

Minutes of the
CANNON BEACH DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
May 20, 2010
Council Chambers

Present: Vice Chair Marilyn Rooper, Board Members, Tom Ayres, Jenee Pearce, and Jay Raskin

Excused: Chair Hank Johnson, and Tim Krupa

Staff: Planner Rainmar Bartl, Building Official Mark Brien, and Administrative Assistant Stephanie McGuire

CALL TO ORDER AND APPROVAL OF AGENDA.

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

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

Vote: Ayres, Pearce, Raskin, 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 April 15, 2010.

By consensus, the Design Review Board agreed to consider this item at the June 17th, 2010 meeting.

(2) Public Hearing and Consideration of DRB 10-07, City of Cannon Beach Application, Pedestrian Trail from East Second Street to East Monroe Street, at Elm Street.

No one objected to the jurisdiction of the Design Review Board to hear this matter at this time. The Chair asked if there were any conflicts of interest or personal biases to be declared. Raskin stated that he had submitted a letter of testimony to the City Council on the City's conditional use application for the trail and for this reason is not going to participate in the matter; he stepped away from the dais. No other Board member had a conflict of interest or personal bias to declare. As ex parte contacts, Board members indicated they had visited the site.

Bartl summarized the staff report, stating that the City of Cannon Beach is requesting a continuation of the hearing to the June 17, 2010, meeting in an effort to reach a settlement with neighboring property owners who have appealed the City approval of the conditional use permit to the Oregon Land Use Board of Appeals.

Motion: Ayres moved that the Public Hearing for DRB 10-07 be continued to the June 17, 2010, meeting; Pearce seconded the motion.

Vote: Ayres, Pearce, and Rooper voted AYE; the vote was 3/0 in favor and the motion passed.

Raskin rejoined the Design Review Board at the dais.

(3) Public Hearing and Consideration of DRB 10-10, Douglas Wood Application, on behalf of the Community Presbyterian Church of Cannon Beach, Addition of a Steeple and a Cross to an Existing Church building, 132 East Washington Street.

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 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, Bartl stated that site development and landscape criteria are not applicable. Architectural criteria E, F, K, and L are not applicable. Rooper asked if criterion N should be added as not applicable. Ayres responded that energy conservation could apply to the lights.

Vice Chair Rooper 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.

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

Rooper asked for testimony from the applicant.

Douglas Wood, Applicant, PO Box 774, Cannon Beach, OR 97110, stated that he was representing the Presbyterian Church. Wood pointed out the details of the proposal on a model. With regard to the cross, he stated that it would be illuminated by two lights at ground level. The cross would only be illuminated when there is activity at the church. Raskin asked if any consideration had been given to restoring the original tower. Wood stated that this idea was explored several years ago when a cell phone provider was interested in co-locating a facility at the church, but this deal fell through. The church does not have the financial resources to proceed with this concept on its own. The church also decided to proceed with a more traditional steeple. In response to a question by Ayres, Woods outlined the history and various design options that had been considered by the church; he stated that this design was chosen because of its size and cost. Rooper asked if the wattage for the exterior lights had been determined. Wood stated that he thought the wattage would be about 60 watts. Wood stated that the lights are not intended to be bright; their intent will be to create shadows in conjunction with the cross.

In response to a question by Rooper, Wood described the two proposed crosses as handcrafted. The cross on the west face of the building will be made of cedar. A Celtic cross will be placed on top of the steeple. This cross has a stainless steel interior and is clad in copper.

Rooper asked for testimony from proponents. There was none.

Rooper asked for testimony from opponents. There was none.

Rooper asked for additional staff response. There was none.

There were no additional statements.

Vice Chair Rooper closed the public hearing.

Consideration of DRB 10-10

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

Ayres stated that he thought the scale of the steeple design was awkward; it is too small and too close to the west end of the building. Raskin concurred. Wood pointed out some of the constraints in the existing roof structure. There would need to be a structural redesign to accommodate a larger relocated steeple. He said that there were concerns regarding the weight of the steeple structure. The structural engineer was comfortable with utilizing the proposed design in conjunction with the existing roof truss system.

Raskin stated that the design reminded him of a school bell tower and it seemed to be a missed opportunity for the church to have a more creative steeple. Ayres stated that the cross in front was fine, but the scale of the steeple seemed small. Pearce said that she thought that the design was fine. Rooper agreed that the design seemed small and thought a larger steeple would create a better appearance. Wood stated that the church congregation had invested a substantial amount of money in this design and that they were pleased with it, noting that a redesign would be costly. Pearce urged the Board to consider the economics of the situation, and approve the application as submitted. Wood displayed several photos of the building elevations, stating that the church congregation was happy with the proposed design. Ayres stated that his opinion was that the scale was off. Raskin reiterated that

he thought the design was a missed opportunity.

