

I. Opening/Citizen Comment

A regular session of the Gresham Design Commission was called to order on the 2 of May, 2018 at 6:34 pm in Gresham City Council Chambers, located at 1333 NW Eastman Parkway, Gresham Oregon. The hearing was recorded and scribed by Jamie Thomes.

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Camilla Cok
Rob Cook
Robert Hayden
Tom Orth

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: Bill Bailey
Pat Lando
Mike McKeel

CITY COUNCIL LIAISON PRESENT: Kirk French
David Widmark

STAFF: David Berniker, Urban Design & Planning
Adam DeWolfe, Urban Design & Planning
GianPaolo Mammone, Urban Design & Planning
David Ross, City Attorney's Office
Jamie Thomes, 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. Good Samaritan Skilled Care Center Continued Hearing: 3457 NE Division St.

Order of Procedure

Application DRE/LL/SUR/TR/VAR 17-26000242 is an application for Design Review for the proposed construction of a 26,265 square-foot building expansion to the existing 30,463 square-foot Good Samaritan skilled care facility. The proposal also includes modifications and improvements to the existing/associated parking area and landscaping as well as a lot line adjustment.

- 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, such as newspaper articles, outside of staff concerning the subject of the hearing.
- Chair Cook and Commissioners Cok, Hayden and Orth had visited the site.
- No person wished to object to the jurisdiction of the Commission to hear the matter.

Project Presentations

Staff presented an overview of the project to the Commission as well as outlined the discretionary review items.

Discussion items included clarification of various drawings displayed by staff during the presentation. In general, the Commission expressed frustration that the drawings provided did not seem to be final versions.

The applicant also provided a presentation for the Commission. Applicant representatives included:

- Joe Zody, FFA Architecture & Interiors
- Dena Muraski, Good Samaritan Society

The Commission was concerned that the drawings initially provided differed from what was provided by the applicant during the hearing. It is difficult to guarantee that what is approved by the Commission will be the final built result.

Public Comment

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

Motion

The Commission closed the hearing.

Commissioner Orth moved that the Commission approve application number DRE/LL/SUR/TR/VAR 17-26000242 based on the findings, conclusions and recommendations stated in the February 28, 2018 Staff Report with the following modifications and/or additions:

- Strike Condition of Approval #32a.
- Strike Condition of Approval #32b.
- Strike Condition of Approval #32c.
- Strike Condition of Approval #41.

- Strike Condition of Approval #42.
- Strike Condition of Approval #43.

Commissioner Hayden seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Camilla Cok	Yes
Rob Cook	Yes
Bill Bailey	Absent
Robert Hayden	Yes
Pat Lando	Absent
Mike McKeel	Absent
Tom Orth	Yes

IV. Archibald Grove Apartments ODCC: 404 SE 202nd Ave. and R753200010

The applicant and staff presented an overview of the proposal to the Design Commission as well as provided questions for Commission feedback. The proposal is for a 37-unit apartment complex consisting of two buildings, two- and three-stories, of wood frame construction on conventional slab grade foundations. The development will provide onsite parking, garbage and recycling collection, bike parking, and outdoor community and playground areas.

Applicant representatives included:

- Diana Moosman, MWA Architects
- Kurt Martig, Lango Hansen Landscape Architects

Applicant Questions and Design Commission Comments

7.0103(B)(3)(d)(5) - Entry Weather Protection

The Commission was generally in favor of the canopies of the street facing entries extending into the front setback as proposed but cautioned the applicant not to allow the canopy to exceed 4 feet. The canopies will complement the overall design of the building.

The Design Commission was not supportive of the use of recessed entries as a method to meet the entry weather protection requirement.

7.0103(B)(1)(d)(4)(b) - Individual Unit Storage

The Commission preferred to have individual unit storage located within the interior of the units rather than outside. Further, the storage space should be at least 24 square feet in size to accommodate larger items such as recreational equipment. The Commission agreed with staff's suggestion to locate the storage areas near the unit entries.

The Commission also urged the applicant to consider possible safety issues that could occur should the storage units be located within areas that also include mechanical equipment such as water heaters. Heavy storage items that fall on such equipment could prove hazardous.

7.0103(B)(2)(D)(3) - Window Reveal

The applicant proposed a window reveal that is less than 1-inch, which will create a flush appearance between the windows and façade. It was noted that the minimum reveal requirement is 2 inches.

The Commission felt that using alternative façade materials that will support the contemporary design of the building by creating contrast and emphasizing the strong design concepts could mitigate the lack of window reveal. Whatever is proposed must be interesting, high quality and compelling. While the Commission felt that the proposed massing of the building was successful, the applicant was cautioned that relentless blank walls should be avoided; use of good materiality would help to mitigate that effect. Examples discussed included projecting window trim or utilizing a flush reveal with a contrasting deep reveal.

The Commission also urged the applicant to consider colors other than white or almond for the window trim that will complement the contemporary design of the building.

The applicant also proposed to exceed the minimum 2-inch window reveal requirement for the corner windows. The Commission was supportive of the treatment of the corner windows and recommended the applicant utilize a smooth grain post at each corner window rather than a rough grain; the smooth grain will work well with the contemporary design.

