



Date 20 April 2022
Subject Cannon Beach Community Development Ordinance (CDO) Audit Project
Breakout **Online Members of the Joint Working Group**

Notes from Joint Session #3

Group 1

1. In ten years time, what would you want to make sure remains a part of the village?

- Retain historic cottages
- No commercial chain establishments
- Retain gravel streets because it's part of the community character and it reduces traffic speeds
- Retain and enhance existing pedestrian orientation
- Expand forest preserve
- Trees, retain as many trees as possible, update the tree ordinance, (Lake Forest Park, WA, as an example), shouldn't be at the discretion of the City Planner

2. In ten years time, what currently doesn't exist that you would like to see in the village?

- More walkable, bikeable community, by increasing trails and connectivity of trails, especially a north to south connection, getting through the S-Curves, past Haystack
- New Ecola Park access to move traffic off of Ecola Park Road; close the existing access to Ecola Park with a more direct connection with the highway (it was recognized this would cost a considerable amount).
- Long discussion over how Cannon Beach community has changed since the sixties through the eighties and how that economic model, which thrived as an artist collective is gone and will not return; feeling that a new model must be found
- Reverse the change in community character that has taken Cannon Beach from low-key beach community to wealthier 2nd home and resort atmosphere.
- More support for the arts, including housing, by building more affordable housing, incentivizing ADUs and other affordable housing

- More affordable housing in general
- Provide more pathway connections
- Retain more trees; existing tree ordinance is too subjective, staff has too much discretion, and it's ineffective
- Clear and objective criteria for land use applications (from a DRB member)
- ADU incentives should be provided for long-term rentals
- Underground utilities

3. Discuss the tools you currently have for architectural controls:

17.90.065 Architectural design elements.

All single-family dwellings, modular housing and manufactured homes located in the RVL, RL, R1, R2, RAM, R3, RM, and C1 zones shall utilize at least two of the following architectural features: dormers; more than two gables; recessed entries; covered porch/entry; bay window; building off-set; deck with railing or planters and benches; or a garage, carport or other accessory structure. (Ord. 94-5 § 11)

Issue for discussion: Given your vision for the village, (and the survey results) is this criteria working?

- No more oversized houses. The group was divided about whether this should apply citywide or in certain areas
- Establish a building height limit along the ocean front. The group was divided on this issue as well, with split over those thinking it would be too big of a fight for the return, i.e., it would affect very few properties; others felt it affects walkability of town, with looming houses along ocean, blocking views
- More discussion regarding height limit: One member emphasized that the number one survey response was limiting size and that would stop this from happening; others felt that 'ship had sailed' and FAR and Lot Coverage, with more definition around applicable architectural features, would offer more nuanced control and achieve the same results, especially after the passage of the lot combination ordinance
- In general, consider FAR, lot coverage, building envelopes, and/or similar techniques to encourage housing that's consistent with community character
- Eliminate or significantly reduce downtown parking requirements
- Consider downtown density and residential density bonuses tied to affordable/workforce housing, and long-term rental or deed restrictions
- Allow reduced parking requirements for affordable housing
- Need for 'clear and objective' standards for DRB is needed
- One home was provided as a perfect example of how architectural or design features influence the street frontage or curb appeal of the residential character

Group 2

1. In ten years time, what would you want to make sure remains a part of the village?

- Maintain the city's green boundary
- Maintain lower heights where they are today; don't allow higher; avoid what happened in Seaside
- High level of concern about loss of trees; need to slow or stop the loss; there is a perception that tree removal protections are not being enforced
- Replace trees on site when trees are removed
- No or minimum curbs or sidewalks; retain gravel roads
- Retain informal beach access
- Modest homes, no McMansions; stop house sizes growing; not allowing lot combining anymore is good and part of the answer
- Small scale is good but depends on where you are; maybe .4 or .5 FAR (floor area ratio), but it's a complicated issue: Haystack Heights for example is already big, and if we want to attract families we need to allow bigger houses
- Keep downtown commercial buildings as shingled architecture
- Preserve the older inventory of houses
- Allow village character we've had "in the past" (from one who acknowledged they filled out the survey differently from the majority)

2. In ten years time, what currently doesn't exist that you would like to see in the village?

- Need a protective designation for older homes that would encourage people to maintain them as is, with rules for renovation in exchange for tax break
- Incentives for affordable housing and workforce housing, above and beyond ADUs
- Inventory wetlands to see if city could take over some and protect as natural and educational resources
- Allow duplexes in Haystack Heights
- Workforce housing, affordable housing
- More flexibility in allowing apartments
- It would be helpful to know how many affordable units are needed
- A standard size swimming pool
- A solution for parking, and agreement about how to solve the problems caused by parking requirements (i.e., small sites being forced to provide parking on-site); understands can't solve completely but resolve to understand the issues and address them
- Maybe the parking solution for downtown should include remote parking solution (shuttles)
- Trees and more trees

- Eliminate construction in wetlands; there is a perception that limitations and protections have been violated
- More controls over tear downs; need to have criteria that must be met before structures can be torn down

A village which is not populated by second homes that are commercial properties; that is not a "village"

- More pedestrian friendly downtown, including no-car street(s)
- A complete trails system that is totally walkable; one has been started but not finished; it needs real connections, not dangerous strips along busy streets and highways
- A local aesthetic that is so recognizable and strong that people who build here adapt to it and "build what is here," especially when they see what has been accomplished

3. Discuss the tools you currently have for architectural controls:

17.90.065 Architectural design elements.

All single-family dwellings, modular housing and manufactured homes located in the RVL, RL, R1, R2, RAM, R3, RM, and C1 zones shall utilize at least two of the following architectural features: dormers; more than two gables; recessed entries; covered porch/entry; bay window; building off-set; deck with railing or planters and benches; or a garage, carport or other accessory structure. (Ord. 94-5 § 11)

Issue for discussion: Given your vision for the village, (and the survey results) is this criteria working?

- The current provisions are not sufficient; they would allow a big box with a dormer
- There has been talk on the DRB for some time that many more prescriptive standards are needed
- The DRB has discussed things like an "anti-snothouse" ordinance; requiring things like pitched roofs and porches
- The size of a structure has something to do with this discussion but it's not clear where the threshold is; for example, small houses that don't have the architectural design elements are not as bad as big houses that don't, therefore maybe big houses need more requirements?
- When a yard is replaced with hard surface it has a negative effect on village character
- Concerns about the state requirements for clear and objective standards for needed housing; how far does it go, do places like Cannon Beach have latitude to address their unique issues
- Do larger structures require more design review and would the state rule prevent a municipality from establishing a threshold
- Concern that clear and objective standards are not as effective as design review; that they may be too prescriptive and not allow creative approaches
- Need more information about the state's requirement, would like to read the legislation and understand the history