

**Design Commission Meeting
Council Chambers
Gresham City Hall
July 18, 2018, 6:30 pm**

I. Opening/Citizen Comment

A regular session of the Gresham Design Commission was called to order on the 18 of July, 2018 at 6:30 pm in the Council Chambers, located at 1333 NW Eastman Parkway, Gresham Oregon. The meeting was recorded and scribed by Jamie Thomes.

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:

Bill Bailey
Camilla Cok
Rob Cook
Pat Lando
Tom Orth

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT:

Robert Hayden
Mike McKeel

COUNCILOR PRESENT:

David Widmark

COUNCILOR ABSENT:

Kirk French

STAFF:

David Berniker, Urban Design & Planning
John Heili, 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. Stark 212 Plaza Hearing: 21260 SE Stark St.

Order of Procedure

Chair Cook said that application DRE/TR 17-26000445 is an application for Design Review for an 8,252 square-foot, one-story commercial-retail building and associated site improvements including auto and bike parking spaces, trash enclosure and landscaping improvements.

- 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, Orth and Lando 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:

- Lack of a materials board.
- Projections, specifically the canopies, into the front yard setback.

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

- Tracy Brown, Planning Consultants, LLC
- Ken Yu, Kaly Construction & Designs, Inc.
- Kelli Grover, Firwood Design Group, LLC

The Commission and applicant representatives discussed the project, including:

- Condition of Approval #5.
- A secondary location for the garbage enclosure as well as the materials of the enclosure.
- The sidewalk along the east side of the building.
- Condition of Approval #24.
- Canopy projections, material, and a possible maintenance agreement.
- The lack of a materials board.
- Glazing percentages.
- The entry and base treatment.
- Reducing the width of the pilaster to gain additional sidewalk space to the south.

Public Comment

Sarah McColl: 21400 SE Stark St., #1, Gresham OR 97030

Ms. McColl noted the location of her home for the Commission. She observed that the application included the removal of existing trees and requested that a wall be constructed due to anticipated noise as well as littering. Ms. McColl also asked about the frequency and timing of garbage collection.

Ms. McColl was unclear as to what was meant by the inclusion of a buffer and noted that currently it is difficult to exit the property due to sight obscuring vegetation along SE Stark Street. She was concerned with the location of the proposed buffer and its impact on visibility.

Staff detailed where the buffer will be located on the site as well as the location of the garbage enclosure. There will be an 8-foot masonry wall around the trash enclosure.

Ms. McColl asked what would replace the cedar trees once removed. Staff explained that, due to the grade difference, a retaining wall would be utilized. Ms. McColl noted that she would prefer if the retaining wall were over 6 feet, which would be larger than the fence currently in place. She explained that the cedar trees protect her view as well as that of her neighbors.

Daniel Adams: 21400 SE Stark St., #3, Gresham OR 97030

Mr. Adams noted the location of his home for the Commission. Mr. Adams was concerned with the removal of the cedar trees, which act as a buffer and provide shade. He was also concerned that the construction of a convenience store would generate traffic throughout the day and night. He felt that the project would adversely impact his privacy and mentioned people possibly trespassing.

Mr. Adams stressed the importance of including a buffer between his home and the commercial development. He also observed that there were already two convenience stores located nearby and that the project could adversely impact their businesses.

John Leasure: 21130 SE Stark St., Gresham OR 97030

Mr. Leasure stated that his main concern is safety. The trees anticipated to be installed along SE Stark Street will create a sight obscuring overhang or blind spot. He noted that three people have died at the intersection of SE Stark Street and SE 212th Avenue, the most recent a bicyclist.

SE 212th Avenue is a through-street that generates traffic; the project will likely exacerbate the current traffic situation.

