

CITY OF CASCADE LOCKS PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA

Thursday, September 13th, 2012 at 7:00 PM
City Hall

1. Call Meeting to Order
2. Commissioners Notes and Objections
3. Declaration of Conflict of Interest or Ex-Parte
4. Approval of Minutes
 - a. July 26th, 2012
5. Old Business
 - a. Discuss Amending Chapter 8-6.108 of the CDC regarding potential parking in the Downtown Area
 - b. Discuss Amending Section 8-6.24.025 of the CDC regarding a Pre-application Applicant Sponsored Meeting
 - c. Planning Commission Tracking Sheet for Code & Comp Plan Amendments
6. New Business
 - a. Report on possible grant application for code amendment work through DLCD
 - b. Discuss the proposal of changing the process of the Architectural Review Process
 - c. Discuss food carts, outside displays and temporary external working space
 - d. Discuss the adoption of the new Trail Plan and incorporating recommendations into our comprehensive plan as a consideration for pedestrian access and connectivity.
 - e. Schedule next meeting
7. Adjournment

(

(

(

I. CALL TO ORDER/PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chairman Bob Walker called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. Planning Commissioner Chair Bob Walker, Planning Commission Member's Larry Cramblett, Rob Brostoff, Nancy Renault and Deanna Busdieker were present. Also present were City Planner Stan Foster, City Recorder Kathy Woosley, Deputy City Recorder Megan Webb, Camera Operator Betty Rush, Chuck Daughtry, Holly Howell, Kim Brigham, Kathryn Brigham, Bob Schatz, Joeine Caldwell, Samantha Vercheron, and Arni Kononen.

II. COMMISSIONERS NOTES AND OBJECTIONS

PCC Walker went over the rules and guidelines for conducting a City of Cascade Locks Planning Commission Meeting. There were no other notes or objections.

III. DECLARATION OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST AND EX-PARTE

PCC Walker stated that he had known the applicants family forever, since they've been in Cascade Locks. PCM Cramblett stated that he's also know the family for years, and has taught one the family members but has no connections with anything regarding finances.

IV. Approval of June 9, 2011 Planning Commission minutes

MOTION: PCM Brostoff moved, seconded by PCM Busdieker, to approve the Planning Commission minutes for June 9, 2011. The motion passed unanimously.

V. OLD BUSINESS

A. Rules of Conduct for Commissioners

PCC Walker covered those rules in his opening notes.

B. RULES OF CONDUCTING A PUBLIC HEARING

PCC Walker covered those rules in his opening notes.

VI. NEW BUSINESS

A. Electing a Planning Commission Chair

PCC Walker stated that the Planning Commission Chair is a one year position and asked for any nominations. PCM Cramblett nominated Bob Walker to continue as Chair, seconded by PCM Busdieker. PCM's Brostoff and Renault voted in favor. PCC Walker abstained.

B. Electing a Planning Commission Vice-Chair

PCC Walker nominated Larry Cramblett to be the PC Vice-Chair, seconded by PCM Busdieker. The nomination was passed unanimously.

C. Public Hearing on LU 12-002 Brigham Fish Market.

PCC Walker asked PC Foster if this LU Case has had lawful notice and Staff advised that it had. PCC Walker opened the hearing at 7:06 p.m. PCC Walker asked if there was anyone that would object to the jurisdiction of this commission to hear this matter, there were no objections. He also read the hearing statement establishing the rules.

Staff Report

Stan Foster introduced himself as the planning consultant for the City of Cascade Locks. He stated that we have received the application from the Brigham family, and that he has determined that it was

complete on June 20th. He said he has reviewed that application to make sure of its compliance with the codes and ordinances of the city. He also stated that this is a lawful use for this property and in terms of land use matters, there are really only the architectural review aspects to insure that the proposed development will meet the criteria of the City Development Code. He said he has reviewed the individual elements of the architectural review criteria and has determined that it does meet the requirements of the city. He also stated that he has outlined each of those in his staff report and the applicant will speak to the design of this proposal. Planning Consultant Foster recommended that this proposal be approved.

PCM Busdieker asked if the location of the proposal was on the other side of the ravine from the Best Western and Planning Consultant Foster said that was correct. PCM Cramblett questioned the proposal meeting the Downtown Plan and wanted to confirm that the downtown standard was revisited and that we were no longer following the look from 1972. PC Foster assured the commission members that he was following the most current code. PCM Cramblett and PCC Walker commended PC Foster on the staff report, stating that it was very well written and well in depth.

