

Minutes of the
CANNON BEACH DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
January 20, 2011
Council Chambers

Present: Chair Hank Johnson, Board Members Tim Krupa, Sandi Lundy, and Jay Raskin

Excused: Tom Ayres, Julia Dwello, and Jenee Pearce

Staff: Planner Rainmar Bartl, and Administrative Assistant Stephanie McGuire

CALL TO ORDER AND APPROVAL OF THE REVISED AGENDA.

Chair Johnson called the meeting to order at 6:02 p.m.

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

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

(1) Election of Chair and Vice Chair

Johnson asked for nominations for Chair.

Raskin nominated Johnson for Chair. Lundy seconded the nomination. There were no other nominations.

Vote: Johnson, Krupa, Lundy, and Raskin voted AYE; the vote was 4/0 in favor and Johnson was elected Chair.

Chair Johnson asked for nominations for Vice Chair.

Raskin nominated Krupa for Vice Chair. Lundy seconded the nomination. Krupa nominated Pearce for Vice Chair. The nomination failed for lack of a second.

Vote: Johnson, Krupa, Lundy, and Raskin voted AYE, in favor of Krupa as Vice Chair. The vote was 4/0 in favor and Krupa was elected Vice Chair.

(2) Consideration of the Minutes of the Design Review Board Regular Meeting of November 17, 2010.

Lundy stated that the correct spelling of her first name is *Sandi*.

Motion: Krupa moved to approve the minutes of November 17, 2010, as corrected. Lundy seconded the motion.

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

(3) Public Hearing and Consideration of DRB 11-01, Breaker's Point Homeowner's Application for Landscape Modifications at the Breakers Point Condominiums, 253 Breakers Point Drive.

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. No ex parte contacts were declared.

Bartl summarized the staff report. Bartl said that the proposed lighting modifications at 5th and Laurel have been

deleted from the proposal. Bartl explained the City's tree removal criteria and referenced the Balden & Associates Arborist Report, noting that trees #1 and #3 are less than 10" in diameter and can be approved for removal as part of a landscape plan. The spruce tree, tree #2, cannot be removed as part of an approved landscape plan because it is more than 10" in diameter. Bartl also noted that some hedge material in the 5th Street right-of-way is proposed for replacement with lawn to improve clear-vision at street intersections. He noted the applicant has coordinated this proposal with the Public Works Department and that a Right-of-Way Permit has been obtained. Regarding the applicable criteria, Bartl stated that site development criteria and architectural criteria were not applicable. Landscape criterion E is not applicable.

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

Johnson stated that the pertinent criteria to be considered are noted in the staff reports and listed on the criteria sheets next to the west door; testimony, arguments and evidence must be directed toward that criterion or other criteria in the Comprehensive Plan or Municipal Code which the person testifying believes to apply to the decision; failure to raise an issue accompanied by statements or evidence sufficient to afford the decision maker and the parties an opportunity to respond to the issue precludes appeal based on that issue; prior to the conclusion of the initial evidentiary hearing, any participant may request an opportunity to present additional testimony, arguments or evidence regarding the application. The Design Review Board shall grant such requests by continuing the public hearing or leaving the record open for additional written testimony, arguments or evidence; persons who testify shall first receive recognition from the chair, state their full name and mailing address, and if appearing in a representative capacity, identify whom they represent.

Johnson asked for testimony from the applicant.

Bruce Francis, PO Box 246, Cannon Beach, OR 97110, applicant, stated that he would answer any questions that the Board may have. Francis introduced Breakers Point HOA Board Chair Frank Patrick, Breakers Point HOA Landscape Chair Terry Thorpe, and Annie Kirk, *Red Bird Design*. Francis reviewed the site map of the Breakers Point Condominiums and outlined the objectives of the landscape plan, noting that the Breakers Point HOA has approved the proposed landscape plan.

Annie Kirk, *Red Bird Design*, PO Box 83, Aurora, OR, 97002, stated that she developed the proposed landscape plan in conjunction with the Breakers Point HOA Landscape Committee with specific priorities targeted including: restoring any landscaping damaged from the condominiums' exterior renovation; ease of maintenance; refreshing and enhancing high visibility areas; utilization of native plantings; preservation of view and wildlife corridors. Kirk noted that 19 new trees are proposed for installation.

Raskin asked about the existing lawn that extends beyond the property line on the ocean front. Kirk stated that the landscape master plan applies only to property within the Breakers Point boundaries, as outlined on the display before the Board. No modifications are planned for the lawn beyond the property lines. Francis stated that the lawn extends approximately 35 feet toward the ocean front. Bartl explained that landscaping within the City's right-of-way has existed since the project was originally constructed approximately thirty years ago.

Kirk outlined the publications that were used as resources for determining plant choices. Kirk stated that escallonia are being removed to improve pedestrian and vehicular sight lines. She explained the components of the landscape plan in detail. Johnson asked about the trees that are proposed for removal, and wondered if the tree that was leaning heavily was slated for removal. Kirk stated that the tree proposed for removal is the tree that is south of the tree Johnson is describing. Francis stated that the tree in question is located within the City's right-of-way. This tree may be addressed in the future as a potential hazard tree. Lundy asked if the *Japanese Maples* were located in protected areas since they have difficulty in windy environments. Kirk stated that the *Japanese Maples* would be located in more protected, courtyard areas; she indicated where these locations were. In response to a question by Krupa, Kirk addressed the hillside area on the north side of 5th Street, west of Laurel Street, stating that drifts of plant material are proposed to mat and ribbon the slope area and this planting scheme should stabilize the slope as well. Non-deciduous plant material is proposed on the slope that is tolerant of the extreme winds and is more tolerant to elk. Raskin asked if sand infiltration has been a problem. Kirk responded that there is sand infiltration, sand build-up, and sandy soil. Those characteristics were considered in making plant choices.

Krupa stated that he was looking forward to the landscaping changes.

Francis addressed the lighting modifications that have been deleted from the plan, stating that the existing lighting and plant material in the City's right-of-way will be maintained. Francis discussed the trees proposed for removal. He presented photographs of tree #2. Francis explained that Breakers Point was specifically requesting the removal of tree #2 because it was undermining the structural integrity of the adjacent retaining wall. Bartl addressed Francis' comments pertaining to tree #2, by stating that such a problem was not listed in the arborist report and because the tree was more than 10 inches in diameter it was beyond the Board's authority to approve its removal as part of a landscape plan. Bartl suggested that Breakers Point could work with staff to further evaluate the potential hazard posed by the tree, which would be outside of the Design Review process.

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 11-01

Motion: Raskin moved to approve the landscape plan, including the removal of trees #1 and #3; Lundy seconded the motion.

Johnson said that he had a problem with the removal of the sitka spruce and tree #1 as well. He thought that the leaning tree to the north of tree #1 should be removed.

Raskin said that he was happy that the landscaping was being improved. Johnson said that he was excited about the landscaping plan and that it was an improvement over what currently exists.

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

(4) Consideration of FS11-01, Freestanding Sign, Castaways Restaurant and Tiki Bar, 316 N. Fir Street.

Bartl presented the staff report, noting that the existing free standing sign was approved in July 2010. The proposed sign will be higher, and the sign face has been changed. The sign is within the criteria for free standing signs.

Johnson asked for a presentation from the applicant.

Ryan Dewey, PO Box 877, Cannon Beach, OR 97110, stated that he was representing Josh Tuckman. In response to a question by Krupa, Dewey stated that the sign location has not changed. In response to a question by Johnson, Dewey stated that the sign is aluminum clad, with a protective coloring, similar to the sign at Cannon Beach Hardware. The lettering is flat. In response to Raskin's question, Dewey stated that the framing of the sign would be constructed of pressure treated posts, clad in cedar. Krupa questioned the height of the sign. Bartl stated that, in his opinion, the height of the sign would not have an impact on vehicular visibility from the exit of the Lumberyard parking lot. Krupa said that he thought that the proposed sign would be a major improvement over the existing sign. In response to a further question by Raskin, Dewey stated that he would prefer to use pressure-treated posts clad in cedar.