Ayres said that he thought that the design should be modified. Rooper asked if Ayres thought that the landscaping helped to diminish the scale of the church. Ayres said he did not. Rooper asked if the Board was ready to vote on the motion.

Vote: Pearce, and Raskin voted AYE; Ayres and Rooper voted No. The vote was 2/2 and the motion failed.

Wood asked Ayres what his suggestions were. Various options were explored utilizing the model to illustrate them. Bartl noted the required 15 foot setback adjacent to E. Washington Street as a potential limiting factor. After further discussion, Wood stated that moving the steeple into alignment with the ridge line of the prayer room could be a solution, if the size of the steeple remained the same.

Harold Van Winkle, Cannon Beach Construction, PO Box 831, Cannon Beach, OR 97110, discussed the views of the church and steeple from S. Hemlock Street.

Ayres thought that the overall design appearance would be enhanced if the size of the steeple box was increased slightly, from five to six feet.

Motion: Raskin moved to approve the architectural design subject to the condition that the steeple is moved to the east so that the midpoint is in alignment with the ridge line of the prayer room, with the dimensions of the steeple increased to six feet by six feet. Ayres seconded the motion.

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

(4) Public Hearing and Consideration of DRB 10-09, Oyala Application for the Construction of a New Commercial Building, 139 West 2nd Street.

No one objected to the jurisdiction of the Design Review Board to hear this matter at this time. Ayres stated that the Architect for the project is the son-in-law of his brother. Ayres stated that he was paid \$200, as a consultant over two years ago, on previous proposal for this property. He stated that he had not seen the submitted design until he received the DRB packet materials and that he did not believe that any of this would affect his ability to make an impartial decision. No other member stated a conflict of interest or personal bias. As ex parte contacts, Board members indicated they had visited the site.

Bartl summarized the staff report. Bartl pointed out the proposed grass-crete area stating that it represents a substantial percentage of the proposed soft landscaping material. The Board's policy is to approve grass-crete as soft landscaping on a case by case basis.

Raskin asked if Bartl would review the Zoning Code criteria regarding building heights. Bartl stated that the Zoning Code states that the overall maximum building height allowable is 28' with an average of 24', where the roof pitch is 5:12 or greater. Bartl pointed out the various roof pitches in the project application and stated that in his opinion the roof's gable ends represented the main roof structure and these gable ends have a pitch of 6:12 pitch. The ancillary roof areas have pitches of 4:12. Staff determined that the roof design was consistent with the City's definition for determining roof height. Raskin asked the Building Official how he was interpreting the roof height. Brien stated that he concurred with Bartl. Raskin asked if Ayres had ever obtained an interpretation on roof heights in the past. Ayres stated that he did not think that he had asked for a determination regarding ancillary roof areas. Raskin thought that the interpretation by staff may creep into averaging, which may not be the intent of the Code. Raskin pointed out that eave averaging was done by the applicant. Ayres stated that eave averaging has been done for quite some time. With regard to the applicable criteria, Bartl stated that site development criteria D and L are not applicable. Architectural criteria E and F are not applicable. Landscape criterion J is not applicable. Rooper questioned architectural criterion F; she thought that it should be included. Ayres thought that E and F, pertaining to large scale projects, should both be included.

Vice Chair Rooper 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.

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

Rooper asked for testimony from the applicant.

David Vonada, Consulting Architect, 5926 SW Riveridge Lane, Portland, OR 97239 reviewed the site plan, and stated that one of the goals of the project was to continue the development of the owner's project on Second and Hemlock Streets into this project. Sustainable features of the design include economy of massing and stair-stepping the building back from Second Street. The use of sixteen-foot building modules creates a variety of interest while conserving the use of materials. Natural ventilation is an additional sustainable feature. Large boulders mark the entrances to the site, with a bioswale capped by grass-crete at the entrance to the parking lot, providing both soft landscaping and accommodating treating parking lot runoff. Vonada noted that the bioswale is subject to further engineering. The ADA parking was reviewed. The finished floor level is one foot above the flood plain. Pedestrian connections to the entrances, sidewalks and parking lot were reviewed. The transitions between wood and concrete decking materials were reviewed. Two commercial spaces were denoted on the second floor. The shed dormer locations were reviewed in conjunction with the roof plan. The parapet element and heights were reviewed. Vonada stated that the parapet could be lowered to 24', with a lower slope to accommodate the roof cricket. The parapet element is a design element used as a transition to the building to the east. The actual fire protection for the building will occur through prescribed treatment of the wall and roof. Vonada stated that the exterior elevations and the variety of materials proposed should create an interesting facade. It was noted that there was a change to the application pertaining to the windows. Additional horizontal treatments have now been added to the windows for added interest. Another slight design change to the far west building module is the window raised above the canopy height, with the canopy limited to the width of the door. Awning type windows will be installed. Raskin asked what the intended uses of the building are. Vonada stated that the retail space would be on the street level and that offices and an exercise studio are proposed for the second level. Vonada reviewed the variety of materials proposed for the project. The proposed awnings would be silver corrugated metal, and the roofing material would be black composition. The gable ends would be alternating cedar shingle siding and black corrugated metal. Basalt-filled gabions will form a backdrop to the landscaping at various points along Second Street. It was noted that the horizontal treatment on the windows are changes to the building elevations. Vonada responded to Ayres questions regarding the parapet and roof cricket at the transition to the existing building to the east.

