

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

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

Excused: William Brehm

Staff: Planner Rainmar Bartl, and Administrative Assistant Stephanie McGuire

CALL TO ORDER AND APPROVAL OF AGENDA.

Chair Johnson called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

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

Vote: Krupa, Johnson, Pearce, Raskin, and Rooper voted AYE; the vote was 5/0 in favor and the motion passed.

**(1) Consideration of the Minutes of the Design Review Board Regular Meeting of February 18, 2010.**

Rooper suggested the word “potential” be added to the first sentence at the top of Page 2. Bartl stated that staff would review the Arborist’s Report to determine if the hazard was potential or actual. Rooper also asked if the fourth sentence referred to the flagstone and brick matching in color or material. Bartl stated that the materials would match in color and that the applicant referred to flagstone and brick interchangeably.

Motion: Pearce moved to approve the minutes of February 18, 2010, as amended. Raskin seconded the motion.

Vote: Krupa, Johnson, Pearce, Raskin, and Rooper voted AYE; the vote was 5/0 in favor and the motion passed.

**(2) Public Hearing and Consideration of DRB 10-05, City of Cannon Beach Application for the Reconstruction of the Public Restrooms at the Southeast Corner of 2nd and North Spruce Streets, 187 North Spruce.**

No one objected to the jurisdiction of the Design Review Board to hear this matter at this time. Jay Raskin declared a conflict of interest as Architect for the project and stepped away from the dais. As ex parte contacts, Board members indicated they had visited the site.

Ayres arrived at 6:05 p.m.

Bartl summarized the staff report and highlighted energy and water saving elements that have been incorporated into the design. It was noted that the Planning Commission granted a variance and a conditional use permit for the project. With regard to the applicable criteria, Bartl stated that site development criteria D and L are not applicable. Architectural criteria E, F, L and O are not applicable. Landscape criterion J is not applicable. Rooper asked about the operational aspects of the project. Bartl stated that the Director of Public Works would respond to her questions.

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.

Mark See, Director of Public Works for the City of Cannon Beach, PO Box 368, Cannon Beach, OR 97110, stated that one building is proposed, which is divided in the interior and has a pass-through door. This design allows for operations staff to close half of each restroom for cleaning or maintenance while leaving the other half of the restroom available for use. It also allow one side to be closed in the winter. This design feature continues the advantage of having two separate buildings. See introduced Architect Jay Raskin.

Jay Raskin, Ecola Architects, PO Box 1160, Cannon Beach, OR 97110, Architect, reviewed the various elements of the application utilizing a *Power Point* presentation. The floor plan was reviewed to show how the building could be partially closed for cleaning. Raskin explained how the construction would be phased in order to maintain a restroom downtown during construction of the new facility. The existing pump house will remain and the pump station roof will be tied into the new building. The roof drains from the entire building are directed into a gutter system that directs flows into the proposed rain garden. Krupa asked if any design elements had been considered to soften the appearance of the pump house. Raskin stated that the operation requirements of the pump house limit design options. Raskin stated that the proposed landscaping and screening measures should soften the appearance of the building. In response to a question by Johnson regarding the existing signage and the trees, Raskin stated that the three pine trees on the north would be removed, as well as several cherry trees. The existing sign would remain in it's present location. Pearce asked about the height of the raised landscape bed containing the sculpture that is located along Spruce Street. She thought that the rim of the bed should be higher, as a safety measure. Ayres suggested that all of the landscape beds be raised to sixteen to eighteen inches in height for easier seating along the perimeter. Johnson asked about the amount of heat that would be produced by the solar panels. Raskin stated that the solar panels are to generate maintenance heat for the building and should help keep the interior dry. The exterior showers were pointed out on the plans. Ayres asked if the shower water flow would be on a timer. Bartl stated that those details would be part of the construction drawings, but it can certainly be a consideration. Rooper asked for clarification regarding the locations of the light fixtures. Ayres and Rooper suggested that lighting be added to the breezeway area. Raskin noted that there is no landscape lighting proposed. Ayres suggested that exterior lighting on the north side of the site be considered.