Krupa stated that he is very happy with the proposed sign.

Motion: Krupa moved to approve the sign application as submitted; Lundy seconded the motion.

Raskin stated his preference for cedar posts. Krupa said that he thought the proposed posts would be sturdier and the appearance acceptable.

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

(5) Determination of a Major or Minor Modification, Pedestrian Trail Elevated Walkway Viewing Area.

Bartl reviewed the background, noting that Chair Johnson has requested that the Board as a group make the determination of whether the deletion of the “viewing area” from the elevated walkway portion of the Lagoon Trail was a major or minor modification. Krupa stated that he thought the change in construction was very minor. Raskin agreed. Johnson said that in his opinion the viewing area is a significant element of the walkway design. In response to a question, Bartl explained the implications of a decision to find that the change was minor, as well as if the change was major.

Motion: Raskin moved that the change be determined to be a major modification. Krupa seconded the motion.

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

(6) Discussion on the Design Criteria of Ecola Creek Tsunami Evacuation Bridge.

Bartl reviewed the draft memorandum regarding the Design Review Board’s request to the City Council for its inclusion in all pertinent phases of the design of the proposed Ecola Creek Tsunami Evacuation Bridge.

Motion: Raskin moved to forward the request to the City Council that the Design Review Board be included in all pertinent phases of the design of the proposed Ecola Creek tsunami evacuation bridge. Krupa seconded the motion.

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

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

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

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

(8) Staff Reports

None

(9) Good of the Order

None

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Johnson adjourned the meeting at 7:15 p.m.

Stephanie McGuire, Administrative Assistant

CITY OF CANNON BEACH AGENDA

Meeting: Design Review Board
Date: Thursday, February 17, 2011
Time: 6:00 p.m.
Location: Council Chambers

6:00 CALL TO ORDER AND APPROVAL OF AGENDA

- (1) Approval of Minutes from January 20, 2011

ACTION ITEMS

- 6:03 (2) **Public Hearing and Consideration of DRB 11-03, Dooger's Restaurant, Building and Landscaping Modifications, 1371 S. Hemlock.**

DRB 11-03, David Vonada application, on behalf of Dooger's Restaurant, for modifications to the landscaping plan and a minor modification to the building to create a covered area for recycling. The property is owned by Hallmark Inns & Resorts. The property is located at 1371 S. Hemlock, and is described as Map 51030DA, Tax Lot 300. The property is zoned C-1, Limited Commercial. The application will be reviewed against the criteria of Municipal Code, Section 17.44.080-17.44.100, Design Review criteria.

If the Design Review Board wishes to approve, modify or deny the final findings of fact for the major modification to an approved plan, an appropriate motion is in order.

- 6:30 (3) **Public Hearing and Consideration of DRB 11-02, City of Cannon Beach Renovation of Public Restrooms, 2nd and North Spruce Streets.**

DRB 11-02, City of Cannon Beach application for the modification of an approved plan for the public restrooms at the southeast corner of 2nd and North Spruce Streets. The property is owned by the applicant. The property is located at 187 North Spruce Street and is described as Map 51020CC, Tax Lot 201. The property is zoned IN, Institutional. The application will be reviewed against the criteria of Municipal Code, Section 17.44.080-17.44.100, Design Review criteria.

If the Design Review Board wishes to approve, modify or deny the final findings of fact for the major modification to an approved plan, an appropriate motion is in order.

- 6:50 (4) **Motion for Chair to Sign Appropriate Orders.**

6:51 INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

- (5) Staff Reports
(6) Good of the Order

7:00 ADJOURNMENT

Please note that agenda items may not be considered in the exact order listed, and all times shown are tentative and approximate. Documents for the record may be submitted to the City Manager prior to the meeting by email, fax, mail, or in person. The meeting is accessible to the disabled. For questions about the agenda, or if you need special accommodations per the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), please contact the City Manager at (503) 436-8050.



Minutes of the
CANNON BEACH DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
March 17, 2011
Council Chambers

Present: Chair Hank Johnson, Board Members, Tom Ayres, Tim Krupa, Sandi Lundy, 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: Pearce moved to approve the agenda; Lundy seconded the motion.

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

(1) Consideration of the Minutes of the Design Review Board Regular Meeting of February 17, 2011.

Motion: Pearce moved to approve the minutes of February 17, 2011. Lundy seconded the motion.

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

(2) Public Hearing and Consideration of DRB 11-04, City of Cannon Beach, Major Modification to an Approved Plan, DRB 10-17.

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 that they had visited the site.

Bartl summarized the staff report, noting that the Design Review Board had made a determination that this matter was a major modification. Bartl noted that the site plan, presented to the Board, for the elevated walkway portion the Lagoon Trail included a section labeled "viewing area with City bench." This note was in error; the area was intended to provide an ADA rest area in anticipation of the fact that the elevated walkway, as constructed, would not conform to an ADA grade standard for walkways of its type. The City was able to construct the walkway in compliance with the applicable grade standard and as a result did not construct the bulb-out area. There are no applicable quantitative criteria. Regarding the applicable criteria, Bartl stated that site development criteria are not applicable. Architectural criteria E, F, G, J, K, L, M, N, and O are not applicable. All landscape criteria are not applicable. Ayres asked if there was a detail in the original drawings pertaining to the viewing area. Bartl said that there was not.

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

Johnson stated that the pertinent criteria to be considered are noted in the staff reports and listed on the criteria sheets next to the west door; testimony, arguments and evidence must be directed toward that criterion or other criteria in the Comprehensive Plan or Municipal Code which the person testifying believes to apply to the decision; failure to raise an issue accompanied by statements or evidence sufficient to afford the decision maker and the parties an opportunity to respond to the issue precludes appeal based on that issue; prior to the conclusion of the initial evidentiary hearing, any participant may request an opportunity to present additional testimony, arguments or evidence regarding the application. The Design Review Board shall grant such requests by continuing the public hearing or leaving the record open for additional written testimony, arguments or evidence;

persons who testify shall first receive recognition from the chair, state their full name and mailing address, and if appearing in a representative capacity, identify whom they represent.

Johnson asked for testimony from the applicant.

Mark See, Director of Public Works, City of Cannon Beach, PO Box 368, Cannon Beach, OR 97110, stated that during construction of the bulkheads at either end of the elevated walkway it was determined that a consistent grade of 1.8% could be achieved and as a result a rest area was not needed. ADA requires a rest area every 100 feet if grades exceed 2%. He stated that by not constructing the rest/viewing area after the fact, the adjacent wetlands would not be disturbed, and there would not be a larger footprint for the elevated walkway. He stated that in his opinion the designated area does not provide a particularly noteworthy view of a wetland area. See noted that other viewing areas long the trail had been developed, including one that provides an excellent view toward a wetland area in the southeastern portion of the trail. The cost of adding the viewing area would be at least \$3,000. In response to a question by Ayres, See stated that the viewing area would extend four feet and be supported by additional piers. See responded to questions by Johnson pertaining to ADA grade requirements, and said that the existing walkway was six feet wide.

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 11-04

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

Bartl clarified that the motion would be to approve the walkway as built and that no rest/viewing area would be installed; Pearce and Raskin agreed.

