

Design Commission Meeting
Zoom
Gresham City Hall
February 2, 2022, 6:30 p.m.

I. Opening/Citizen Comment

A regular session of the Gresham Design Commission was called to order on the **2nd of February 2022** at 6:31 p.m. (VIRTUAL), located at 1333 NW Eastman Parkway, Gresham Oregon. The meeting was recorded and scribed by Carrie Osborn.

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:

Camilla Cok
Pat Lando
Matthew Sugarbaker
Mike McKeel

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT:

Rob Cook
Robert Hayden
Tom Orth

STAFF:

David Berniker, Urban Design & Planning Director
Kevin McConnell, City Attorney
Jim Wheeler, Urban Design Manager
GianPaolo Mammone, Associate Planner
John Heili, Associate Planner
Jay Higgins, Associate Transportation Planner
Carrie Osborn, Planning Technician

Chair Sugarbaker relinquish his duties to Vice Chair Cok.

Vice Chair Cok introduced staff and members of the Commission that were present.

II. Hearing Opening Statement

Vice Chair Cok reviewed the opening statement.

Public Comment:

Carol Rulla spoke with City Council regarding Parking and Traffic studies and wanted to share this information with Design Commission. Ms. Rulla wanted to raise awareness that there can be errors in these studies. She suggest that the City find a way that the public could review these studies earlier in the process.

III. Eastside Timbers Hearing(4710 SE 174th Ave)(PMA-21-00655):

Order of Procedure

Type III Conditioned Plan Map Amendment (PMA) that is conditioned on the recommending of a Type III Design Review E (DRE) for construction of a two-story, 46,700 square-foot futsal building with accessory office uses, 120 surface parking stalls, and associated site improvements with vehicular and pedestrian access from SE 174th Avenue and SW 11th Street. The proposal includes the Modification of a Future Street Plan (FSP) and a Major Variance for modification to Public Works dead-end block length standards.

- No member of the Commission needed to make any disclosure or abstain from participating or voting on the application.
- No Commissioner 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.
- COMMISSIONERS Lando, Sugarbaker, 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 as well as one non-discretionary item:

- Discretionary Item #1: Primary Internal Drives 7.0603(A)(1)(C)(9)
 - Staff recommends that the Design Commission waive the guideline and standard.
 - The Commission supported Discretionary Item #1.
- Discretionary Item #2, #3, & #4: Building Placement and Frontage & Parking Location 7.0603(A)(3) & 7.0603(A)(6)(C)(1) & (2)
 - Staff recommends that the Design Commission waive the guideline and standard.
 - The Commission supported Discretionary Item #2, #3, & #4.
- Discretionary Item #5: Parking Area Perimeter Screening 7.0603(A)(7)(C)(4)
 - Staff recommends that the Design Commission find this guideline is met with Condition of Approval #12D
 - The Commission supported Discretionary Item #5
- Discretionary Item #6: Internal Parking Area Landscaping 7.0603(A)(7)(C)(5)
 - Staff recommends that the Design Commission find this guideline is met.
 - The Commission supported Discretionary Item #6.
- Discretionary Item #7: Façade Depth 7.0603(B)(1)(C)(2)
 - Staff recommends that the Design Commission find this guideline is met.
 - The Commission supported Discretionary Item #7.
- Discretionary Item #8: Façade Articulation & Rhythm Design Elements 7.0603(B)(1)(C)(3)
 - Staff recommends that the Design Commission find this guideline is met.
 - The Commission supported Discretionary Item #8.
- Discretionary Item #9: Projection Façade Elements 7.0603(B)(1)(D)(4)
 - Staff recommends that the Design Commission find this guideline is met with Condition of Approval #17
 - The Commission supported Discretionary Item #9.
- Discretionary Item #10: Building Entry Materials 7.0603(B)(2)(C)(4)
 - Staff recommends that the Design Commission find this guideline is met.
 - The Commission supported Discretionary Item #10.
- Discretionary Item #11 & #12: Building Entry Transparency & Enhanced Entry Transparency Zone 7.0603(B)(2)(C)(7) & (B)(4)(C)(3)
 - Staff recommends that the Design Commission find this guideline is met.
 - The Commission supported Discretionary Item #11 & #12.