Leslie McClanahan Hardy, PO Box 144, Tolovana Park, OR 97145, responded to questions by the Board, and clarified that the pine trees would be removed. Johnson asked if the sign would remain in the current location. McClanahan stated that the sign would remain in the present location and that the surrounding evergreen huckleberry bushes should make the sign more visible than it is now. She stated that the design of the landscape was intended for easy maintenance. An overflow will be installed in conjunction with the rain garden in the event the capacity of the garden is exceeded. Raskin said that the escallonia hedging on the east side of the parking lot will be removed to provide a better visual integration to the wetland area to the east. Johnson asked about the bark dust path and if it should be hard surfaced. McClanahan stated that there is an informal existing path at this location. Kirk Anderson, City Landscape Specialist, stated he would prefer the area to be in bark chips. He stated that the City will utilize the same material that is used in conjunction with the playground equipment. It is an easy to manage material.

Johnson asked for testimony from proponents. There was none.

Johnson asked for testimony from opponents. There was none.

Johnson asked for additional staff response. Bartl suggested that the Board address the following comments in their discussion: height of the landscape perimeter around the sculpture; sign location; additional lighting in the breezeway and on the north side of the site.

There were no additional statements.

Chair Johnson closed the public hearing.

### **Consideration of DRB 10-05**

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

Pearce suggested that the rim of the landscape bed that contains the sculpture be raised to sixteen inches. Bartl stated that this item should be considered under architectural design.

Amended: Pearce moved to approve the site plan and to give the City discretion on locating the sign.

Vote: Ayres, Krupa, Johnson, Pearce, and Rooper voted AYE; the vote was 5/0 in favor and the motion passed.

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

Amended: Ayres moved to approve the architectural plan with the following conditions: additional lighting shall be placed in the breezeway area; low-level lighting on the north side of the site, for the purposes of illuminating the walkway, may be added if deemed necessary by staff; one recessed light shall be installed in the eaves over each shower; the perimeter of the raised landscape bed that surrounds the sculpture shall be the same height as the rain garden raised perimeter wall.

Vote: Ayres, Krupa, Johnson, Pearce, and Rooper voted AYE; the vote was 5/0 in favor and the motion passed.

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

Vote: Ayres, Johnson, Krupa, Pearce, and Rooper voted AYE. The vote was 5/0 in favor and the motion passed.

Raskin rejoined the Design Review Board at the dais.

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

Motion: Ayres moved to authorize the Chair to sign the appropriate orders; Pearce seconded the motion.

Vote: Ayres, Krupa, Johnson, Pearce, Raskin, and Rooper voted AYE; the vote was 6/0 in favor and the motion passed.

### **(4) Staff Reports**

Bartl reviewed proper protocols and procedures with the Board.

### **(5) Good of the Order**

In response to a question from Johnson, Bartl responded that Public Works staff would answer Johnson's questions regarding the three garbage cans at the end of West Second Street. Kirk Anderson stated that there was a decision made a number of years ago to place three garbage cans at the end of West Second Street for six months of the year, and two garbage cans during the winter. Bartl stated that the number of garbage cans would be reviewed again by staff. See stated that the City is amendable to investigating a larger capacity garbage can design.

Rooper asked about the Marie Rockett Sculpture. Bartl reviewed the process involved with the sculpture. The Parks and Community Services Committee determined that the sculpture did not meet the criteria of the Memorial Policy and referred the matter to the Sculpture Without Walls Committee. Bartl stated that the Sculpture Without Walls Committee determined that the Rockett sculpture was consistent with the Sculpture Without Walls program and it would be sited as part of that program. It will be placed in Les Shirley Park, at a location to be determined by the Committee. See noted that the sculpture must be removed no later than April 30, 2011. In response to a question from Rooper regarding the location of the sculpture at Ecola Square, Bartl reviewed other temporary sculpture exhibits that have been placed in the City. Rooper and Raskin expressed the opinion that the sculpture location should have been reviewed by the Design Review Board. Johnson stated that he had raised concerns at the Sculpture Without Walls Committee meeting. Bartl stated that, as the Design Review Board liaison to the Sculpture Without Walls Committee, further Board comments should be referred to Johnson. Bartl stated that Board members will be informed of when the Sculpture Without Walls Committee will discuss the location of the sculpture in Les Shirley Park.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Chair Johnson adjourned the meeting at 7:00 p.m.

---

Stephanie McGuire, Administrative Assistant