

Design Commission Meeting
Council Chambers
Gresham City Hall
August 1, 2018, 6:30 p.m.

I. Opening/Citizen Comment

A regular session of the Gresham Design Commission was called to order on the 1st of August, 2018 at 6:30 p.m. in the Council Chambers, located at 1333 NW Eastman Parkway, Gresham Oregon. The meeting was recorded and scribed by Amanda Lunsford.

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:

Bill Bailey
Camilla Cok
Rob Cook
Pat Lando
Mike McKeel

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT:

Robert Hayden
Tom Orth

COUNCILOR ABSENT:

Kirk French
David Widmark

STAFF:

David Berniker, Urban Design & Planning
Amanda Lunsford, 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. MAJ Development Optional Design Commission Consult: NE 181st Ave. just north of I-84, R628210150, R628210100

Presentations

The applicant gave a presentation that included:

- Site plan
- Easements
- Driveway access
- Neighboring projects
- Storefront glazing

Staff gave a presentation about the project which addressed the following questions from the applicant:

- 1 & 2: Building Placement.** Several easements effect the property. Utility easements constrain an 18 by 80-foot area at the south side of the site along the 181st frontage. In response the building is positioned 20-feet 8-inches from the property line. The applicant wanted the Commission's feedback on the location of the building. The applicant also wanted to know if the easement lengths can be deducted from the total frontage length.
- 3: Pedestrian Circulation.** The proposal is not yet showing entries for Building C. The applicant asked, if both buildings along 181st have primary street facing entrances, is the sidewalk a sufficient pedestrian connection between these buildings.
- 4 & 5: Vehicular Circulation Area.** A masonry screen with trellis is proposed to buffer the drive-thru from the street. The applicant has provided examples of similar built features on projects in Wilsonville and in Clark County. The Commission's feedback was requested on the drive-thru orientation and screening. The applicant also wanted to know whether there are drive-thru stacking length requirements.

Staff also provided the following discussion items:

- 1. Primary Internal Drives.** A shared primary internal drive was established with the Marriott Development Permit, because the total parking stalls for the two sites would exceed 100. Primary internal drives are designed much like a public street. Staff wanted the Commission's input on the design of the eastern drive edge considering the primary internal drive criteria.
- 2. Transparency.** Staff asked for the Commission's input on the quantity of transparency. The standards measure transparency between the heights of 2 feet and 12 feet.

Commission Comments

The Commission had the following comments:

- 1. Standard 7.0603(A)(3)(D)(1)(b) – Building Placement and Frontage.** The Commission was interested in alternate building locations that would situate additional building area within the setback zone (zero to 10-feet from the public right-of-way). The Commissioners endorsed consolidating buildings along the street front and/or locating pedestrian amenities and buildings at the corners of NE 181st Avenue and the private drives. Where it is not possible to locate buildings along the public street, the Commission felt that the proposed low masonry wall with trellis would be comparable to a building façade.
- 2. Standard 7.0603(A)(3)(D)(3) – Building Placement and Frontage: Vehicular Circulation.** The Commission generally supported the low masonry wall with trellis to screen the drive-thru area from the public street. The Commission recommended a wall with trellis or pedestrian amenities along any areas of the public street frontage that lack buildings.
- 3. Standard 7.0603(A)(2)(D)(2) – Primary Internal Drives.** Staff explained that two crosswalks across the primary internal drive shared with the adjacent Marriott were a

condition of approval for the Marriott's development permit; at the Marriott's Design Review a sidewalk on the eastern side of the drive was also anticipated. The Commission discussed the location of the two crosswalks and whether there is a need for a sidewalk along the eastern side of the drive, particularly considering the close proximity of hotels. Ultimately, the Commissioners concurred that the two crosswalks and the sidewalk along the shared drive will need to be provided.

4. Standard 7.0603(A)(8)(D)(1) – Pedestrian Circulation. The Commission deliberated likely pedestrian routes onsite and in the immediate vicinity:

- The Commissioners affirmed that the crosswalks and sidewalk along the primary internal drive shared with the Marriott should be well connected to an internal pedestrian circulation system that links building entries.
- The Commission foresees people walking between the parking lot facing entrances of the convenience store and the restaurant with drive-thru. Therefore, the Commission requested a crosswalk traversing the central onsite drive to provided direct and safe access between these entries.

