

Minutes of the
CANNON BEACH DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
February 18, 2010
Council Chambers

Present: Chair Hank Johnson, Board Members Tom Ayres, William Brehm, Tim Krupa, Jenee Pearce, Jay Raskin, and Marilyn Rooper

Staff: Planner Rainmar Bartl, and Administrative Assistant Stephanie McGuire

CALL TO ORDER AND APPROVAL OF AGENDA.

Chair Johnson called the meeting to order at 5:58 p.m.

Motion: Raskin moved to approve the agenda; Brehm seconded the motion.

Vote: Ayres, Brehm, Krupa, Johnson, Pearce, Raskin, and Rooper voted AYE; the vote was 7/0 in favor and the motion passed.

(1) Consideration of the Minutes of the Design Review Board Regular Meeting of January 21, 2010.

Motion: Pearce moved to approve the minutes of January 21, 2010. Rooper seconded the motion.

Vote: Ayres, Brehm, Krupa, Johnson, Pearce, Raskin, and Rooper voted AYE; the vote was 7/0 in favor and the motion passed.

(2) Public Hearing and Consideration of DRB 10-04, Antoine Simmons application for Site, Architectural, and Landscape Modifications to a Motel, the Blue Gull Inn, 632 S. Hemlock Street.

No one objected to the jurisdiction of the Design Review Board to hear this matter at this time. No Board member declared a conflict of interest or personal bias. As ex parte contacts, Board members indicated they had visited the site.

Bartl summarized the staff report. With regard to the applicable criteria, he stated that site development criteria C, D, E, H, K and L are not applicable. Architectural criteria E, F and E are not applicable. Landscape criteria E and J are not applicable.

In response to a question, Bartl clarified the property boundaries, street rights-of-way areas, and landscape areas on the Madison Street side of the property.

Chair Johnson opened the public hearing and stated that the pertinent criteria were posted; testimony and evidence must address those criteria or other applicable criteria; failure to raise an issue accompanied by statements or evidence sufficient to permit the decision makers to respond to the issue would preclude appeal based upon that issue; prior to the conclusion of the initial evidentiary hearing, any party may request that the hearing record remain open for at least seven days for the submission of additional testimony or evidence.

Johnson asked if any additional correspondence had been received. There was none.

Johnson asked for testimony from the applicant.

Antoine Simmons, PO Box 698, Cannon Beach, OR 97110, owner of the Blue Gull Inn, reviewed the various elements of the application. Simmons stated that he has owned this property for approximately ten years. He stated that the proposed modifications will mirror the improvements made to the Inn at Haystack Rock, which is located on the east side of Hemlock Street. Simmons stated he is proposing to remove the larger Black Pine at the