Douglas Rust: 748 SE 212th Ave., Gresham OR 97030

Mr. Rust noted that motorists in general speed along SE Stark Street. With the focus of the development located at the corner of SE Stark Street and SE 212th Avenue, what will happen to traffic along SE Stark Street when those motorists speed past the driveway to the development? Further, how much will traffic increase on SE 212th Avenue? Mr. Rust also asked about the hours of operation for the facility, especially evening hours, and what tenants can be anticipated. Mr. Rust was fearful that hooliganism would increase with the development and that the flavor of the neighborhood would change drastically.

Mr. Rust noted that the removal of the cedar trees would be an issue for the other neighbors, especially in terms of impacted shade.

Traffic congestion was also a concern. The current speed bumps were felt to be ineffective and that new speed bumps such as those on NW Wallula Avenue should be installed. The speaker noted that Gresham Station has increased traffic in the area, and the construction of the project would further increase traffic along SE 212th Avenue.

Also noted was a concern for a decrease in property value as well as the lack of an improved street. The current sidewalk is 3 feet in width while the new sidewalk will be 5 feet; how will that appear when the two connect? Trash and noise were also a concern.

The speaker felt that SE 212th Avenue should be improved should the project proceed.

Applicant Response to Public Testimony

Tracy Brown and Kelli Grover responded to the concerns from the public testimony.

In terms of the eastern property line, a retaining wall will be installed. A fence would separate the loading zone enclosure from the adjoining property. While not formally determined, the fence will likely be wood.

Mr. Brown acknowledged the concerns heard from the public testimony in terms of traffic. He noted that the property directly east is zoned the same as the project site and thought perhaps in the future the area may transition to a commercial zoning.

Ms. Grover explained that the applicant had approached the owner of the site with the cedar trees to be removed early in the project. The owner provided a letter to the applicant agreeing to remove the trees. Further, an arborist report revealed that the cedar trees to be removed are in ill health and will not survive much longer.

Additional Discussion

The Commission asked if a traffic study had been required with the application. Staff replied in the negative.

The Commission asked if any further studies had been conducted for traffic calming methods and service level of SE 212th Avenue. Staff explained that transportation planning had not expressed a concern for the road. However, the applicant will be required to make half street improvements on both SE Stark Street and SE 212th Avenue.

Motion

Commissioner Orth moved to approve application number DRE/TR 17-26000445 based on the findings, conclusions and recommendations stated in the July 10, 2018 Staff Report with the following modifications or additions:

- Amend Condition of Approval #5 to read: Provide 7 feet of dedication on SE Stark Street and a 6.93-foot planter strip, which requires an approved Development Engineering Design Modification request, and 6-foot sidewalk behind the existing curb.

- Amend Condition of Approval #6 to read: Provide for a curb return with a 25-foot radius at the corner of SE Stark Street and SE 212th Avenue.
- Amend Condition of Approval #15 to read: The garbage and recycling enclosure shall be resized to include a cardboard container, oil container (in a separate location), and space for a food waste roll cart provided in locations that are conveniently accessible by the development's users and tenants.

Provide a minimum 12-foot access width for a garbage truck to drive into the enclosure area. Double the depth of the enclosure to 20 feet or provide a second enclosure as required to accommodate the garbage, recycling, and oil containers described herein in a location and configuration approved by the Manager.

Containers 3 yards and larger may not be placed facing each other inside an enclosure. A minimum of 2 feet, including pad area, shall be provided around the sides and rear of each container. A minimum of 3 feet, including pad area, shall be provided in front of each container for maneuverability in depositing garbage or recyclable materials. In cases where the containers face each other, a minimum of 4 feet shall be provided.

A no parking sign as well as gate restrainers in the open and closed position are required at the enclosure.

The enclosure shall be constructed of material(s) that is durable, maintainable, attractive and not listed as prohibited by Table 7.0603(B)(8)(d). The enclosure walls shall be masonry, at least 6 feet in height, and designed using identical materials and detailing as that of the primary building.