Johnson said that he thought that adding the viewing area would create visual interest and provide an area for artists and others to utilize a viewpoint. Johnson said that he would like the City to add the viewpoint at some time, even if it was not built in the near future. Ayres asked when the best construction time would be. See responded that the trail was built in September and that September would likely be the best time to construct any changes in order not to disturb the wetland any more than necessary. Krupa said that the walkway was not that long, and in his opinion there was no redeeming feature in adding a viewing area. Krupa stated that there is nothing to view in that particular area of the trail, other than the leaves of adjacent trees. Ayres disagreed and thought that the long length of the walkway would be more interesting with the viewing area added. Ayres also thought that the view area location, elevated in the manner that it was, provided an interesting perspective on a wetland area that is different from the normal ground level view; this is certainly one of the most interesting stretches of the trail. Ayres said that he would support the addition of the viewing area at the City's convenience, and that the addition could be built in straight lines rather than on a 45 degree angle. Raskin said that he would have preferred to see the viewing area constructed during the initial construction period, but was not in favor of adding it at this time.

Vote: Krupa, Lundy, Pearce, and Raskin voted AYE; Ayres and Johnson voted NO. The vote was 4/2 in favor and the motion passed.

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

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

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

(4) Staff Reports

Bartl announced that Raskin had tendered his resignation from the Design Review Board and thanked him for his service.

(5) Good of the Order

None

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Johnson adjourned the meeting at 6:25 p.m.

Stephanie McGuire, Administrative Assistant

Minutes of the
CANNON BEACH DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
April 21, 2011
Council Chambers

Present: Chair Hank Johnson, Board Members John Fraser, Tim Krupa, Sandi Lundy, Jenee Pearce
Excused: Tom Ayres
Staff: Planner Rainmar Bartl, Building Official Mark Brien, and Administrative Assistant Stephanie McGuire

CALL TO ORDER AND APPROVAL OF AGENDA.

Chair Johnson called the meeting to order at 6:02 p.m. and welcomed John Fraser to the Design Review Board.

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

Vote: Fraser, Johnson, Krupa, Lundy, and Pearce 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 March, 2011.

Motion: Pearce moved to approve the minutes of March 17, 2011. Krupa seconded the motion.

Vote: Johnson, Krupa, Lundy, and Pearce voted AYE; Fraser abstained. The vote was 4/0 in favor and the motion passed.

(2) Public Hearing and Consideration of DRB 11-06, Cannon Beach Community Presbyterian Church, Application for the Construction of a Steeple at the 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 that they had visited the site.

Bartl summarized the staff report. Bartl stated that a conditional use permit and a setback reduction were approved by the Planning Commission at their March 24, 2011 meeting. Regarding the applicable criteria, Bartl stated that site development criteria and landscape criteria are not applicable. Architectural criteria E, F, K, and L are not applicable.

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

Johnson stated that the pertinent criteria to be considered are noted in the staff reports and listed on the criteria sheets next to the west door; testimony, arguments and evidence must be directed toward that criterion or other criteria in the Comprehensive Plan or Municipal Code which the person testifying believes to apply to the decision; failure to raise an issue accompanied by statements or evidence sufficient to afford the decision maker and the parties an opportunity to respond to the issue precludes appeal based on that issue; prior to the conclusion of the initial evidentiary hearing, any participant may request an opportunity to present additional testimony, arguments or evidence regarding the application. The Design Review Board shall grant such requests by continuing the public hearing or leaving the record open for additional written testimony, arguments or evidence; persons who testify shall first receive recognition from the chair, state their full name and mailing address, and if appearing in a representative capacity, identify whom they represent.

Johnson asked for testimony from the applicant.

Jay Raskin, Ecola Architects, PO Box 1160, Cannon Beach, OR, reviewed the history of the project, and displayed a model of the proposed project showing the steeple over the chapel, in the approximate location where the original steeple had been located. Raskin stated that the proposed steeple is a manufactured item and will be shipped to the site and installed, with a white finish. In response to a question by Johnson, Raskin stated that the entire steeple, as well as the cross, is white. Shingles will be added.

David Robinson, PO Box 165, Cannon Beach, OR, stated that the proposal has been reviewed by the church's design team, the church elders, and the church congregation. Robinson thanked the Design Review Board for their comments pertaining to the previous applications submitted a year ago, and said that he was very pleased with this design, which is based on the Design Review Board's comments.

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 11-06

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

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

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

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

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

(4) Staff Reports

None

(5) Good of the Order

None

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Johnson adjourned the meeting at 6:09 p.m.

Stephanie McGuire, Administrative Assistant

Minutes of the
CANNON BEACH DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
May 19, 2011
Council Chambers

Present: Board Members Tom Ayres, John Fraser, Sandi Lundy, Jenee Pearce
Excused: Tim Krupa and Chair Hank Johnson
Staff: Planner Rainmar Bartl, and Administrative Assistant Stephanie McGuire

CALL TO ORDER AND APPROVAL OF AGENDA.

Senior Design Review Board Member Ayres called the meeting to order at 6:03 p.m.

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

Vote: Ayres, Fraser, Lundy, and Pearce 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 21, 2011.

Motion: Pearce moved to approve the minutes of April 21, 2011. Fraser seconded the motion.

Vote: Ayres, Fraser, Lundy, and Pearce voted AYE. The vote was 4/0 in favor and the motion passed.

(2) Public Hearing and Consideration of DRB 11-05, Andra Georges Application for Modifications to the West Elevation of the “White Bird” Building, Including Sign Placement, at 251 North Hemlock Street.

No one objected to the jurisdiction of the Design Review Board to hear this matter at this time. Fraser stated that he was located within the notification area and stepped away from the dais. No other Board member declared a conflict of interest or personal bias. As ex parte contacts, Board members indicated that they had visited the site.

Bartl summarized the staff report. The sign locations meet the criteria of the Zoning Code. Regarding the applicable criteria, Bartl stated that site development criteria and landscape criteria are not applicable. Architectural criteria E, F, G, H, I, J, N, and O are not applicable. Ayres asked for clarification pertaining to the location of the name of the building. Bartl stated that the applicant would answer questions during the applicant presentation.

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

Ayres stated that the pertinent criteria to be considered are noted in the staff reports and listed on the criteria sheets next to the west door; testimony, arguments and evidence must be directed toward that criterion or other criteria in the Comprehensive Plan or Municipal Code which the person testifying believes to apply to the decision; failure to raise an issue accompanied by statements or evidence sufficient to afford the decision maker and the parties an opportunity to respond to the issue precludes appeal based on that issue; prior to the conclusion of the initial evidentiary hearing, any participant may request an opportunity to present additional testimony, arguments or evidence regarding the application. The Design Review Board shall grant such requests by continuing the public hearing or leaving the record open for additional written testimony, arguments or evidence; persons who testify shall first receive recognition from the chair, state their full name and mailing address, and if appearing in a representative capacity, identify whom they represent.

Ayres asked for testimony from the applicant.

Daniel Georges, 225 South 1st Street Brooklyn, NY 11211, representing the applicant, reviewed the elements of the proposed project. Georges stated that the lettering for the Garret Sea Building will be routed and painted dark

brown or black. The lettering would be placed on three custom- made cedar boards. The main focus of the proposed signage is on the signs that identify the three businesses located within the building. Bartl stated that building identifier signs have not been counted in the computation of allowable signage for a property. Georges stated that the ground floor tenants are interested in making their signs larger, to a maximum sign size of 42" x 42". At this height, they will still comply with the minimum required clearance above the sidewalk of eight feet. Georges said that he would like that sign size option available for all three tenants of the building.

Ayres asked for testimony from proponents. There was none.

Ayres asked for testimony from opponents. There was none.

Ayres asked for additional staff response. There was none.

There were no additional statements.

Senior Design Review Board Member Ayres closed the public hearing.

Consideration of DRB 11-05

Motion: Pearce moved to approve the architectural plan, with the condition that the three tenant signs be the same size, 42" x 42"; Lundy seconded the motion.

Lundy asked if the Design Review Board would be reviewing the content of each of the signs. Bartl stated that signs that are attached to a building do not receive additional Design Review Board review, other than location, size and materials. The Board discussed the location of the building identifier sign. Ayres and Pearce stated that they are comfortable approving the building identifier sign if the location and size remain as presented in the drawings.