Raskin asked if there was a connection or an elevation difference to adjacent properties to the east. Vonada explained that the parking lot would be elevated. He indicated a connection point on the site plan. Raskin questioned the accessibility of one of the parking spaces. Vonada showed that a backup area is provided for the space to facilitate maneuvering. Raskin asked if the handrail and the ADA ramps could be shifted an additional tread length to accommodate the handrail. Raskin also asked if the bioswale location for the drainage from the parking lot was a technical or aesthetic solution. Vonada said that the bioswale accomplishes two goals, meeting the soft landscaping component as well as treating the storm water as it comes off the parking lot. The bioswale would be over-excavated, lined with fabric and rain rock, and capped with grass-crete (concrete with the diamond type shape). Ayres questioned whether the grass-crete would survive the traffic. Ayres commented on the high water table of the area. In response to a question by Rooper, Vonada said that the windows and fascia trim will be black. Ayres asked about the window material. Vonada responded that the windows would be aluminum, black finished, to keep the window profiles thin. Rooper asked about the fence replacement on the south side of the project. Vonada said that the existing fence and retaining wall would require a wall extension to meet the grade of the parking lot. The fence will be replaced with a staggered width, cedar board fence. Rooper asked about the lighting, and thought that there may be too much lighting. Vonada reviewed the eight different fixture types and locations proposed, including a bollard in the parking lot, the lights located on the fence of the parking lot, and down lights under the canopies and decks. Rooper asked if the trellis would show. Vonada said that it is intended to hide the fixtures in the spaces between the beams. Rooper asked about the lights in the front and center of the building area. Vonada explained that the building sign would be located at that location, and the sign mounted lights would be placed there. Low-wattage, up-lighting will be installed at the planters. Canopy-mounted lights will have a 50-watt bulb capacity. Generally, the lamps may have lower wattage. Two lights will be visible over

the door. Ayres questioned the “Type 7” light. Vonada responded that it was a recessed can light.

Leslie Garvin, Sitka Designs, PO Box 167, Cannon Beach, OR, provided an updated plant list for the Board and stated that the quantities were the only items that had changed on the revised list. Garvin reviewed the landscape design including the variety of textures and colors in the plants chosen. Plants that can withstand the wet winters and near drought summers were chosen for the bioswale area. Several deciduous trees will be planted, that have a tall, narrow look. Rooper asked for an explanation of the *green wall*. Garvin explained that a green wall is a trellis that will be planted with a climbing hydrangea.

Rooper asked for testimony from proponents. There was none.

Rooper asked for testimony from opponents. There was none.

Rooper asked for additional staff response. Bartl said that a determination of the building height should be discussed by the Board when considering the architectural design. Bartl also noted that the bioswale component would require engineering; however, there is no specific requirement by the City for bioswale engineering. The soft landscaping element should be addressed by the Board.

Rooper asked for any final statements by the applicant.

Garvin stated that there is approximately 175 square feet of landscaping beyond what is counted to meet the soft landscaping requirement. Garvin pointed out the planters on the drawings, stating that the narrow planters average approximately two feet in width. In response to a question, Bartl stated that the landscaping requirement was changed in 2008 to require a minimum width of three feet. Raskin asked if the landscaping near the canopies had been included. Bartl pointed out the various areas where the landscaping was not counted because it was not open to the sky. Bartl directed Board members to the site coverage calculations where this information is indicated. Vonada stated that the bioswale function of the grass-crete is a part of the sustainability of the project, as well as soft landscaping; however, the applicant would like to request that the bioswale function be an optional one, in the event it cannot be properly engineered.

Vice Chair Rooper closed the public hearing.