- Amend Condition of Approval #16 to read: Provide an 8-foot-high wood fence along the east property line beginning at the north property line and continuing south to the end of the buffer wall located on the east property line.
- Amend Condition of Approval #21 to read: Provide a 3-foot wide walkway along the east side of the building from the parking area to the doorways on the east façade. Paving materials at pedestrian crosswalks in the parking area shall contrast visually with adjoining surfaces. Painted striping at crosswalks are not permitted in satisfaction of the standards.
- Amend Condition of Approval #24 to read: Provide minimum 8-inch deep offsets between the building wall and face of pilasters along the south parking lot facing building wall. Modify the adjacent walkway to maintain a minimum 5-foot wide depth.
- Amend Condition of Approval #26 to read: Provide a materials board to include a sample material for each of the exterior façade finish materials and paint colors for review and approval by the Manager. There shall be no exposed concrete stem wall or edge of slab condition below the storefront. The finish in these areas shall be a non-paint, durable long-lasting finish matching the building's stucco finish, storefront metal, or alternate method approved by the Manager.

- Amend Condition of Approval #32 to read: If applicable, the owner shall secure a City encroachment permit for the canopies along the SE Stark Street frontage that extend into the right of way, if these are removable. If the canopies are permanent extensions into the right of way, a City license to encroach is required. The encroachment permit or license shall provide requirements for the upkeep and maintenance of those building elements covered by the agreement.

Commissioner Lando seconded the motion. The motion passed.

Chair Cook	Yes
Vice-Chair Orth	Yes
Commissioner Bailey	Yes
Commissioner Cok	Yes
Commissioner Hayden	Absent
Commissioner Lando	Yes
Commissioner McKeel	Absent

IV. Rockwood Apartments ODCC: 740 SE 182nd Ave., R233502220

The applicant and staff presented an overview of the proposal to the Design Commission as well as provided questions for Commission feedback. The proposal consists of:

- A meandering outer exercise path.
- A loop for auto circulation and parking.
- Five apartment buildings.
- Public open space.
- A boomerang-shaped community center.
- The development of SE 185th Avenue, which will terminate at the northern boundary of the development area. Connectivity to SE Stark Street is anticipated in the future.

Applicant representatives included:

- France Manalaysay Fitzpatrick, Community Development Partners
- Sergio Palleroni, Center for Public Interest Design
- Giovanni Sidari, Waechter Architecture
- Dylan Morgan, PLACE

Applicant Questions and Design Commission Comments

Open Space Overlay Boundary Revision Request

The Design Commission was amenable to an Open Space Overlay Boundary Revision; however, as proposed, the Commission indicated that the public open space feels like private space. The

Commission was particularly concerned about how neighbors will access the site on foot from the outside of the community and would like to see the design be “permeable” for pedestrians.

The Commissioners expressed that the character of the future street is critical and were interested in the detailing of the right of way. The Commission also believed that the SE Yamhill Street frontage should be designed as a gateway into the public open space.

7.0103(A)(6)(D)(3) - Transitions Between Public and Private Space

The Commission was supportive of the design of the public/private transition areas but would like to see more detail.

7.0103(A)(4)(D)(1) and 7.0103(A)(4)(D)(3)(a) - Shared Outdoor Space and Children’s Play Area

The proposed public open space was acceptable to the Commission in lieu of shared open space and a children’s play area dedicated to the apartment complex.

7.0503(A)(3)(D)(3) - Building Orientation

The Design Commission indicated that due to the characteristics of the site and the open space design, the percentage of buildings fronting the street was sufficient.

7.0503(A)(4)(D)(8) - Courtyard Entries

The Commissioners were comfortable defining the proposal as a courtyard scheme and expressed that the entry locations off the courtyard meet the standard. The applicant discussed using color and emphasizing the entry areas; this idea was supported by the Commission.