Amended: Pearce moved to approve the architectural plan with the conditions that the sign sizes for the identified businesses shall not exceed 42" x 42", the sign bracket for the upper sign shall line up with the upper window trim on the middle window on the second floor; and the letters identifying "The Garret Sea Building" shall be routed and painted either black or dark brown with the location and font as represented on the plan.

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

Fraser rejoined the Design Review Board at the dais.

(3) Consideration of FS11-02, Freestanding Sign, Sunset Inn, 154 Sunset.

Bartl presented the staff report. Fraser asked why the Hallmark sign was not being used for this property since it is owned by the Hay Family LLC. Bartl stated that the business would be under new management, would require a new business license, and the signage reflects the new business name.

Ayres asked for a presentation from the applicant.

Antoine Simmons, PO Box 998, Cannon Beach, OR 97110, stated that he would be managing the property for the Hay family. Simmons stated that a concrete pad and electrical service exist at the location from another free standing sign that had blown down several years ago. Simmons distributed sign color chips and explained the color scheme. In response to a question by Ayres, Simmons stated that the sign material would be MDO, which gives the appearance of wood. Simmons said that the posts would be 8' x 8' pressure treated wood. Ayres asked if the sign would be lit. Simmons said that lighting had not been determined, but thought that it would be halogen light fixture of 100 watts, with the lighting fixtures hidden by the landscaping. Simmons said that the sign is located about 17' from the street. Ayres suggested that the lighting be a low level, so that it not create glare. Fraser said that he thought that all signs had to be constructed of wood. Bartl reviewed allowable sign material permitted in the Zoning Code. In response to a question by Fraser, Simmons stated that he has been hired to

manage the property on behalf of the Hay family, because the property is similar to other smaller hotels that are currently under his management. Ayres questioned whether or not the material was MDO or foam, and stated that there would not be any texture to the sign if MDO is used. Simmons stated that the lettering would be raised, to give the sign dimension. Fraser and Ayres discussed the proposed sign material.

Motion: Pearce moved to approve the sign and materials as proposed, with the conditions that the sign posts shall be 8' x8' pressure treated wood; compact fluorescent or LED lighting in the equivalent of 100 watts shall be used; and the lighting fixtures shall be hidden in the landscaping and not create glare;
Lundy seconded the motion.

Vote: Ayres, Lundy and Pearce voted AYE; Fraser voted no. The vote was 3/1 in favor and the motion passed.

(4) Consideration of FS11-03, Freestanding Sign, Sandcastle Inn, 615 S Hemlock Street.

Bartl presented the staff report

Ayres asked for a presentation from the applicant.

Antoine Simmons, PO Box 998, Cannon Beach, OR 97110, applicant, distributed a new design that deletes the bucket and shovel from the sign design. Simmons reviewed the color chips, noting that the same materials would be used for the sign that were just approved for the sign at the Sunset Inn. Simmons stated that the background would be solid in color. The sign would be attached to the existing posts. In response to a question by Fraser, Simmons explained the check in and check out procedures for the management of the Sandcastle Inn and the Sunset Inn.

Motion: Fraser moved to approve the new sign design without the bucket and shovel, and the materials proposed, with the conditions that the letters be raised and the wood texture be on the sign, as shown in the application materials presented. Pearce seconded the motion.

Vote: Ayres, Fraser, and Lundy voted AYE; Pearce voted no. The vote was 3/1 in favor and the motion passed.

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

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

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

(6) Staff Reports

Bartl said that there is still a vacancy on the Design Review Board.

(7) Good of the Order

None

ADJOURNMENT

Ayres adjourned the meeting at 6:51 p.m.

Stephanie McGuire, Administrative Assistant

Minutes of the
CANNON BEACH DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
June 16, 2011
Council Chambers

Present: Chair Hank Johnson, Board Members John Fraser, Sandi Lundy, Jenee Pearce

Excused: Tom Ayres and Tim Krupa

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. Bartl said that there was an additional item to be added to the agenda: Modification to the Existing Freestanding Sign at Heather's Court.

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

Vote: Fraser, Johnson, Lundy, and Pearce 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 May 19, 2011.

Motion: Pearce moved to approve the minutes of May 19, 2011. Fraser seconded the motion.

Vote: Fraser, Johnson, Lundy, and Pearce voted AYE. The vote was 4/0 in favor and the motion passed.

(2) Public Hearing and Consideration of DRB 11-07, Application for Major Modifications to a Commercial Building at 255 North Hemlock Street.

No one objected to the jurisdiction of the Design Review Board to hear this matter at this time. Fraser stated that he was located within the notification area and stepped away from the dais. No other Board member declared a conflict of interest or personal bias. As ex parte contacts, Board members indicated that they had visited the site.

Bartl summarized the staff report. Regarding the applicable criteria, Bartl stated that site development criteria B, C, D, and L are not applicable; architectural criteria E and F are not applicable; and landscape criterion J is not applicable.

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

Johnson stated that the pertinent criteria to be considered are noted in the staff reports and listed on the criteria sheets next to the west door; testimony, arguments and evidence must be directed toward that criterion or other criteria in the Comprehensive Plan or Municipal Code which the person testifying believes to apply to the decision; failure to raise an issue accompanied by statements or evidence sufficient to afford the decision maker and the parties an opportunity to respond to the issue precludes appeal based on that issue; prior to the conclusion of the initial evidentiary hearing, any participant may request an opportunity to present additional testimony, arguments or evidence regarding the application. The Design Review Board shall grant such requests by continuing the public hearing or leaving the record open for additional written testimony, arguments or evidence; persons who testify shall first receive recognition from the chair, state their full name and mailing address, and if appearing in a representative capacity, identify whom they represent.

Johnson asked for testimony from the applicant.

Joe Fritsch, JOX, LLC, 3810 SE 142nd Ct, Vancouver, WA 98683, applicant, introduced his wife Roxanne, and reviewed the elements of the project, including the colors of the stain to be utilized. Fritsch explained that the

first phase of the project will be to create a more individual character to each of the buildings on the site. This objective will be achieved by providing more trim detail to the existing dormers, using a variety of siding materials and varying color treatments. This will create a different storefront look for each of the businesses. Fritsch reviewed the details of the proposed changes to Building A, including replacing the Breckenridge plywood, with solid cedar board and batten; a Cape Cod Gray stain is proposed for the front portion of Building A with a reddish stain for the area across from the main entrance to Building C. Building B will have elements of a Tudor design, with a *Hardiplank* product, which was shown to the Board, providing the “stucco” treatment. Fritsch stated that approximately eight feet of Building C will be demolished to open up the interior of the site and create a visual connection between Hemlock Street and Spruce Street. Beveled cedar siding will be utilized on this portion of the building. A dark green stain will be used for the main store front entry to Building C.

David Vonada, Tolovana Architects, PO Box 648, Tolovana Park, OR 97145, presented a computerized simulation moving through the project from Hemlock Street to Spruce. In response to a question by Johnson, Vonada stated that the narrowest portion of the project is currently approximately seven feet in width. The proposed remodel and removal of eight feet of Building C will create a more open public space in the interior of the site. Lundy asked if seating would be available in the public space. Fritsch said that there are presently three benches. He anticipates replacing them with more visually attractive benches. Fritsch highlighted where the replacement landscaping would occur. A cherry tree is proposed for the northeast corner of Building C, it will match the tree on the east side of Building A. Fritsch reviewed the lighting proposed for the new entry to Building C. The proposed cupola will have a copper exterior.

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 11-07

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

Lundy complimented the applicants on a well thought out project.

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

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

Johnson said that he liked the proposed remodel of Building C, but he would prefer that the buildings look more similar, and he didn't really care for all of the different trim treatments. Johnson said that the trim materials and designs were very well thought out, which he appreciated.