Applicant Testimony: Bob Schatz, Allusa Architecture, Kim Brigham, applicant.

Mr. Schatz stated that the plan was to build a 2000 sq ft, 1 story building for selling fish, with the back half of the market for storing, processing and smoking fish. He said the front of the building will be for the sale of fish. He said he has made the design to have a front porch area, with the idea of doing this because they are situated so close to the street. Mr. Schatz provided a color and larger scale drawing of the building for the commissioners, and explained the different design aspects of the building. He stated that the code requirements are met with the type of siding and the color, and the steeply pitched roof. He said the building is not exactly 1920's craftsman but does have the feel of that as well as the feeling of the Pacific Northwest. He described the arch on the front of the building displaying the name, Brigham Fish, and will be built to resemble the Bridge of the Gods. He said the sides of the arch are stone columns. He said there will be steel sculptures of salmon made to look patina on each of the columns as well as another salmon sculpture at the very top of the roof above the arch. He said the railings along the front of the building will either be a fish hook design or a Pendleton blanket pattern design. PCM Cramblett stated that he would be concerned about that safety of the sharp edges on the fish hook design. Mr. Schatz stated that they would make sure there would be no sharp edges. He described the front of the building including siding to mimic fish scales made of hardy board and painted brown. He said due to expense the siding, on the sides and back of the building it will be lap siding, which is a traditional siding, made out of the same hardy board and painted the same color. He said the roof will be made out of architectural grade composition roof shingles. He also stated that he has included some design around the eaves of the building as well.

Mr. Schatz said he has been working with the Port of Cascade Locks regarding the access and parking. He said they would like to have a walk way in the front of the building and parking in the rear. He said in working with the Port, they will be sharing the driveway with the lot right next door. He stated that they will be making a 24' wide driveway that will include 12 feet on their property and 12 feet on property next door. He stated that this also allows for their property to have potential for a future development. PC Foster asked Mr. Schatz to explain how they would be leaving the site that would be retained for future development. Mr. Schatz stated that they had planned to leave it as is, adding a curb were it meets the driveway. PCM Cramblett mentioned in the site plan that they had put that it would be a "landscaped area for future development", and asked if it would be landscaped. Mr. Schatz stated that there is not a plan to landscape it and that it already has plants on it. PCM Cramblett said he was concerned that they were building a nice new building and that maybe they would go beyond, even if it was some rock or something easy to upkeep.

PCC Walker asked Kim Brigham about the deliveries and where they would be made. She stated that they would be made at the back of the building. PCM Brostoff asked the applicant about the parking area in the back of the property as he noticed that it wraps around an embankment and the parking area butts right up to the embankment. He asked if there was a berm or anything to stop cars from driving over the embankment. Also he asked for confirmation on the distance of the 23 ft from the back of the building to parking spot 4. He asked if it was to the back of the car or to the back of the spot. Mr. Schatz answered that the 23 feet is to the back of the parking spot, he also stated that spot 4 is the shortest distance. He said spots 5, 6 and 7 have more distance. Mr. Schatz also stated that on the site map there are two lines showing the embankment, one is the top of the bank and one is a 50 foot buffer. He stated that these lines were done by a surveyor. He stated the difference is that the buffer is from some sort of an environmental or water zone below the bank and the other is the top of the bank and they have to stay away from both. He stated that there will be a curb around the parking lot. PCM Busdieker asked the applicant what would happen when an RV tried to park in the rear parking lot. Mr. Schatz stated that there will be parking along the curb. PCM Busdieker asked how they planned to let them know that there is parking along the curb. Mr. Schatz stated that he supposed they could put up a sign but because of the hammer head design of the parking lot they would be able to move around.

Mr. Schatz mentioned that the interior design of the building has changed a bit, moving the door that was on the side of the building to the back. PCM Cramblett noticed that they took one bathroom away leaving one remaining. Mr. Schatz stated that when future development happens, moving the door to the rear will make it easier to accept deliveries.

PCM Cramblett asked the applicants about the counter surfaces. Kim Brigham stated that they will have stainless steel tops as required. PCM Cramblett also asked how the applicants will be dealing with the waste from fish. Kathryn Brigham stated that they will be requiring the fish be delivered to them already cleaned and gutted to cut down on their waste.