property's northeast corner. He stated he had an arborist evaluate the tree and the recommendation is to remove the tree hazard. He stated he is also proposing to remove the Black Pines in Landscape Area B, replacing them with an escallonia hedge. He described the modifications to the courtyard area, including the relocated fountain, the installation of "flagstone" to match the existing red brick, and the placement of outdoor furniture. In response to a question by Brehm, Simmons stated that the large bench at the front of the property will be removed in order to accommodate the relocation of the sign. Johnson asked about courtyard lighting. Simmons stated that the courtyard lighting has not been finalized; he noted that the existing lighting adjacent to Hemlock Street will remain. In response to a question by Ayres, Simmons stated that each porch will be lit by a light attached to the porch ceiling. With regard to the lighting of the courtyard area, Bartl suggested that the Board could appoint a subcommittee to review the proposed lighting after it is completed by Simmons. Brehm asked how the landscaping would be watered. Simmons pointed out the hose bib locations on the plans. Simmons stated that the white trellis on the porches would be removed to open up the porch areas. The scalloped cedar in the façade end of the porches will be replaced with carved scenes of the type shown in the submittal. Rooper asked if the carved scenes will be sized to fit the available space porches. Simmons responded in the affirmative. Johnson asked about the scalloped siding on Unit 11. Simmons stated that the scalloped siding should be modified. Johnson asked if all the lattice would be removed from the buildings. Simmons responded in the affirmative. Rooper asked if all of the lattice fences would be removed. Simmons stated that they would all be removed except in Landscape Area B. Rooper asked how the change in grade of Landscape Areas C and D would be addressed. Simmons stated that a small wall constructed of stone will be installed. Brehm asked for clarification on the trellis design. Simmons stated that the proposed design is intended to be Craftsman in style, and will be constructed of cedar. The trellis is intended to provide a focal point in the courtyard. Rooper asked why an escallonia hedge is proposed for Landscape Area B. Simmons stated that he was looking for a material that would provide year-round screening of the parking lot. He stated that the height of the existing Black Pines no longer provides that screening. Rooper stated that, in her opinion, the escallonia is too repetitive of other similar hedges on adjacent property. Krupa and Pearce said that they thought that the escallonia was an appropriate choice of material. Johnson stated that he liked the visual effect of the existing pine trees. Simmons stated that the proposed removal of the trees is also necessary for visibility of the new sign location. Johnson stated that he thought the sarcococca proposed in Landscape Area E did not have sufficient height. Simmons introduced Ashley Dvorak, landscaper. Dvorak stated that the garden area on the north side is very shaded, which is why the sarcococca was chosen. The plant would be about three feet in height. The sarcococca would be planted in groups of five. Johnson questioned the use of the river rock. Simmons clarified that it will only be utilized in the northeast corner of the property, in the vicinity of a drainage area, to address a grade change. Dvorak said that she also thought of using Leyland Cypress, a fast-growing hedge material, and keeping the cypress shaved as an alternative to planting an escallonia hedge. Raskin asked if a mixture of Black Pine and escallonia could be used, perhaps retaining three or four of the pine trees within the proposed hedge area. Simmons stated that he was amenable to that option.

Johnson asked for testimony from proponents. There was none.

Johnson asked for testimony from opponents. There was none.

Johnson asked for additional staff response. There was none.

There were no additional statements.

Chair Johnson closed the public hearing.

Consideration of DRB 10-04

Motion: Raskin moved to approve the site plan; Brehm seconded the motion.

Vote: Ayres, Brehm, Krupa, Johnson, Pearce, Raskin, and Rooper voted AYE; the vote was 7/0 in favor and the motion passed.

Motion: Ayres moved to approve the architectural plan; Pearce seconded the motion.

Raskin suggested that board and batten siding be used in the porch areas under the railings. The Design Review Board agreed. Raskin commented that he preferred the original roof brackets.

Amended: Ayres moved to approve the architectural plan with the condition that board and batten siding be installed at the refurbished porch skirting entries and in the gable areas. Pearce seconded the motion.

Vote: Ayres, Brehm, Krupa, Johnson, Pearce, Raskin, and Rooper voted AYE; the vote was 7/0 in favor and the motion passed.

Motion: Raskin moved to approve the landscape plan; Brehm seconded the motion.

Johnson and Pearce volunteered to be part of a lighting subcommittee.

Amend: Raskin moved to approve the landscape plan with the condition that the applicant submits a lighting plan to the lighting subcommittee for review and approval. Brehm seconded the motion.

Brehm asked if the motion should include retaining several pine trees in Landscape Area B, interspersed with the escallonia. Johnson and Pearce said that they would like to see a plan for all of the pine trees. Raskin noted that an arborist's report has been provided for the large Black Pine tree on the northeast corner of the property. Bartl read the arborist's report conclusion to the Board. Krupa said that he thought that the entire Board should resolve the tree issues; he did not want it referred to a subcommittee, trees were too important to leave to a subcommittee to determine the outcome. Ayres stated that he would like to see the large pine tree retained. Brehm said that he would defer to the arborist report, which recommends removal of the tree. Johnson said that he thought that the issues identified in the arborist report could be addressed if the tree were pruned. Raskin stated that he thought the building had a nice appearance on the north side and did not need the large pine tree to provide visual interest. Raskin asked about removing the large pine tree and planting another tree on the long side of the property adjacent to Madison Street. Dvorak noted the limited width of the available landscape area and noted that the proposed Ninebark can reach a height of eight feet. Krupa said that he thought that the large pine tree is out of scale with the buildings and that there is an arborist's report that recommends that the tree be removed. Krupa said that he would defer to the Arborist's report and support removing the tree.