Consideration of DRB 10-09

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

Raskin questioned the location of the grass-crete and expressed concern that it may not hold up. Raskin thought a less-used location may be more appropriate. Vonada stated that tire scrubbing could be problem in areas with lots of turning movements. He was hopeful that at the entrance to the parking lot vehicle tires would be traveling straight and the grass-crete would be minimally affected. Ayres stated that he liked the look of the green strip of grass-crete, but questioned whether the water would have an impact on the condition of the grass-crete. In response to a question by Rooper, Bartl stated that he felt that the site plan was the appropriate place to discuss the soft landscaping due to the amount proposed. Ayres stated that he thought that the narrow landscaping that did not count toward the calculations would significantly contribute to the appearance of the project, and that even if the grass-crete struggles, the rock of the bioswale may function well for the drainage. Raskin thought that the bioswale may not work due to the volume of water draining from the site, but raising the surface grade should help the situation. Ayres stated that the current storm sewer is very close to the surface. Raskin thought that the contribution of the non-contributing landscape items make up for the grass-crete, and he is comfortable with the grass-crete as a part of the soft landscaping. Ayres stated that his overall impression of the project is that it is very well landscaped.

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

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

Raskin commented that he liked the project, but stated that he was not comfortable with the roofs that have a 4:12 pitch, and did not think that they conformed to the spirit of the Code. He thought that they were quite flat in appearance. Ayres concurred with the comment regarding the flat appearance. Raskin thought that the parapet is a very dominate element and does not fit with the small scale approach to the project; Rooper concurred. Raskin thought that the pitch of the parapet could be lowered. Vonada stated that the parapet could be lowered to 24'. Raskin stated that he liked the choice of the materials and the mix of the architectural materials proposed. Pearce said that she liked the new window design proposed. Ayres said that he originally liked the parapet, but was no longer sure about it and said that the three-dimensional size of the parapet seemed too large. Raskin thought that the sloping wall on the front face draws attention to the feature and competes with other, more attractive design elements.

Bartl suggested that the roof pitch interpretation be dealt with first. Brien stated that the dominant pitch is 6:12, due to the higher percentage of the 6:12 pitch throughout the project. Bartl suggested that the Board could review variable pitched roofs on a case-by-case basis. A consideration in pitches of less than 5:12 could be how the various pitches relate to each other in total and their overall ratios to other pitches throughout the project. Raskin stated that he believes in consistency in Code requirement interpretations. Ayres stated that strict compliance in interpretation does not always lead to creative design elements. Brien said that the pitch interpretation applies to a very small percentage of projects and that it is difficult to arrive at a common prescriptive path for roof height interpretation. Ayres said that he thought that the design met the intent of the Code, which is that the steeper pitched roof designs are encouraged. Ayres said that if the Building Official is comfortable with the interpretation on this project, then he could be comfortable with the interpretation. Raskin concurred. Brien reiterated that the dominant feature is the 6:12 pitch and he believed that the intent of the Code is met with the design. Ayres and Pearce concurred, as did Raskin and Rooper.

Amended: Raskin moved to approve the architectural design subject to the following conditions: the windows and window placement are those indicated on plans submitted to the Board at the May 20th, 2010 meeting; and that the parapet structure on the eastern portion of the project shall be redesigned to reduce its visual impact. The revised design shall be subject to review and approval by the Design Review Board. Pearce seconded the motion.

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

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

Ayres thought the gabions created a nice contrast. Rooper stated that she did not care for the gabions. Rooper asked if the basalt boulders would have a variety of shapes. Garvin stated that a variety of shapes will be chosen. Raskin, Rooper, and Ayres commented that they thought the project was over-lit.

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

(5) Consideration of FS10-01, Freestanding Sign, Cannon Beach Property Management, 3188 South Hemlock Street.

Bartl presented the staff report to replace the existing freestanding sign.

Rooper asked for a presentation from the applicant.

Tami Florer, owner of Cannon Beach Property Management, PO Box 231, Cannon Beach, responded to Ayres question regarding sign material stating that the sign would be constructed of wood, painted chocolate brown with white lettering, and a tan logo. Raskin questioned whether the wood would hold up. In response to a question by Rooper, Florer stated that she would prefer that the posts for the sign remain natural wood. She said that the existing sign is constructed of wood. The existing lighting will remain. Raskin suggested that the applicant be allowed to use a dimensionally stable wood if she wishes to do so.

Motion: Raskin moved to approve the proposed freestanding sign, giving the applicant the option of utilizing a sign material that will provide a long-lasting stable surface for the sign. Pearce seconded the motion.

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

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

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

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

(7) Staff Reports

Bartl updated the Board on the status of Board membership.

(8) Good of the Order

None

ADJOURNMENT

Vice Chair Rooper adjourned the meeting at 8:35 p.m.

Stephanie McGuire, Administrative Assistant