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

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

Johnson asked if potted plants were proposed to be added throughout the project. Fritsch said that several pots would be placed throughout the project.

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

Fraser rejoined the Design Review Board at the dais.

(3) Consideration of FS11-04, Heather Court, Modification of an Existing Freestanding Sign at 271 N. Hemlock.

Bartl presented the staff report.

Johnson asked for a presentation from the applicant.

John Sowa, 33645 Cullaby Lake Lane, Warrenton, OR, applicant, reviewed the proposed sign colors, and noted that the sign material used for the existing sign is a wood sign board, and that the proposed sign will be made of "alu-panel" with vinyl lettering. The proposed "alu-panel" material will withstand the weather elements better than the wood based material. Sowa said that he would prefer a wood sign, but the proposed sign will have more visibility on Hemlock Street. Lundy asked if the proposed sign is in compliance with the sign standards. Bartl responded in the affirmative. Fraser said that he prefers wood signs, and thought that the proposed sign could be constructed on wood just as easily as "alu-panel." Johnson said that he would like to see more consistency with the materials on the other signs. Sowa said that a coating is placed over the alu-panel, just like a coating is placed over sign board, so the signs will have the same appearance. Lundy said that she would like to see a nicer font used to project a more intimate and consistent design with the other signs. Fraser asked if the Design Review Board could condition the approval of the sign so that in several years the signs are replaced with wooden signs. Bartl stated the Board could do so.

Motion: Pearce moved to approve the sign application as submitted.

The motion failed for a lack of a second.

Motion: Fraser move to approve the sign application as proposed, with the condition that the Design Review Board review the sign in several years and determine if the sign should be changed to wood.

The motion failed for a lack of a second.

Lundy said that she objected to the font style of the sign, not the sign material, and would like to see the font changed to the same or a similar font like the *Sweet Basil's* sign.

Motion: Lundy moved to approve the application subject to the font changed to the same font or a font similar to the font used in the existing *Sweet Basil's* sign. Fraser seconded the motion.

Vote: Johnson, Lundy and Pearce voted AYE; Fraser voted NO the vote was 3/1 in favor and the motion passed.

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

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

Vote: Fraser, Johnson, Lundy and Pearce voted AYE; the vote was 4/0 in favor and the motion passed.

(5) Staff Reports

None

(6) Good of the Order

None

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Johnson adjourned the meeting at 7:05 p.m.

Stephanie McGuire, Administrative Assistant

Minutes of the
CANNON BEACH DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
July 21, 2011
Council Chambers

Present: Chair Hank Johnson, Board Members John Fraser, Tim Krupa, Sandi Lundy, Jenee Pearce

Excused: Tom Ayres

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: Pearce moved to approve the agenda; Krupa seconded the motion.

Vote: Fraser, Johnson, Krupa, Lundy, and Pearce 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 June 16, 2011.

Motion: Pearce moved to approve the minutes of June 16, 2011. Fraser seconded the motion.

Vote: Fraser, Johnson, Lundy, and Pearce voted AYE; Krupa abstained. The vote was 4/0 in favor and the motion passed.

(2) Public Hearing and Consideration of DRB 11-08, Application for Modifications to the West Building Elevation of Sandpiper Square in the Vicinity of the Existing Loading Dock at 172 North Hemlock 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 that they had visited the site.

Bartl summarized the staff report, stating that the Design Review Board had approved this application in December of 2009; however, no building permit was applied for within the required one year period after approval by the Design Review Board, so the approval lapsed. Bartl noted that the design is the same as the design approved in 2009. Regarding the applicable criteria, Bartl stated that site development criteria are not applicable; architectural criteria E, F, G, M and O are not applicable; and landscape criteria E, H, J and L are not applicable. Fraser asked for directional clarification on the drawings and loading dock access. Bartl clarified the elevations and access to the loading dock.

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

Johnson stated that the pertinent criteria to be considered are noted in the staff reports and listed on the criteria sheets next to the west door; testimony, arguments and evidence must be directed toward that criterion or other criteria in the Comprehensive Plan or Municipal Code which the person testifying believes to apply to the decision; failure to raise an issue accompanied by statements or evidence sufficient to afford the decision maker and the parties an opportunity to respond to the issue precludes appeal based on that issue; prior to the conclusion of the initial evidentiary hearing, any participant may request an opportunity to present additional testimony, arguments or evidence regarding the application. The Design Review Board shall grant such requests by continuing the public hearing or leaving the record open for additional written testimony, arguments or evidence; persons who testify shall first receive recognition from the chair, state their full name and mailing address, and if appearing in a representative capacity, identify whom they represent.

Johnson asked for testimony from the applicant.

David Vonada, Tolovana Architects, PO Box 648, Tolovana Park, OR 97145, stated that the project is identical to the project presented in 2009. Vonada displayed photographs of the site, and reviewed the drawings. Johnson asked if the stairs would be moved. Vonada stated that the stair landing is eliminated, and the stairway shifts approximately two feet, and will be a straight stairway. The stairway area will provide cover for the recycling area beneath. In response to a question by Fraser, Vonada said that the stair treads would be constructed of Trex, for ease of maintenance. Vonada stated that Trex has also been installed on the balance of the building. Fraser said that he did not like Trex and prefers wood. In response to a question by Johnson, Vonada said that there would be new replacement plants to fill in the area that may be damaged during construction. Pertaining to the landscaping, Johnson said that he believed there should not be replacement vine maples because the existing vine maples are salt damaged. Johnson suggested substituting another plant material of a similar size, preferably utilizing plants used at other locations at Sandpiper Square. Vonada said that he would be willing to substitute for the vine maples with something else. Bartl asked if the applicant could have the flexibility to substitute the vine maple for another plant. Johnson said that in his opinion, the applicant could choose a substitute plant for the vine maple.

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 11-08

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

Fraser said that he did not want to approve the use of the Trex product because it is not aesthetically pleasing. Johnson noted that Trex is already utilized throughout the Sandpiper Square complex, and thought that it would not look good to mix materials, even though the loading dock is on the northwest side of the property. Pearce said that she also prefers wood, but that because of the maintenance issues associated with wood stair treads will vote to approve the use of Trex.

Vote: Johnson, Krupa, Lundy, and Pearce voted AYE; Fraser voted no. The vote was 4/1 in favor and the motion passed.

Motion: Pearce moved to approve the landscape plan with the condition that the landscape plan is modified to replace the two vine maples with more suitable plants of comparable size, preferably plants used at other locations at Sandpiper Square. Fraser seconded the motion.

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

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

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

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

(4) Staff Reports

Bartl stated that the next meeting is August 18, 2011, and there is one agenda item scheduled.

(5) Good of the Order

Fraser said that the free standing signs installed by Hallmark at the *Sandcastle Inn* and the *Sunset Inn* were not like those represented in the drawings, and did not reflect the Board's action. Bartl said that he would research the matter. Johnson asked about the font used on the *Wine Bar* sign at Heather's Court. Lundy said that her motion was that the font be compatible to the *Sweet Basil's* sign, and she thought that the font used was in conformance with her motion.

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Johnson adjourned the meeting at 6:22 p.m.

Stephanie McGuire, Administrative Assistant

Minutes of the
CANNON BEACH DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
August 18, 2011
Council Chambers

Present: Chair Hank Johnson, Board Members John Fraser, Sandi Lundy, Jenee Pearce
Excused: Tom Ayres and Tim Krupa
Staff: Planner Rainmar Bartl, Building Official Mark Brien, and Administrative Assistant Stephanie McGuire

CALL TO ORDER AND APPROVAL OF AGENDA.

Chair Johnson called the meeting to order at 6:10 p.m.

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

Vote: Fraser, Johnson, Lundy, and Pearce 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 July 21, 2011.