- Discretionary Item #13: Window Proportions 7.0603(B)(4) (C)(6)
 - Staff recommends that the Design Commission find this guideline is met.
 - The Commission supported Discretionary Item #13.
- Discretionary Item #14 & #15: Arcade Design Integration & Arcade Columns 7.0603(B)(6)(C)(1) & (C)(2)
 - Staff recommends that the Design Commission find this guideline is met.
 - The Commission supported Discretionary Item #14 & #15.
- Discretionary Item #16 & #17: Arcade Walkway Width & Arcade Environment 7.0603(B)(6)(C)(3) & (C)(4)
 - Staff recommends that the Design Commission find this guideline is met.
 - The Commission supported Discretionary Item #16 & #17.
- Non-Discretionary Item #1: Alternate Buffer 9.0110(G)(2)
 - Staff recommends that the Design Commission find this guideline is met with Condition of Approval #25
 - The Commission supported Non-Discretionary Item #1.
- Non-Discretionary Item #2: Parking Reductions 9.0853(B),(C),(E) & (G) & 10.1521(A)(2)
 - Staff recommends that the Design Commission find this guideline is met.
 - The Commission supported Non-Discretionary Item #2.
- Non-Discretionary Item #3 & #4: Future Street Plan Revisions & Type III Major Variance Provisions 9.0710 & 9.0712 & 10.1530
 - Staff recommends that the Design Commission find this guideline is met with Condition of Approval #23
 - The Commission supported Non-Discretionary Item #3 & #4.
- Condition of Approval #8 Revision: To read; With the building permit submittal, provide drawings and/or documentation demonstrating compliance with one additional item of the prescribed standards of Section 7.0603(C)(1)(D)(3) - Additional Sustainability Standards for Buildings greater than 30,000 square feet.
 - Staff recommends that the Design Commission find this standard is met with Condition of Approval #8
 - The Commission supported revision of Condition of Approval #8
- Condition of Approval #15 Revision: To read; Provide manufacture data, specifications, and/or drawing notations that demonstrate the metal wall panel thicknesses shall be no less that the thickness of 24 gage (0.025 inches).
 - Staff recommends that the Design Commission find this guideline is met with Condition of Approval #15
 - The Commission supported revision of Condition of Approval #15
- Modification of Condition of Approval #25 to read; Construction of a center turn lane on SE 174th Avenue at the driveway for left turns that is lengthened south of the driveway to allow two-stage gap acceptance turns from the driveway. Construction of the center turn lane must maintain 6 feet of shoulder within the public right of way or in an easement on the east side of SE 174th Avenue for pedestrian use or must make other accommodations on the east side of the street for ADA-compliant pedestrian travel.
 - Staff recommends that the Design Commission find this guideline is met with Condition of Approval #25
 - The Commission supported modified of Condition of Approval #25
- Revision of Condition of Approval #23 to read; Provide a recorded public easement for pedestrian and bicyclist access across the site that provides access consistent with Gresham

public park hours of operation or the Eastside Timbers Facility hours of operation, whichever is greater.

- The Commission supported revision of Condition of Approval #23

Applicant Presentation

The applicant described the proposal. Representatives included:

- Joe Leonetti, Eastside Timbers, MWA Architects
- Joanne Rimkeit, Soderstrom Architects
- Todd Mobley, Landcaster Mobley

Commission Comments

Commissioners had no comment for the applicants.

Public Testimony:

Carol Rulla provided written and public comment. The applicant's parking study used only one hour of data collection (8pm-9pm) to estimate the "peak" parking demand for the two comparison sites. There's no explanation of why data wasn't taken throughout the evening to be able to determine the true peak parking demand that Monday evening. It's entirely possible that the peak could have been earlier in the evening when combined use by restaurant patrons and futsal users was greater. Please note that the Rose City East & West restaurants both opened at 6:00pm, and weekday futsal games start at 6:30pm. Why weren't parking counts taken at least 6:30pm-9pm to determine the true peak hour that evening? Even if the parking study's use of the 8pm-9pm counts represents the actual estimate of the peak demand of the proposed facility, the parking study shows a high (usually coded "red") parking utilization of 94% (113 estimated peak demand / 120 spaces) for the proposed facility. This high parking utilization indicates that actual peak demand will often exceed the proposed 120 parking spaces, even if you don't count the existing high parking demand for users of the outdoor fields. Keep in mind that parking studies only estimate peak demand; therefore, estimated parking utilization over 90% doesn't show that there would be sufficient parking capacity to justify further reduction to the minimum parking requirements.

Rick Dwyer provided a written comment. He is in favor of the applicant but has some issues he would like addressed.

