

Minutes of the  
CANNON BEACH DESIGN REVIEW BOARD  
April 15, 2010  
Council Chambers

Present: Chair Hank Johnson, Board Members, Tom Ayres, Tim Krupa, and Marilyn Rooper

Excused: Jenee Pearce and Jay Raskin

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: Rooper moved to approve the agenda; Ayres seconded the motion.

Vote: Ayres, Krupa, Johnson, and Rooper voted AYE; the vote was 4/0 in favor and the motion passed.

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

Motion: Ayres moved to approve the minutes of March 18, 2010, as amended. Rooper seconded the motion.

Vote: Ayres, Krupa, Johnson, and Rooper voted AYE; the vote was 4/0 in favor and the motion passed.

**(2) Public Hearing and Consideration of DRB 10-08, Dave Finley Application for the Conversion of an Accessory Building into an Accessory Dwelling, 187 East Susitna.**

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

Bartl summarized the staff report. It was noted that the Planning Commission granted a variance in May of 2009. With regard to the applicable criteria, Bartl stated that site development criteria D, E, H, K and M are not applicable. Architectural criteria E, F, K, and L are not applicable. Landscape criteria E and J are not applicable. Bartl stated that an accessory dwelling must be used as a long term rental. In response to a question by Ayres, Bartl stated that five parking spaces are required because the single family dwelling is a short term rental. Bartl responded to Krupa's questions pertaining to affordable housing. Bartl clarified the lot lines and highway rights-of-way in response to questions by Rooper.

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.

Dave Finley, 2990 NW Bauer Woods Drive, Portland, OR 97229, applicant, outlined the proposal to enclose the existing carport and convert the building into an accessory dwelling. Johnson asked about existing utilities.

Finley stated that the carport and upstairs office have electricity only. Ayres asked about access to the dwelling. Finley stated that the exterior stairway would become an interior stairway, and that the existing east door provides access to an existing storage room utilizing a sliding door that is proposed to remain in place. Ayres questioned the square footage of the proposed accessory dwelling and suggested that an interior door between the accessory dwelling and the storage area be removed to ensure that the maximum permitted area for an accessory dwelling is not exceeded. Building Official Brien will be visiting the site to verify the storage area. Rooper asked about exterior lighting. It was noted that the two proposed additional locations for exterior lighting were noted on the drawings, but no lighting fixture style had been chosen. Ayres asked about the windows on the west and south elevations in relation to their proximity to the property line. Building Official Brien stated that the windows would be required to be fire-rated, with a one-hour wall if the building is located less than three feet from the property line.

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 10-08**

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

There was no discussion.

Vote: Ayres, Krupa, Johnson, and Rooper voted AYE; the vote was 4/0 in favor and the motion passed.

Motion: Ayres moved to approve the architectural plan subject to the applicant submitting proposed exterior lighting fixtures to a subcommittee of the Design Review Board for review and approval; Rooper seconded the motion.

Ayres expressed concern about the west windows being close to the property line. Alternate window locations were discussed. Currently, windows and a door are proposed on the east elevation and one window on the west elevation. Krupa thought that the space was small and therefore the proposed windows were adequate for the dwelling. He noted that a view to the garden would be pleasant. Rooper asked if the gutters for the existing structure would be upgraded. Bartl stated that a drainage plan would be required as part of the building permit application. Finley said that all the gutters would be upgraded. Ayres stated that some windows may need to be fire escape rated.

Amend: Ayres moved to approve the architectural plan subject to a subcommittee reviewing the exterior lighting fixtures, and that the first floor interior door between the accessory dwelling and the storage area is removed and the affected area is framed in so that the storage area cannot become useable for the accessory dwelling. Rooper seconded the motion.

Vote: Ayres, Krupa, Johnson, and Rooper voted AYE; the vote was 4/0 in favor and the motion passed.

