includes 63 percent of overall frontage length occupied by building including 12 percent public plaza frontage; however, the building is beyond the 10-foot maximum setback due to an existing 15-foot utility easement. The setback zone is proposed to be developed with a stormwater treatment element featuring weir-walls and plantings; consequently, the overall building setback from the backside of the public sidewalk, which will project 4 feet into the property, will be 9 feet due to curb and striping locations along SE 223rd Avenue that will not change. An alternate setback layout would reduce the public planter strip width from 8 feet to a minimum of 5 feet and increase the landscape separation between building and edge of sidewalk to a maximum of 12 feet. Additionally, staff notes the proposed building entry façade is 91 feet back from the front yard property line where 40 feet is the maximum prescribed by the standard. The plaza is proposed to be developed with seating, lighting, paving, landscaping, and a sustainable element as prescribed by the standard.

Parking and vehicular circulation occupy 27 percent of the primary SE 223rd Avenue frontage where 30 percent is the maximum allowed by the standard, but parking and vehicular circulation occupy 67 percent of the SE Stark Street frontage in violation of this same standard. The proposal includes landscaping screening along this edge in support of the standard and offers an improvement over current pedestrian conditions along the SE Stark Street frontage.

Commission Comments

- The Commission noted that the setback issue as outlined was not under the purview of the Design Commission.
- In consideration of the building use and special needs of the occupants, the Commission was supportive of the building layout and placement with regard to its entry setback, but encouraged the applicant to explore options for making the entry facade and the entry plaza more prominent and visible from the NE 223rd Avenue frontage.
- The Commission was supportive of the use of perforated panels and glazing along SE 223rd Avenue as the element provides some connection to the pedestrian environment. However, the Commission noted that, in general, the SE 223rd Avenue facing façade has a distinct lack of pedestrian-scale elements, which detracts from the overall façade.
 - The public to private transition should utilize pedestrian-scale elements, such as wayfinding to entries.

- Incorporating color can make the experience interesting, safe, and work to reassure any client or staff that they are headed in the correct direction for the building entry.
- The applicant was encouraged to consider an element that will connect to the pedestrian sidewalk area, such as a canopy.
- Walking from public transportation is an issue as the design suggests that staff and client access will only occur from the parking lot.
- The Commission supported the design of the proposed buffer along SE 223rd Avenue and stated that the buffer should not be reduced.
- The Commission encouraged the applicant to consider methods that would better extend the building entry to SE 223rd Avenue.

Question 3: Sections 7.0603(A)(8)(D)(1), 7.0603(B)(2)(D)(1), 7.0603(B)(3)(D)(3), and 7.0603(B)(4)(d)(3a) - Building Entry, Prominent Façade, and TransparencyThe proposal notes that the south lot line abuts multifamily residential development, while the north abuts the backside of existing (and likely future) commercial development. The proposal also states that the scale and use of the primary entry to the south is more compatible with the residential development, allows for pleasant solar exposure, and responds to the obvious primary entry point for vehicles and associated accessible parking. A public plaza has also been incorporated to further enhance the location of the primary entry. Due to the proximity of the development to a major intersection, primary vehicle entry is located at the far south end of the site. A vehicular driveway located at the north edge of the property would be limited to right turn in and out only where the proposed entry drive location would serve both right and left turn vehicular circulation.

Staff noted for Design Commission consideration that a Type-C screening buffer is required along the south property line while only parking lot screening is required along the north property line.

The applicant requested feedback regarding if this building entry location design criteria would be better addressed if the pedestrian entry were moved to a location along the building frontage closer to the north portion of the site nearer the transit stops and pedestrian crossings at the intersection of SE 223rd Avenue and SE Stark Street versus the current entry location on the south side of the building where it is nearer the adjacent residential use and away from the backside of the corner market on the north parcel, but is over 200 feet further south.

The applicant's narrative addressing these Code criteria states that due to the unique program requirements for the government tenant, one common public entry and lobby is required to serve two primary programs. Factors for the entry location include fit with surrounding development, primary vehicle entry, and safety of staff. Child Welfare services are operated out of this building, and it is critical to staff safety, and the safety of children, to have a distinctly separate entry point from biological parents. The staff entry to the north serves foster parents as well, and the interior parking needs segregation from the primary entry to ensure proper

security. The primary building entry features a two-story lobby with full height glass facing south, and a two-story glass opening facing SE 223rd Avenue. Doors open facing both east and west to accommodate foot traffic from SE 223rd Avenue as well as users coming from the parking lot. A public plaza has been provided and blends with an expanded, landscaped area directly in front of the primary entry. This area features a stormwater swale, landscape walls, and a bridge element to connect the series of sidewalks with the primary entry.

All active spaces that do not present security or privacy issues have been designed with generous glazing. The most active space without privacy or security issues is the waiting and intake facilities facing the entry and the southeast corner of the building.