Motion: Pearce moved to approve the minutes of July 21, 2011. Lundy seconded the motion.

Vote: Johnson, Lundy, and Pearce voted AYE; Fraser voted no. The vote was 3/1 in favor and the motion passed.

(2) Public Hearing and Consideration of DRB 11-09, Application for Modifications to Mo's Restaurant, Including a 1,035 Square Foot Addition, at 195 West Warren Way.

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, Pearce and Johnson indicated that they had visited the site.

Bartl summarized the staff report, noting that the Planning Commission approved a pre-existing conditional use permit, a setback reduction, and a variance for new screening for the outdoor service area. Staff has concluded that the application meets the quantitative criteria of the Zoning Code. Regarding the applicable criteria, Bartl stated that site development criterion C is not applicable; all architectural criteria are applicable; and landscape criterion J is not applicable.

Johnson asked if any additional correspondence had been received. Correspondence in opposition to the project was received from Dennis Pierce, 1810 25th Ave E, Seattle, WA 98112, owner of Units 116 and 166, Tolovana Condominiums, 3400 S. Hemlock Street, Cannon Beach, OR. Bartl referred to the site criterion I and architectural criterion I, which both pertain to evaluating view impacts,

Johnson stated that the pertinent criteria to be considered are noted in the staff reports and listed on the criteria sheets next to the west door; testimony, arguments and evidence must be directed toward that criterion or other criteria in the Comprehensive Plan or Municipal Code which the person testifying believes to apply to the decision; failure to raise an issue accompanied by statements or evidence sufficient to afford the decision maker and the parties an opportunity to respond to the issue precludes appeal based on that issue; prior to the conclusion of the initial evidentiary hearing, any participant may request an opportunity to present additional testimony, arguments or evidence regarding the application. The Design Review Board shall grant such requests by continuing the public hearing or leaving the record open for additional written testimony, arguments or evidence; persons who testify shall first receive recognition from the chair, state their full name and mailing address, and if

appearing in a representative capacity, identify whom they represent.

Johnson asked for testimony from the applicant.

David Vonada, Tolovana Architects, PO Box 648, Tolovana Park, OR 97145, reviewed the project. Vonada stated that a survey of the property had been completed. He reviewed the parking areas and the proposed relocated entry area on the southern portion of the east elevation; it is being relocated to improve customer flow. The screened service area in the front yard, adjacent to Warren Way, was reviewed. Vonada noted that there had been no exterior improvements to the restaurant since the early 1990's. The proposed addition will provide new ADA restrooms. Vonada noted that one variance application had not been granted by the Planning Commission; a small portion of the northwest corner of the building has been modified to conform to the required 15-foot front yard setback. Vonada said that he had met with the Tolovana Condominium Homeowner's Association, and based on discussions with the Homeowners, the height of the north end of the addition has been lowered by two feet to minimize view impacts. The entire building will be refaced with board and batten wainscoting and clear cedar. A new, blue metal roof will be installed; Vonada distributed the color chip noting that the color in the presentation materials did not accurately reflect the color of the roof material. The exterior stains and colors were presented to the Board. In response to a question by Johnson, Vonada reviewed the concerns Mr. Pierce raised in his correspondence pertaining to the view corridor. Vonada said that the trees are proposed to be removed, which will enhance Mr. Pierce's view. The cooler area has been relocated slightly, but could not be moved enough to enhance Pierce's view. Mr. Pierce will continue to have a view of Haystack Rock. In response to a question by Fraser, Vonada stated that the proposed modifications will not increase the seating in the restaurant. Responding to Fraser's question regarding parking, Bartl stated that the off-street parking requirement for restaurants in Tolovana Park area was recently changed to be equivalent of that in the Midtown area and as a result the proposal conforms to the parking requirement. Vonada indicated the additional sidewalks that are proposed for increased pedestrian flow. In response to a question by Johnson, Vonada stated that the wooden fence near the condominiums, Building 3, will be removed. The screening of the service area will be replaced so that it matches the new exterior treatment of other building. Vonada reviewed the lighting plan, noting that recessed lights will be installed in the soffit of the roof overhang associated with the east elevation, this will reduce glare. In the parking areas, ground-mounted light bollards will replace the existing "lollypop" lighting, reducing light pollution on adjoining property. Vonada said that the sign has not been addressed yet, but a new sign is planned in the near future. In response to a question by Johnson, Vonada outlined the phased remodeling schedule.

Rita Frailey, Cannon Beach Landscape Service, PO Box 126, Tolovana Park, OR 97145, reviewed the proposed landscape plan. The plan is intended to be low maintenance and survive the site's proximity to the ocean. The pine trees and pampas grass will be removed.

Johnson asked for testimony from proponents.

Robert Dedrick, 1095 East Main Street, Silverton, OR 97381, stated that the Tolovana Homeowner's owns the property and leases the property to Newport Pacific until 2032. He stated that he is pleased with the project and is very pleased that the outdoor lighting will be changed, but stated that he would like to see the fence between Tolovana Inn Building 3 and Mo's remain to prevent foot traffic from accessing the beach at this location.

Jim McDonald, Manager of Tolovana Inn, PO Box 24, Banks, OR, stated that he has been maintaining the fence for many years, and recommends that the fence be retained for safety reasons. Mr. McDonald said that he would prefer that the fence be constructed from a non-combustible material.

Johnson asked for testimony from opponents. There was none.

Johnson asked for additional staff response. There was none.

In his final statement, Mr. Vonada said that the fence could be retained. Lundy stated that she could not support a cyclone fence. In response to a request by Fraser, Vonada reviewed the existing fence location and gate. Pearce suggested constructing the fence of wrought iron. Fraser asked for a code determination regarding the fence and gate. Brien said that the fence should not impede fire access, but would require a site visit for that determination. Fraser asked if a gate is needed. Vonada said that maintaining a gate would be desirable. Mr. Devereaux said that

the gate had been replaced many times. Deveraux said that the gate should be maintained, because the buildings are constructed to the edge of the riprap. Pearce asked the applicant and the HOA representatives if a wrought iron fence is acceptable. Vonada said that he would prefer to install a cedar sided fence.

Chair Johnson closed the public hearing.

Consideration of DRB 11-09

Motion: Fraser moved to approve the site plan; Lundy seconded the motion.

Vote: Fraser, Johnson, and Lundy voted AYE; Pearce voted no. The vote was 3/1 in favor and the motion passed.

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

Amended: Pearce moved to amend the motion to approve the architectural plan subject to constructing a fence and gate between Mo's and Condominium Building 3, in wrought iron or other material that does not have to be maintained; Fraser seconded the motion.

Fraser said that he is open to the fence being constructed of wrought iron or wood, or an upgraded existing fence.

Vote: Fraser and Pearce voted AYE; Johnson and Lundy voted no. The vote was 2/2 the motion failed.

Johnson called for the question to approve the architectural plan as submitted.

Vote: Fraser, Johnson, Lundy and Pearce voted AYE; the vote was 4/0 in favor and the motion passed.

Bartl clarified that the fence between Mo's and Condominium Building 3 will remain. The Board agreed.

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

Vote: Fraser, Johnson, Lundy and Pearce voted AYE; the vote was 4/0 in favor and the motion passed.

(3) Public Hearing and Consideration of DRB 11-10, Modifications to Unit #6, Sea Colony Condominiums, 3751 South Hemlock 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 Johnson and Pearce indicated that they had visited the site.

Bartl summarized the staff report. Regarding the applicable criteria, Bartl stated that site development criteria is not applicable; architectural criteria E, F, K, and L not are applicable; and landscape criteria E, H, J, and L are not applicable.