7.0503(A)(4)(D)(1) - Corner Lot Entries

The Commissioners were unified in their desire to see an active, engaging SE Yamhill Street-facing façade. They were supportive of locating one entry on the future street and one entry on SE Yamhill Street.

7.0503(B)(1)(D)(2), 7.0103(B)(2)(D)(1) and 7.0103(B)(1)(D)(2) - Massing, Façade Articulation and Building Length

As the design develops the Design Commission would like to see a few large, bold architectural gestures on each of the buildings that divide the massing and articulate the façade.

7.0103(B)(2)(D)(4), 7.0103(B)(2)(D)(5) and 7.0503(B)(4)(D)(9)(a) - Transparency

More transparency on facades, especially the street fronting facades (future street), is desired by the Commission, but alternative façade treatments, such as public art, murals, or vegetated wall panels may be acceptable alternatives.

7.0103(B)(1)(D)(4)(b) - Storage

The Commission preferred more storage for outdoor items; however, due to the scale and uniqueness of the proposal, the Commission was comfortable with the proposed storage areas.

V. Other Commission Business

Chain Link Fencing in Design Districts

Staff noted recent circumstances where chain link fencing was allowed by the Design Commission even though the use of the material is prohibited within the design districts. For example, the Rick's Custom Fencing project was allowed the use of chain link fencing given that the location of the material was along the perimeter of the property not directly abutting the street and was hidden by shrubs. Staff then asked the Commission if a policy could be crafted that would identify when chain link fencing could be allowed in design districts in certain circumstances.

For instance, the policy could allow the use of chain link fencing when it is not visible from the street, public right of way, public place or perhaps when it is beyond 250 feet from those locations. Staff also noted that the material could also be allowed when it is screened by vegetation or decorative/permanent fence material.

In general, the Commission felt that the instances staff had outlined were a good start to a possible policy. However, the Commission also stressed caution in how and when the material could be applied.

The Commission also observed that the application of thicker, black welded wire fencing has been successful recently. Security and abutting compatible uses such as those detailed in the Rick's Custom Fencing project were discussed. It was noted that chain link fencing should not be used in a residential application.

When drafted, the policy will be presented to the Commission for feedback.

Baseline Apartments: 20661 SE Stark St., Gresham OR

Staff outlined the approved 104-unit Baseline Apartment complex that was approved by the Design Commission. The majority of the site includes a Habitat Conservation Area (HCA).

Staff detailed the location of the buffer fronting SE Stark Street that extends along the eastern property line and noted that, similar to the north end of the buffer where no fence or wall was required, the south end is also located adjacent to the HCA which is restricted from future development. In order to accommodate the buffer wall/fence in this location, several cottonwood trees ranging from 9 to 36 inches in caliper would have to be removed from the HCA near SE Stark Street.

To retain the trees, staff suggested that the buffer fence not be installed in the location of the cottonwood trees. The buffer wall and plantings would then extend along the majority of the eastern property line save for this location and the one to the north as described.

The Commission agreed with the proposal outlined by staff, though some concern was noted concerning the longevity of some of the larger trees given the shorter lifespan of cottonwoods.

Staff indicated the applicant had provided an arborist report regarding the condition and life expectancy of the trees.

Upcoming Design Commission Meetings

Staff reviewed discussion topics for upcoming Design Commission meetings, including the use of thin brick material as a proposed material for a new project.

Good Samaritan Condition of Approval #32 Update

Staff reviewed the memorandum dated June 20, 2018 concerning City of Gresham file DRE/LL/SUR/TR/VAR 17-26000242 - Good Samaritan and the adjustment of the language for Condition of Approval #32. The Commission was agreeable to the language adjustment.

Design Commission Membership

Staff noted that Commissioner Hayden will be on temporary leave for the foreseeable future. The Commissioners were encouraged to attend as many meetings as possible in order to ensure for a meeting quorum.

V. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 9:53 pm.



Chair



Recording Secretary

10/3/18

Date

10/29/2018

Date

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