The Commission also responded to several questions raised by staff relating to the fenestration design, specifically the required minimum 25 percent glazing/window area on street-facing facades and the larger blank wall areas at the east and west ends of the south façade of Building C. Remarks included:

- In terms of window percentage, the Commission encouraged the applicant to meet the 25 percent standard if possible, and if not to come as close as possible to 25 percent.
- If the applicant provides cohesive, high-quality design with attention to materiality and detailing for the building facades, the Commission felt that a modest shortfall in the window area coverage would be a relatively minor detail.
- With regard to the larger blank wall areas on the south façade of Building C, the Commission felt that these areas were not necessarily problematic and that this could work with the relatively simple and overall modern design.
 - The Commission felt that the windowless areas may actually help to make the façade design somewhat unique and less like a typical apartment building.

7.0103(B)(3) - Sense of Entry

The Commission deferred to the applicant to appropriately address the design of the street-facing entry areas in their final plans, including the transition from public to private space, which would include design features both on the ground plane and the building façade.

It was noted that landscaping (which had not yet been designed in detail) would be an important component of meeting the entry area design requirements.

7.0103(A)(1)(d)(1)(a) - Building Orientation

The applicant proposed to have the main entry of the ground-floor unit at the west end of Building D face south and open onto a corridor between Buildings D and C instead of onto SE 202nd Avenue. This deviates from the Code, which requires that all ground-floor units facing the street have a main entry opening directly toward the street.

The Commission was generally supportive of the treatment of the ground-floor entries if the west end of the corridor between Buildings D and C is enhanced with design features that highlight it as a prominent entry into the site from SE 202nd Avenue. For instance, an entry cue such as a canopy could be utilized.

General

General comments from the Commission included:

- Show all register vents on all elevations.
- The pop of color proposed was generally well received.

V. Douglas Grove Apartments ODCC: 462 SE 202nd Ave., R753201890, R753201920 and R753201860

The applicant and staff presented an overview of the proposal to the Design Commission as well as provided questions for Commission feedback. The proposal is for a 25-unit apartment complex consisting of two buildings, two- and three-stories, of wood frame construction on conventional slab grade foundations. The development will provide onsite parking, garbage and recycling collection, bike parking, and outdoor community and playground areas.

Applicant representatives included:

- Diana Moosman, MWA Architects
- Kurt Martig, Lango Hansen Landscape Architects
- Bill Lanning, MWA Architects

Applicant Questions and Design Commission Comments

7.0103(B)(3)(d)(5) - Entry Weather Protection

The Commission was supportive of entry awnings that project into the front yard setback at NE Glisan Street. The Commissioners preferred a maximum awning depth of 4 feet and did not support the use of recessed entries.

7.0103(B)(1)(d)(4)(b) - Individual Unit Storage

The Commission discussed the size and location of the proposed storage facilities and provided the following feedback:

- The Commissioners were supportive of in-unit storage areas.

- The Commissioners expressed safety concerns about storage areas and water heaters being collocated.
- The Commission recommended that the applicant provide the full 24 square feet of storage space specified by the standard.

7.0103(B)(2)(D)(3) - Window Reveal and 7.0103(B)(2)(D)(4) - Façade Composition

The Commission endorsed flexibility in the percentage of transparency proposed for the west façade of Building B, acknowledging that it is located approximately 107 feet from NE 202nd Avenue.

Based on the applicant's presentation, the window reveal standard is proposed to be met at corner windows and on the horizontally-oriented sets of windows on Building A. The Commission was supportive of the corner window design including the detail of wrapping fiber cement around the corner post.

The Commission discussed the materiality and transparency of the proposal. The Commission generally endorsed the proposal's simple and modern aesthetic; however, the Commission emphasized that use of high quality materials and creative construction details will be particularly important if the proposal contains blank wall areas and varies from the window reveal standard.

7.0103(A)(1)(d)(4)(c) - Transitions and Compatibility between Multi-Family Developments and LDR-5, 7.0103(A)(1)(d)(4)(a) Transitions and Compatibility between Multi-Family Developments and LDR-5, and 7.0103(A)(1)(D)(1)(a)(ii) Building Orientation

The Commission was comfortable with the proposed site plan, specifically nonconformity with standards for:

- Building frontage on NE 202nd Avenue;
- The maximum number of units contained in a building, any portion of which is within 50 feet of the LDR-5 district; and
- The minimum distance between proposed buildings.

The Commission was supportive of developing a creative and engaging open space along NE 202nd Avenue and noted that landscaping will be an important element to creating a street edge.

Additional Items

- The Commission stated that it will evaluate an alternative buffer plan, per the City of Gresham Development Code Section 9.0110(G)(2).
- The second and third level breezeway landings are proud of an adjacent façade in two locations along NE Glisan Street. The Commission commented that this distracts from the design intent and expressed a preference that landings do not project beyond any adjacent façade.

VI. Other Commission Business

The Design Commission reviewed the schedule of upcoming meetings.

VII. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 9:29 pm.



Chair



Recording Secretary

6/20/18

Date

6/28/18

Date

For more information, please visit: www.GreshamOregon.gov/Design-Commission