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

Johnson stated that the pertinent criteria to be considered are noted in the staff reports and listed on the criteria sheets next to the west door; testimony, arguments and evidence must be directed toward that criterion or other criteria in the Comprehensive Plan or Municipal Code which the person testifying believes to apply to the

decision; failure to raise an issue accompanied by statements or evidence sufficient to afford the decision maker and the parties an opportunity to respond to the issue precludes appeal based on that issue; prior to the conclusion of the initial evidentiary hearing, any participant may request an opportunity to present additional testimony, arguments or evidence regarding the application. The Design Review Board shall grant such requests by continuing the public hearing or leaving the record open for additional written testimony, arguments or evidence; persons who testify shall first receive recognition from the chair, state their full name and mailing address, and if appearing in a representative capacity, identify whom they represent.

Johnson asked for testimony from the applicant.

David Vonada, Tolovana Architects, PO Box 648, Tolovana Park, OR 97145, reviewed the proposed enclosure of the original roofed porch. A new wall and windows are proposed, and the materials will match the existing materials. Two skylights will be added. Lundy asked if other units will be similarly remodeled.

Richard Fraser, PO Box 1114, Cannon Beach, OR 97110, owner, responded to Lundy's question, stating that the project has been reviewed by the Homeowner's Association. If the Design Review Board approves this application, this project will be the template for future proposed projects at the condominiums.

In response to a question by Fraser, Bartl stated that the building footprint has not changed, therefore the site criteria are not applicable.

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 11-10

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

Vote: Johnson, Lundy and Pearce voted AYE; Fraser voted no. The vote was 3/1 in favor and the motion passed.

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

Vote: Johnson, Lundy, Fraser and Pearce voted AYE; the vote was 4/0 in favor and the motion passed.

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

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

Vote: Fraser, Johnson, Lundy and Pearce voted AYE; the vote was 4/0 in favor and the motion passed.

(5) Staff Reports

Pursuant to a request by Fraser at the last meeting, Bartl reported that he and Johnson had reviewed the recently installed Hallmark signs to determine if they conformed to the plans that the Board had approved. Bartl stated that he and Johnson visited the sites with the color chips, the colors on the signs were a match. He also noted that the S. Hemlock Street sign had the wood texture that was part of the Board's approval. Johnson said that he could not see any significant difference in the colors approved and installed. Johnson also stated that the texture does exist on the Sandcastle Inn sign, but one must be close to the sign to see the texture.

The potential meeting date of September 29th was discussed. The consensus of the Board was that the September 29th date would be acceptable.

Fraser asked if the canvas sign at the Purple Pelican is permitted. Bartl stated that it is a temporary sign and meets the square footage requirement.

(6) Good of the Order

None

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Johnson adjourned the meeting at 7:15 p.m.

Stephanie McGuire, Administrative Assistant

Minutes of the
CANNON BEACH DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
September 29, 2011
Council Chambers

Present: Chair Hank Johnson, Board Members John Fraser, Sandi Lundy, and Jenee Pearce

Excused: Tom Ayres and Tim Krupa

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: Pearce moved to approve the agenda; Fraser seconded the motion.

Vote: Fraser, Johnson, Lundy, and Pearce 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 August 18, 2011.

Motion: Pearce moved to approve the minutes of August 18, 2011. Fraser seconded the motion.

Vote: Fraser, Johnson, Lundy, and Pearce voted AYE. The vote was 4/0 in favor and the motion passed.

(2) Public Hearing and Consideration of DRB 11-11, Application for Modifications to the Warren House Pub, 3301 South Hemlock 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 that they had visited the site.

Bartl summarized the staff report. Regarding the applicable criteria, Bartl stated that site development criteria C, D and E are not applicable; architectural criteria E, F, K and L are not applicable; and landscape criteria E, H, J and L are not applicable.

Johnson asked if any additional correspondence had been received. Correspondence from the LaBrash family, 124 Fernwood, Cannon Beach, was noted.

Johnson stated that the pertinent criteria to be considered are noted in the staff reports and listed on the criteria sheets next to the west door; testimony, arguments and evidence must be directed toward that criterion or other criteria in the Comprehensive Plan or Municipal Code which the person testifying believes to apply to the decision; failure to raise an issue accompanied by statements or evidence sufficient to afford the decision maker and the parties an opportunity to respond to the issue precludes appeal based on that issue; prior to the conclusion of the initial evidentiary hearing, any participant may request an opportunity to present additional testimony, arguments or evidence regarding the application. The Design Review Board shall grant such requests by continuing the public hearing or leaving the record open for additional written testimony, arguments or evidence; persons who testify shall first receive recognition from the chair, state their full name and mailing address, and if appearing in a representative capacity, identify whom they represent.

Johnson asked for testimony from the applicant.

David Vonada, Tolovana Architects, PO Box 648, Tolovana Park, OR 97145, reviewed the site plan and clarified the location of the building addition and explained that the siding and appearance would match the existing cedar

sided building. A trash enclosure will be added to the project. Improvements will be made on the east property line, including the parking lot and landscape improvements. Two additional parking spaces will be added. Fraser asked for clarification regarding the ADA parking. Vonada stated that the ADA access ramp will remain the same, but the parking space will shift slightly to the east. In response to a question by Pearce, Vonada explained the landscape plan, noting that some existing plants will be retained and replanted.

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 11-11

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

Vote: Fraser, Johnson, Lundy and Pearce voted AYE; the vote was 4/0 in favor and the motion passed.

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

Vote: Fraser, Johnson, Lundy and Pearce voted AYE; the vote was 4/0 in favor and the motion passed.

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

Vote: Fraser, Johnson, Lundy and Pearce voted AYE; the vote was 4/0 in favor and the motion passed.

(3) Public Hearing and Consideration of DRB 11-12, Application for Modifications to the Hallmark Inn, 1400 South Hemlock 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 that they had visited the site.

Bartl summarized the staff report. Regarding the applicable criteria, Bartl stated that site development criteria are not applicable; architectural criteria B, G, H, I, J, K, L and O are not applicable; and landscape criteria are not applicable.

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

Johnson stated that the pertinent criteria to be considered are noted in the staff reports and listed on the criteria sheets next to the west door; testimony, arguments and evidence must be directed toward that criterion or other criteria in the Comprehensive Plan or Municipal Code which the person testifying believes to apply to the decision; failure to raise an issue accompanied by statements or evidence sufficient to afford the decision maker and the parties an opportunity to respond to the issue precludes appeal based on that issue; prior to the conclusion of the initial evidentiary hearing, any participant may request an opportunity to present additional testimony, arguments or evidence regarding the application. The Design Review Board shall grant such requests by continuing the public hearing or leaving the record open for additional written testimony, arguments or evidence; persons who testify shall first receive recognition from the chair, state their full name and mailing address, and if

appearing in a representative capacity, identify whom they represent.

Johnson asked for testimony from the applicant.

David Vonada, Tolovana Architects, PO Box 648, Tolovana Park, OR 97145, stated that the scope of the project includes replacing all balcony railings at the site, including bringing the height of the balcony railing into compliance with the current Building Code. Vonada described the changes proposed for the exterior access corridors, including the proposed materials for the rail material and wainscoting. In response to a question by Johnson, Vonada stated that the wood rail material would weather into a silver grey color. The wainscoting will be *Hardipanel* that will be stained a light tan color. The refuse containers will be integrated into the room access covered walkways and the wainscoting. Vonada provided color chips to illustrate the colors that the building exterior will be stained; noting that to provide visual interest, the body of the building and the support columns will be stained different colors. The body of the building will be stained "*Covered Bridge*," the lighter of the two colors. The other color, "river wood," will be a color blend called out as *ST-2*. Johnson asked if the proposed cable railing system complied with the Building Code. Vonada replied that it did. Pearce complimented Vonada on the project. Pearce and Lundy said that they have cable railing systems at their homes and like them very much.

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 11-12

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

Vote: Fraser, Johnson, Lundy and Pearce voted AYE; the vote was 4/0 in favor and the motion passed.

