

**Design Commission Meeting
Oregon Trail Conference Room
Gresham City Hall
December 20, 2017, 6:30 p.m.**

I. Opening/Citizen Comment

A regular session of the Gresham Design Commission was called to order on the 20 of December, 2017 at 6:30 p.m. in the Oregon Trail Conference Room of Gresham City Hall, located at 1333 NW Eastman Parkway, Gresham Oregon. The meeting was recorded and scribed by Amanda Lunsford.

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:

Rob Cook
Robert Hayden
Pat Lando
Mike McKeel
Tom Orth

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT:

Bill Bailey
Camila Cok

COUNCILOR PRESENT:

Kirk French

COUNCILOR ABSENT:

David Widmark

STAFF:

Amanda Lunsford, Urban Design & Planning
GianPaolo Mammone, Urban Design & Planning
Mary Phillips, 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. Rick's Custom Fencing Discussion: 17855 NE Halsey St.

The applicant provided sample materials for the stone siding. The applicant discussed the benefit of using the thinner veneer to help prevent cracking due to the high east winds.

The Commission and applicant discussed the application of the stone, concerns with the cement backing, and warranty of the stone.

The Commission agreed to the applicant's request to use the new stone material with the following conditions:

1. Ensure there is an installer's certification or warranty on the material.

2. The stone may not create a 'shelf' overhang at the finished floor line, and should extend below grade as indicated in the details submitted to the Commission.
3. The thin stone assembly will be as indicated in the details presented at this meeting, and as consistent with the manufacturer's standard details, with:
 - a. Thin stone face layer, on
 - b. Mortar setting bed, on
 - c. Scratch cost cement layer, on
 - d. Metal lath, secured to
 - e. 2x wood furring, on
 - f. Plywood sheathing, on
 - g. Pre-manufactured steel building structural system.
4. The finished face of the stone will be proud of the face of stucco by +/-3 1/8" as indicated in the details presented.

III. Yamhill Firs Discussion: 19025 SE Yamhill St.

General Comments.

- Overall the Commission stated that the scope of the issues is major, that there are a lot of omissions of big items, and there is a significant combined effect from the changes.
- The Design Commission directed the applicants not to proceed with any work on the issues discussed or other construction not on the approved plans without a review and approval from the Design Commission.

CMU on the Trash Enclosure: The plain CMU used on the trash enclosure did not include the integral color matching the building as shown on the approved building permit plans, and as required by the Design Review approval. The applicant stated that they would like to install systems on the outside of the CMU to meet the requirement. The first option they presented is to use primer and paint to make it match the building. The second option would be to use a stucco cement wash with a color application. The applicant stated that they would prefer to go with the second option.

- The Commission felt that although the stucco would have a better visual appearance, the appoint option would be easier to maintain as the stucco option would get "beat up" and have divots, etc. (The commissioners noted that this is why the integral color requirement is here.)

Walk Paving Material. Staff noted that the walkway paving material was required to be both pervious to meet stormwater requirements and include recycled content. The approved pavers were requested to be changed to permeable concrete with recycled content, however the recycled content proposed was much less that that required by the code. The applicant indicated that this concrete has already been poured. The applicant stated that using recycled

materials in the base rock would clog up any water running through and they opted not to put any recycled material in the base rock (which the code required).

- The Commission directed that since the concrete did not fully meet the sustainability requirements, any proposal to address this issue should include enhancing the project's sustainability elsewhere on site. Commission directed the applicant to look at the other sustainability options outlined in the code.

Window Trim. The applicant discussed with the Commission their concerns with maintenance and moisture penetration on the approved window trim. The applicant asked the Commission to remove this requirement from the design.

- The Commission agreed that the stacked trim would have water issues.
- The Commission said that the applicant's proposal to leave out the deeper trim was not compatible with the approved design and did not meet the requirements for facade depth.
- The commission directed that any alternative should maintain a similar profile to the approved trim, and that an alternative trim design should address both the depth and width of trim (i.e. it should be 6-by where 6-inch trim was shown on the approved plans, rather than 4-by as mentioned by the applicant. A 2-by-6 cedar board was recommended.) The trim proposed should also be in locations similar to what was approved with the Design Review.

Window Mullions. The windows for the entire complex were installed as white vinyl (rather than bronze) without the divided light mullions that were shown on the design review elevations and the approved building permit plans. The applicant proposed glue-on removable grids be placed on the existing installed windows to create the appearance of mullions. The applicant also indicated that replacing all the windows would not be financially feasible for the project and could jeopardize its funding sources.

- The Commission asked for clarification of the size discrepancies of the window openings on the approved plans and what was built. Staff indicated the window openings were previously discussed and approved with the Design Commission, however updated building permit plans have not been submitted by the applicants.
- The Commissioners feedback on the proposed glue-on window grid system included:
 - The tack-on grids would cause a significant maintenance issue with durability between the grids and the windows as well as issues with people pulling the grids off, or the grids coming partially off due to weathering.
 - The Commission indicated that the code specifically prohibits add-on or "faux" architectural elements, which is exactly what the proposed glue-on mullions would be. One commissioner indicated that, due to this, the glue on system was a "non-starter."
 - The Commission was in consensus that the glue on grid system was not feasible.
 - Alternatives to consider:

- The Commission asked if the window panes, but not the frames could be replaced, the applicant indicated they did a cost estimate for this that was prohibitive to them.
- The applicant could look at several options that replace some but not all of the installed windows with a true grid window. This should be looked at carefully, and might include just the larger windows on the upper facades, just the south and west windows, or just the south and west façade windows on only the south building, or some similar proposal where it is appropriate.
- The applicant could also look at an alternate way to recess the windows, rather than using mullions.
- It could also be worth seeing alternative elevation proposals showing mullions compared to no mullions in combination with the proposed trim updates.
- Manufactures representatives to discuss alternative mullion options were recommended, or at least a cut sheet should be provided.
- In any alternative the corner of the south and west facades of the south building need to be consistent, with the treatment wrapping that building corner.

Direction. The Commission directed the applicant to return with a proposal addressing all the items together in a holistic manor (and not to proceed with the work on site prior to this). The Commission indicated they needed more information to review the alternatives and requested whatever proposal is brought back to commission should include full elevations and real samples. The Commission recommended the applicants work with Staff to put together an updated proposal with detailed drawings.

IV. Adjourn

Other Commission Business

The meeting adjourned at 8:45 p.m.



 Chair



 Recording Secretary

2/7/18

 Date

2/8/18

 Date

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