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

Rooper said that she would like to see more landscaping than the two additional shrubs proposed. Ayres agreed that the landscaping was very sparse. Johnson stated that he would like to see additional plants around the building or at the south end. Ayres commented that an additional landscaping area near the driveway could

enhance the project. Bartl suggested that the applicant develop a landscape plan and return to the Design Review Board for landscape plan approval prior to obtaining a building permit final. The consensus of the Board was that the landscape plan could be reviewed and approved by a subcommittee rather than the full Board. Johnson stated that he would be willing to serve on the subcommittee. Johnson stated that larger shrubbery could be planted on the north side. Ayres agreed.

Amended: Ayres moved to approve the landscape plan subject to a revised landscape plan being submitted for the area surrounding the accessory dwelling for review and approval by a subcommittee. Approval of the revised landscape plan is required prior to issuance of an occupancy permit for the dwelling. Krupa seconded the motion.

Johnson and Rooper will serve as the subcommittee to review the exterior lighting fixtures and the revised landscape plan.

Vote: Ayres, Johnson, Krupa, and Rooper voted AYE. The vote was 4/0 in favor and the motion passed.

### **(3) Public Hearing and Consideration of DRB 10-06, City of Cannon Beach Application for the Construction of an Emergency Supplies Building at 4301 US Highway 101.**

No one objected to the jurisdiction of the Design Review Board to hear this matter at this time. No one declared a conflict of interest. As ex parte contacts, Rooper indicated that she had visited the site.

Bartl summarized the staff report. It was noted that the Planning Commission approved a conditional use permit in March 2010. With regard to the applicable criteria, Bartl stated that site development criteria D, E, H, K and M are not applicable. Architectural criteria E, F, K, and O are not applicable. Landscape criteria D, E, H, K, and M are not applicable. Rooper asked if there would be additional landscaping. Bartl stated that there would be a natural grassy area around the building. Rooper asked if a sign would be placed on the building. Cruz Flores, Public Works Foreman, stated that there would be no fence, and it had not yet been determined if a sign would be placed on the building. Security considerations would need to be reviewed by staff.

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.

Cruz Flores, Public Works Foreman, City of Cannon Beach, PO Box 368, Cannon Beach, OR 97110, applicant, stated that he would answer any questions that the Design Review Board may have. Flores noted that the site is within the urban growth boundary. The proposed building will be slightly longer than the emergency supply building located on Old Cannon Beach Road. In response to a question by Johnson, Flores stated that there would not be additional site grading required, only minor excavation for the building foundation. Ayres asked about the terrain to the east of the proposed building location. Flores responded that the terrain becomes very steep just beyond the proposed building site.

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 10-06**

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

Vote: Ayres, Krupa, Johnson, and Rooper voted AYE; the vote was 4/0 in favor and the motion passed.

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

Johnson suggested that the color of the roll up door could match the color of the tan siding, or the green roof.  
Rooper agreed.

Amended: Rooper moved to approve the architectural plan subject to the color of the roll up door matching the color of the tan siding, or the green roof; Ayres seconded the motion.

Vote: Ayres, Krupa, Johnson, and Rooper voted AYE; the vote was 4/0 in favor and the motion passed.

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

Vote: Ayres, Johnson, Krupa, and Rooper voted AYE. The vote was 4/0 in favor and the motion passed.

**(4) Authorization for the Chair to Sign the Appropriate Orders**

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

Vote: Ayres, Krupa, Johnson, and Rooper voted AYE; the vote was 4/0 in favor and the motion passed.

**(5) Staff Reports**

Bartl stated that William Brehm had resigned from the Board. Meeting protocol was discussed.

**(6) Good of the Order**

Johnson asked if the City staff could cut the shrubbery near the bank, on the east side of S. Hemlock Street, in the vicinity of the south entrance onto Highway 101. Bartl stated he would direct the question to the Public Works Department.

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Johnson adjourned the meeting at 7:46 p.m.

---

Stephanie McGuire, Administrative Assistant