5. Standard 7.0603(B)(4)(D)(1) – Street Facing Façade Transparency and Standard 7.0603(B)(4)(D)(2) – Transparency for Non-Street Facing Facades with Customer Entries. The Commission recognized that the standard only measures transparency from 2-12 feet in height (the transparency zone established in the Gresham Community Development Code). The Commissioners acknowledged that the street facing elevation and the parking lot facing elevation with a customer entry do not meet the standard but contain glazing outside the zone. The Commissioners agreed that the quantity of transparency proposed was satisfactory.

Staff also addressed the following questions from the applicant:

- The Gresham Community Development Code does not allow utility easements to be deducted from the total frontage length, but easements are constraints that may be considered when a discretionary request is evaluated.
- There are no stacking length requirements in the Gresham Community Development Code.

III. Civic NW Optional Design Commission Consult: R993042370, R993043470

Presentations

The applicant gave a presentation on the project which included:

- Master Plan Principles
- Plaza Plan
- Building Elevations
- Resident Open Space
- Parking and Driveways areas

- Landscape Buffer
- Residential Storage

Staff gave a presentation on the project which included the following applicant questions:

1. Will a combination approach to storage be acceptable – some units may have less than the required 24 square-feet but will have optional, stand-alone leasable storage space. Staff asked the Commission to consider if the combination of provided storage space with available leasable storage space meets the intent of the standard and guideline.
2. Will the driveway access on Civic Drive be acceptable? Because of the driveway's alignment with 16th St., creating a continuation of the block structure, and in concert with the pedestrian path, staff is generally supportive of the mid-block driveway as proposed, as it helps to break down the long block length and aids in the onsite and offsite vehicular circulation.
3. Can the mid-block pedestrian pathway be less than 16-feet in width? Within the proposed pedestrian path, staff would like to see better definition between the driveway and the walkway using landscaping, pedestrian scale lighting, benches and changes in paving materials. As this is supposed to be the primary through-connection dividing the block structure, if the Commission agrees to reduce the width of the pathway, staff asked that the applicant provide significant enhancements at this entry to the site – potentially including prominent wayfinding signage or an art feature that announces this connection.
4. Would the placement of the loading area be allowed at the terminus of the driveway without additional screening? For all loading spaces on the site, staff feels it is important that these spaces be screened from view of public spaces including the pedestrian pathway through the site, and other shared spaces such as the plaza and children's play area, via tall landscaping, fences or walls. The placement of the loading space at the end of the driveway is not ideal as it would be highly visible at the terminus of 16th St., which is envisioned as being a major east-west connector through the Civic Neighborhood.
5. Materials.
 - a. Is the use of fiber cement lap siding acceptable as a primary exterior finish (65% of the exterior façade or more) for the residential component of the mixed-use buildings? The applicant is asking if the use of fiber cement lap siding will be acceptable to use as a primary exterior finish – this would be used on the residential component of the structures.
 - b. The other primary material identified is brick. The applicant is proposing a thin brick veneer. Would the Commission give consideration to the use of thin brick? The guideline for primary materials states that the predominant building material shall be high quality, durable, and attractive.
6. Can the required perimeter screening buffer between the Wy'East connector path and adjacent parking stalls be less than 10 feet? Additionally, can this screening buffer provide shrubs and other landscaping in lieu of trees.