(4) Consideration of FS 11-05, Freestanding Sign, Acupuncture and Natural Medicine, 1355 South Hemlock Street.

Bartl presented the staff report, noting that the sign has been installed and it meets the sign standards in terms of height and area.

Johnson asked for a presentation from the applicant.

Genevieve Johnson, PO Box 1292, Cannon Beach, OR 97110, owner of the Acupuncture and Natural Medicine clinic, presented the sign, including its design and colors.

Motion: Fraser moved to approve the sign as presented; Pearce seconded the motion.

Vote: Fraser, Johnson, Lundy and Pearce voted AYE; the vote was 4/0 in favor and the motion passed.

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

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

Vote: Fraser, Johnson, Lundy and Pearce voted AYE; the vote was 4/0 in favor and the motion passed.

(6) Staff Reports

Bartl stated that the November meeting date would be November 10, 2011.

(7) Good of the Order

Fraser distributed renderings of the signage for the *Sand Castle Inn* depicting the sign drawing from the application and the actual sign installed. Fraser stated that he had listened to the audio recordings of the meeting, and that he, Lundy, and Ayres specifically requested that the sign show wood texture. Fraser thought that the installed sign did not have any wood texture. Johnson said that he had looked at the sign and had made the determination that the installed sign met the intent of the Design Review Board action.

Johnson asked about the wrecked cars at the “Sports Park” site. Bartl said that he thought the cars were for a Fire District extrication drill. He said that staff will investigate the matter and email the Design Review Board members with the information.

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Johnson adjourned the meeting at 6:38 p.m.

Stephanie McGuire, Administrative Assistant

Minutes of the
CANNON BEACH DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
November 10, 2011
Council Chambers

Present: Chair Hank Johnson, Board Members John Fraser, Tim Krupa, Sandi Lundy, and Jenee Pearce

Excused: Tom Ayres

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: Pearce moved to approve the agenda; Fraser seconded the motion.

Vote: Fraser, Johnson, Lundy, and Pearce 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 September 29, 2011.

Fraser requested the following amendment to the minutes: Page 4, Good of the Order, "Fraser thought that the installed sign did not have *any* wood texture."

Motion: Pearce moved to approve the minutes of September 29, 2011, as amended. Fraser seconded the motion.

Vote: Fraser, Johnson, Lundy, and Pearce voted AYE. The vote was 4/0 in favor and the motion passed.

Krupa arrived at 5:59 p.m.

(2) Consideration of FS 11-06, Freestanding Sign, The Wayside Inn, 3339 South Hemlock Street.

Bartl presented the staff report, noting that the sign meets the sign standards in terms of height and area.

Johnson asked for a presentation from the applicant.

Nicole Bailey, Manager of The Wayside Inn, PO Box 1091, Cannon Beach, OR 97110, presented the sign, including its design and colors. In response to a question by Johnson, Bailey said that the proposed sign will replace the existing temporary sign. In response to a question by Lundy, Bailey said that the lettering will be raised 1/4". Bailey responded to a question by Fraser, stating that the sign would be constructed of MDO and the lettering would be formed using a router to add dimension. Fraser said that he prefers wood signs. Bartl explained that MDO is a type of plywood. Lundy asked why black was chosen for the sign color. Bailey said that the color scheme for the property at 3339 South Hemlock is black and off white, and that the color schemes for each of the properties owned by the company help to identify the properties.

Motion: Pearce moved to approve the sign as presented; Lundy seconded the motion.

Vote: Johnson, Krupa, Lundy and Pearce voted AYE. Fraser voted No; the vote was 4/1 in favor and the motion passed.

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

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

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

(4) Staff Reports

Bartl stated that the December meeting date would be December 8, 2011. Bartl announced that Bill Bennett has been appointed to the Design Review Board, and that his term will begin in January 2012.

(5) Good of the Order

None

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Johnson adjourned the meeting at 6:07 p.m.

Stephanie McGuire, Administrative Assistant

Minutes of the
CANNON BEACH DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
December 8, 2011
Council Chambers

Present: Vice Chair Tim Krupa, Board Members Tom Ayres, John Fraser, and Sandi Lundy

Excused: Chair Hank Johnson, and Jenee Pearce

Staff: City Planner Rainmar Bartl

CALL TO ORDER AND APPROVAL OF AGENDA.

Vice Chair Krupa called the meeting to order at 6:00 pm.

Motion: Lundy moved to approve the agenda; Fraser seconded the motion.

Vote: Ayres, Fraser, Lundy, and Krupa 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 November 10, 2011.

Motion: Fraser moved to approve the minutes of November 10, 2011 as presented; Lundy seconded the motion.

Vote: Fraser, Lundy, and Krupa voted AYE, Ayers abstained, he was not in attendance at the meeting. The vote was 3/0 in favor and the motion passed.

(2) Consideration of FS 11-06, Freestanding Sign, Providence Clinic, Modifications to an Existing Freestanding Sign, 172 N. Hemlock Street

Bartl presented the staff report, noting that the proposed modifications to the freestanding sign meet standards in terms of height and total sign area.

Krupa asked for a presentation from the applicant.

David Vonada, Tolovana Architects, PO Box 648, Tolovana Park, OR 97145, Applicant, reviewed the elements of the proposed freestanding sign modifications. He noted it was part of a way finding sign program to direct people to the Providence Clinic on the west side of the Sandpiper Square building from Hemlock Street. The sign at the building entry is part of that program as well. For the sign program to work, it is important that all the signs use the uniform Providence colors. This is the reason the proposed sign does not match the colors used to identify the other business in the freestanding sign. In response to a question by Fraser, Vonada confirmed that the sign is made of wood that will be routed to create relief for the sign's letters.

Krupa stated that the colors of the Providence sign placed on the building do not match those shown on the submittal for the freestanding sign. Vonada stated that this is an issue with the color reproduction of the sign in the Board's packet. The colors will in fact match; the colors used will be those of the Providence identity program.

There were no other presentations or questions.

Motion: Fraser moved to approve the proposal as presented; Ayres seconded the motion.

Krupa stated his concern that the proposed Providence Clinic portion of the freestanding sign does not match the colors used for the other businesses listed in the freestanding sign. In addition, the dimensions of the Providence

Clinic sign do not match that of the other businesses listed. As a result the sign does not create a harmonious appearance. Ayres stated that he understood Krupa's concerns, but in this case, because the nature of the use, a medical clinic, it is important that the sign is readily visible and can be distinguished from the other signs through the use of the Providence colors. Lundy agreed with Ayres comments.

Krupa recognized Eric Waller, representing the Providence Clinic. Mr. Waller stated that the colors to be used are the trademark Providence colors. He showed Board members his badge to illustrate the true colors that will be used. He stated that when signage is used in conjunction with a Providence facility, Providence's policy is to always utilize the trademark colors. Use of the trademark colors is important to establish that the Cannon Beach Clinic is part of the Providence system.

Amended: Fraser moved to approve the proposal, subject to the Providence Clinic sign colors utilizing true trademark colors, as depicted in the employee identification badge; Ayres seconded the motion.

Vote: Fraser, Lundy, and Ayres voted AYE, Krupa voted NO. The vote was 3/1 in favor and the motion passed.

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

Motion: Fraser moved to authorize the Chair to sign the appropriate order; Lundy seconded the motion.

Vote: Fraser, Lundy, Ayres and Krupa voted YES. The vote was 4/0 in favor and the motion passed.

(4) Staff Reports

Bartl and other Board members thanked Krupa for his service on the Board.

(5) Good of the Order

Krupa indicated that there a number of signs that exceeded the maximum letter height of twelve inches. Bartl asked Krupa to provide him with a list and he will investigate.

ADJOURNMENT

Krupa adjourned the meeting at 6:24 p.m.

Rainmar Bartl, City Planner