Parking 9.0800

The applicant has submitted a parking study and has requested a reduction in the number of parking spaces required for this development from 187 to 120 spaces. The parking study indicates that evenings and weekends will have a peak demand of 113 spaces. Nowhere in the study for this application has the demand of the existing soccer fields been taken into consideration even though the peak demand for the fields is also evenings and weekends. The study, and the staff report, appear to treat the futsal building as existing in a vacuum. Parking for the soccer fields will consume all available parking on weekends and evenings, leaving no available spaces for users of the futsal facility.

Neighborhood Circulation/Future Streets 9.0700

When the traffic impact analysis dated October 12, 2020 was submitted, City Transportation Planning determined it to be incomplete. The reason behind this determination was that after submittal, the developer contacted the City about a proposal to revise the site's access. The proposed change would add a second access driveway to the Centennial School District lot to the north of the site, with the aim of separating the ingress right and left turns to separate driveways. Internal circulation would

presumably be altered to connect the two lots. Assuming that this two-driveway proposal is either supplanting the original proposal in the application or if the developer wants the proposal considered as an alternative, the TIS should be updated to include it.

Pedestrian & Bicyclist Access/Connectivity A5.509, 7.0603

The staff report in condition of approval #23 indicates that a pedestrian and bicyclist access across the site provides access 24 hours per day. This does not exist currently as the pedestrian gates are padlocked. I understand that this is for security reasons which I agree with. That being said, the City should remove or modify that condition.

Public Facilities/Streets A5.400

It appears from the drawing the applicant submitted (119 Sheet 1) that the proposed center left-turn lane will begin approximately at the north end of the Centennial School lot. There are currently no sidewalks or curbs along the Centennial property. The proposed addition of the left-turn lane shifts the roadway approx. 11 feet to the east. The staff report, in condition of approval #25, states that construction of the center turn lane must maintain 6 feet of shoulder within the public right of way on the east side of SE 174th Avenue for pedestrian use or must make other accommodations on that side of the street for ADA-compliant pedestrian travel. Visiting the site, I noticed there is a utility pole and a fire hydrant near where the street will curve back to its original alignment. What will be done to protect these? At a minimum, sidewalks with curbs should be constructed along the entire length of the revised street alignment.

Applicant stated that they worked with the facilities to see when they had games scheduled and when their facilities were at full capacity. The applicant also stated that the restaurant would be providing food service to the soccer players and their families. It would not be a destination for the community to go.

Applicant stated that the peak demand for the facility is met by the supply which was measure at 94%. This is not excessive for this type of private parking.

Jay Higgins, Transportation Planner stated the city would propose to modify the conditions so that it states that public access for the pedestrian bicyclist easement for park hours or business hours, whichever is greater.

IV. Latino Network Building (312 SE 165th Ave) (DA-22-00007)

Staff gave a presentation of the proposed building and provided questions that the applicant is looking for feedback from the Design Commission.

- Exceeding maximum front and street-side setback
- Site Landscaping
- Building Massing: Building Corner
- Roof: Heat Island Reduction
- Buffering and Screening Requirements

Applicant Presentation

The applicant described the proposal. Representatives included:

- Andrea Diedrich, ZGF
- Amanda Hills, ZGF
- Tony DeFalco, Latino Network

There was consensus among the Commissioners about appreciating the project. With the design being close (as is) to an optimal solution with a successful approach to the building corner and the plaza design.

Suggestions were made by the Commissioners that the landscaped requirement could be met by adding some landscape to the plaza. This additional landscape to the plaza wouldn't have necessarily to be "soft landscaping". The design though, could start to consider the plaza as a part of the landscape and elaborate on that consideration and that potential "opportunity".

The Commissioners agreed that the building corner was well done, and that they were fine with what the design showed. No changes were needed

There was consensus among the Commissioners that the proposed width of the buffer (5 feet) was of concern.

The Commissioners did not offer a specific minimum width as a guideline/solution.

The Commissioners thought that the optimal solution would have a buffer width between 5 and 15 feet, would have enough space for mature trees to grow (2 story high), it would clearly show how it would/could screen and protect the neighbors, and essentially, it would meet the intent of the code.

"Softening" the north façade (by design, material, or vegetation) above the height of the proposed wall might help in creating a less imposing, heavy edge facing the residential neighbors to the north.

V. Other Commission Business

July 15, 2020, September 16, 2020 and April 7, 2021 Design Commission

Commissioner Cok moved to approve the Design Commission Minutes. Commissioner McKeel seconded the motion. The motion passed.

Staff informed Commission that on the next meeting February 16, 2022, there will be the Non-Discretionary Item Review and Discussion and

VI. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 9:34 pm.