Amend: Raskin moved to approve the landscape plan with the condition that the applicant submit a lighting plan to the lighting subcommittee for review and approval, and that the black pine tree on the north corner be removed. Brehm seconded the motion.

Vote: Brehm, Krupa, and Raskin voted AYE; Ayres, Johnson, Pearce, and Rooper voted No. The vote was 3/4 and the motion failed.

Motion: Pearce moved that the applicant submit a revised tree plan to a Design Review Board subcommittee for review and approval.

The motion failed for lack of a second.

Krupa said that the trees are too important for the Design Review Board to delegate to a subcommittee. Ayres asked Johnson if the tree could be pruned. Johnson suggested that the tree be pruned and observed for a period of time to see if it thrives. Ayres concurred with this approach.

Motion: Ayres moved to approve the landscape plan with the condition that the applicant submit a lighting plan to the lighting subcommittee for review and approval; that the applicant prune the large pine tree on the northeast corner; that the applicant remove some of the smaller pine trees, but retain a portion of the existing pine trees to intersperse with the escallonia hedge in Landscape Area B. The motion was seconded by Pearce.

Krupa asked what pruning the tree would accomplish. Bartl stated that after the pruning and a reasonable

observation period, an evaluation can be undertaken to determine if the tree still creates the issues that were identified in the arborist's report. At that point it may still have to come out. Ayres said that by pruning the tree, there would be a smaller tree mass requiring fewer roots which would minimize root intrusion. Simmons noted that the bedding for the gardening material will be placed over the tree roots and may rot the tree roots. Johnson said that he did not think that the bedding material would interfere with the tree.

Brehm stated that he would like to see a separate motion pertaining to the trees. Brehm asked what the criteria would be for determining whether or not the tree pruning is successful, including the time period for review of the tree and who would decide if the pruning was successful. Bartl stated that if the pruning fails to achieve the objectives, Simmons could apply for a tree removal permit.

Rooper said that the landscaping material seemed packed and wondered about the survivability of it. Johnson said that he thought that the plants should survive.

Vote: Ayres, Brehm, Johnson, Pearce, Raskin, and Rooper voted AYE; Krupa voted No. The vote was 6/1 in favor and the motion passed.

Motion: Raskin moved to approve the sign; Pearce seconded the motion.

Rooper asked if down lighting would be used; Simmons said that it would

Vote: Ayres, Brehm, Krupa, Johnson, Pearce, Raskin, and Rooper voted AYE; the vote was 7/0 in favor and the motion passed.

Members of the Board thanked the applicant for making to the improvements to the property.

(3) Authorization for the Chair to Sign the Appropriate Orders

Motion: Raskin moved to authorize the Chair to sign the appropriate orders; Rooper seconded the motion.

Vote: Ayres, Brehm, Krupa, Johnson, Pearce, Raskin, and Rooper voted AYE; the vote was 7/0 in favor and the motion passed.

(4) Staff Reports

There was no staff report.

(5) Good of the Order

Krupa asked that the Board follow procedure and obtain recognition from the Chair before speaking.

Raskin has asked Bartl for clarification regarding Board members participation in a hearing on the proposed trail.

Johnson asked why three garbage cans have been placed at the end of West 2nd Street. He also asked if the fence around the yard debris area could be replaced with something more attractive. Bartl stated he will ask the Public Works Department about the garbage cans. Bartl reviewed the history of the yard debris transfer area, noting that its location is intended to be temporary.

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Johnson adjourned the meeting at 7:20 p.m.

Stephanie McGuire, Administrative Assistant