Staff noted there are areas where the entry design deviates from the standards related to building entry prominence and transparency. Specifically, the proposal does not meet the standard for establishing a prominent entry façade feature and does not meet prescribed percentage and width of transparency along the entry facade with drawings demonstrating 14-foot-wide glazing and 55 percent coverage where 40 feet wide and 60 percent coverage are the standards.

Commission Comments

- The Commission supported the proposed entry location.
- The Commission noted, however, that the entry design lacks strong design elements that are incorporated on other portions of the building.
 - The entry design could be adjusted so that the entry has more prominence and perhaps additional transparency.
 - The Commission suggested that the applicant could consider bridging the design elements that are occurring at other portions of the building to the entry design, or creating an entry design that is separate from the other design elements of the building, thus creating another individual design element that will emphasize the space as a separate entity.
- The applicant and Commission discussed relocating the TriMet stop on the west side of the southbound lane of SE 223rd Avenue closer to the building entrance.

Question 4: Sections 7.0603(B)(1)(D)(1), 7.0603(B)(1)(D)(2-3), 7.0603(B)(1)(D)(4), and 7.0603(B)(1)(D)(6) - Building Rhythm and Façade Articulation

The applicant's narrative and drawings demonstrate articulating elements on Level 2 and 3, and the narrative states:

At ground plane, the glazing wall steps back a total of 42 inches from the overhead projection, with full-height glazing for approximately 60 percent of the ground floor facade. To help activate the façade at the interior parking or northeast corner, a perforated metal panel pattern will animate this opaque element and allow light to filter through it for a back-glow effect at night. Due to existing easement on the SE 223rd Avenue frontage, the building sets back from the street edge beyond the right of way

requirement established by the City. In addition to arterial standard planting strips and sidewalks, an additional landscape zone to soften the building edge has been provided. This landscape strip features a rhythm of landscape walls, a stormwater swale, trees, and layered plantings including a continued hedge row at the north end screening the parking area and garage entry.

Staff noted that the proposal includes a 10-foot-high ground floor ceiling with a step up to an 11-foot soffit adjacent to the perimeter glazing where the standard prescribes 12-foot ceilings for ground level spaces. Additionally, the repeating façade articulation elements that would satisfy the prescribed standards for projection depth and spacing are present on mostly portions of the Level 2 and Level 3 facades. The applicant requests Design Commission input on the ground level street facing façade particularly at the northeast corner where 64 feet of north-facing perforated metal panels are proposed to wrap the corner at the interior parking area and extend 87 feet further, or approximately 43 percent, along the street facing façade.

Commission Comments

- A canopy that extends toward the street as well as a change of material that would wrap to the SE 223rd Avenue façade could work to better connect the façade to the pedestrian experience.
- The Commission was supportive of the use of metal panels and suggested the applicant consider additional treatment such as color to animate this portion of the façade.
- Additionally, the Commission encouraged the applicant to explore other façade finishes, such as wood or other pedestrian-friendly materials, to enliven the pedestrian experience along this long street facing façade.
- The Commission was generally supportive of the proposed ceiling height of the ground floor as it is proportional to the overall design.

Question 5: Section 7.0603(B)(8)(D)(1) - Primary Materials

The applicant requests the use of a fiber cementitious panel, which under the Corridor Design Standards is classified as a secondary material, on areas of the building facades in excess of the 35 percent coverage prescribed by the Code. The applicant has provided material samples and product data that demonstrate the proposed Equitone panel product exceeds traditional fiber panel in its density, graffiti resistance, color-fastness, and general durability. The product is through colored and does not require painting, meaning damage to the product will not expose raw, unfinished material. An anti-graffiti coating is available; however, very little of the product is being proposed at the ground floor. This product has a higher density than medium density fiber board (111.8 lb/ft³ vs. 83 lb/ft³), and less water absorption (14.5 percent vs 36 percent) per ASTM C1185. The product is installed with exposed prefinished fasteners to match panel finish.

The applicant asks if the Design Commission would support the use of this material on facades in excess of the prescribed 35 percent.

Commission Comments

- The Commission was supportive of the use of the proposed Equitone through-color, fiber cementitious panel with exposed fasteners as an acceptable alternate primary material and would be allowed to exceed the 35 percent maximum façade coverage prescribed by the standard.

IV. Other Commission Business

Staff Check-in

Staff reviewed the Design Commission schedule and upcoming meetings. The December 18 meeting will include two Optional Design Commission Consults: the first for Albertina Kerr, and the second for a Holiday Inn Express. The January 1, 2020 meeting has been canceled, and there is a possible Optional Design Commission Consult scheduled for January 15 as well as the continuation of the Development Code and Process Updates discussion.

November 20, 2019 Design Commission Minutes

Commissioner McKeel moved to approve the November 20, 2019 Design Commission minutes. Commissioner Cok seconded the motion. The motion passed.

V. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 9:29 pm.

Chair

Recording Secretary

Date

Date

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