Commission Comments

1. **4.1250(A)(4)(S11) – Storage Facilities.** The Commission expressed concern regarding the provision of in-unit storage. The Commission advised the applicant to provide dedicated areas in units that are large enough to achieve the standard. In addition, ensure that there are separate accommodations for bike storage. If storage areas are proposed outside of the units, the Commission recommended that they be available for use by all tenants rather than requiring a separate leasing of the space (as proposed), as this would be inequitable.
2. **4.1250(A)(4)(S2) – Vehicular Access.** The Commission was supportive of the inclusion of the driveway for vehicular access on the NW Civic Drive.
3. **4.1250(A)(1)(S4)(d) – Mid-Block Pedestrian Pathway.** The Commission was not in favor of the reduced width pedestrian pathway adjacent to the driveway at NW Civic Drive. The Commission stated that the pathway should meet the 16-foot minimum width standard. The Commission also felt that this entry point needed to be grander.
4. **4.1250(A)(4)(S7)(c) – Loading Areas.** The Commission reviewed the location of the loading zone at the back of the driveway, aligning with NW 16th Street. The Commission felt that additional screening of the loading area would be necessary, or the loading area should possibly be relocated away from the pedestrian path. The Commission wanted to see more detail to understand how onsite loading (including other onsite loading areas) will appear and be compatible with adjacent pathways and open space areas.
5. **4.1250(B)(8)(S1) – Materials.** The Commission offered several suggestions regarding material usage.
 - a. **Fiber Cement Lap Siding.** The majority of the Commission felt they could support the use of fiber cement lap siding as a primary material on the mixed-use buildings if the quality of the material could be shown to be long lasting and attractive.
 - b. **Thin Brick.** The majority of the Commission would consider the use of thin brick if the applicant could resolve concerns regarding durability and appearance. Specific concerns include: the “through color” of the thin brick – ensuring that if chipped or cut, the brick will maintain color consistency; provide details of how the brick is applied on the façade and how it will transition at corners and between other materials; and how the thin will be maintained to ensure longevity.
6. **4.1250(A)(6)(S15) – Parking Area Landscaping: Perimeter Screening.** The Commission stated that while less than the standard 10-foot buffer width between the parking modules and the Wy’East pedestrian path could be approved, the request to reduce this width to 4-feet was not acceptable. The Commission was supportive of a 6-foot buffer width if the abutting parking stalls included wheel stops to prevent vehicle overhangs into the landscape area. The Commission also felt the inclusion of trees in the buffer

area was necessary, but some trees could be accommodated on the outside of the pathway. The pathway could meander to allow space for trees on either side of the path.

The Commission also had the following additional requests:

- 1. Variance Request – Hillside Slope.** The Commission did not have any immediate objections to the requested variance. The applicant will need to address the findings in the Development Code.
- 2. NW Council Drive Frontage.** The Commission agreed that some softening of the retaining wall along NW Council Drive was needed. This could be done with landscaping, massing changes, or materials. It was also suggested that the applicant use an alternate material instead of the thin brick veneer on the retaining wall.
- 3. NW Fanning Way Massing.** The Commission has questions about the placement of balconies. Feedback primarily focused on the need to balance the public, semi-public, and private realms at the entry areas and patios. The Commission saw the wood walls around the patios as creating an unfriendly barrier to the pedestrian experience on the street. They also suggested that stair entries should be more inviting, potentially by widening the stairs. The Commission would like to have more clarity on the entries to the units and the buildings, specifically as viewed from the street. The Commission also expressed support for varying the color on the NW Fanning Way facades to help break down the massing along the street edge, which appears as a single plane on the rendering.
- 4. Sunshades.** In lieu of structural canopies on the exterior of the building, the Design Commission will consider alternative means of providing shading/insulation on the south and west facing facades. The applicant should address this as part of their submittal narrative/plans.

V. Adjourn

Materials Board

The Commission is concerned with applicants not providing a materials board for a hearing. In order to avoid this, it was suggested the applicants be provided with a “hearing checklist”. If the items on the checklist are not provided, then the hearing will be automatically be continued. Staff responded that it will review internal processes to address the Commission’s concerns.

April 18, 2018 Design Commission Minutes

Commissioner Lando moved to approve the April 18, 2018 Design Commission minutes. Commissioner Cok seconded the motion. The minutes passed unanimously. Commissioner McKeel abstained.

May 16, 2018 Design Commission Minutes

Commissioner Lando moved to approve the May 16, 2018 Design Commission minutes. Commissioner Cok seconded the motion. The minutes passed unanimously. Commissioner McKeel abstained.

The meeting adjourned at 9:45 p.m.



Chair

10/3/18

Date



Recording Secretary

10/3/18

Date

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