PCM Busdieker asked the applicants what kind of volume they were planning on. Kathryn Brigham stated that at first they will be dealing with their family but plan to buy from other fisherman in the future. PCM Busdieker also asked about what kind of odor will the processing create. Kathryn Brigham stated that they have looked into the smoker that they will be purchasing and that they have a letter from them stating that there will be very little odor from the smoking process. PCM Brostoff asked if the smoking process would be done at the Market. Mr. Schatz stated that yes it would be done there. Kathryn Brigham stated that they would be purchasing a modern smoker that eliminates some of the smoke going into the air. PCM Cramblett asked PC Foster if we needed to be concerned about the odor from processing. PC Foster stated there is not, and compared it to the Eastwind grilling burgers and the odor of the smoke coming from them. He said some people like the smell of smoked fish and may attract people to stop, some will not. PCC Walker asked if there would still be folks selling fish in the different locations, or would they all be selling at the Market. Kathryn Brigham stated that they would primarily be focusing on their family and if they were to buy fish from other suppliers they would have to meet the Market's standards.

PCM Cramblett asked if the tribes had any set standards. Kathryn Brigham stated that right now the tribes have not set any rules other than they have to be fresh quality fish for over the bank sales. She said they have provided pamphlets for potential buyers on how to check for fresh quality fish. PCM Cramblett asked if the tribes were regulated by Hood River County Health Dept. Kathryn Brigham stated that no they are not regulated, however in Washington, the health inspector does come out to inspect their locations. PC Foster stated that if they were to be selling processed food on site, they would be regulated like any other restaurants. PCM Cramblett confirmed that as a fish market they would not be regulated. Kathryn Brigham stated that they would be following all of the Hazard Analysis and Critical Control Point (HACCP) requirements so that in the future they might sell to restaurants. PCM Brostoff asked if the smoked fish would fall under the requirements of the health department. Kathryn Brigham

stated that they would be developing a HACCP standard for that. PCC Walker asked if there were any other questions, there were none.

Proponents: Samantha Vercheron stated she would like to defer. Joeline Caldwell stated that she was a Port Commissioner, and as a commissioner, she would like to show her support. She said she was representing the commission as a whole, stating they believe that this is an outstanding business to bring into Cascade Locks. She stated that she can't think of any other business that is more significant than this to bring here. She said she believes this will bring in a lot of people and will be a good business.

Mr. Daughtry stated that he is the General Manager for the Port of Cascade Locks, and was here to show support for the Brigham Fish Market. He said he believes this is a perfect fit for Cascade Locks. He also stated that Commissioner President Groves would have been here tonight had there not been a joint Economic Development meeting at the pavilion. He said Port Commissioner Groves and his wife are very supportive of the Fish Market. He said the Port has good relations with CRITFC (Columbia River Inter Tribal Fish Commission), and with talking to them initially about this proposal, were told the Port had the right family for this. Mr. Daughtry said regarding health regulations, the applicants would be providing what is called a trusted source. He stated the applicant will be adding value to the fish by being able to sell it cleaned and filleted, with that value going back to the tribal community.

Mr. Daughtry stated there is need as for flexibility in the CDC to be able to bring in development. He stated that the landscaped area in this plan is larger than the building, and there shouldn't be big areas along WaNaPa that are full of bark dust, gravel and dirt. He said those spaces should be filled up with cash register oriented business. He stated that the applicants are meeting the code and that they don't want to change any of the plans, however, suggested that we look at this applicants property in the future and allow them to develop this property in a way that would maximize the economic benefits in the community. He said this could include off street parking, as well as potentially using the landscaped area as an loading/unloading area. Mr. Daughtry also said the Port is working with ODOT on the access to this property and that they are also working on plans to develop the rest of the property.

Opponent: None.

PCC Walker closed the public hearing for LU 12-002 at 7:42pm.

PCM Brostoff moved for approval with a second from PCM Renault. The motion was passed unanimously.

Staff Response: PC Foster clarified to the applicants that there will be a 14 day appeal period. He said that will be 14 calendar days from today.

Reports:

PC Foster wanted to discuss some things he has been asked to review. He said one of them is the downtown parking requirements. He said he would like to review the CDC to see if it could be amended to include taking credit for some of the on street parking. He also stated the ICA Koch would like a recommendation from the commission to possibly look at locating a municipal parking lot off of the street to address some of the parking requirements. He stated that the current applicants have met these parking requirements, but asked if this is the best use of the land by filling up the best views with parking spaces. He stated that he would like to begin working on this at the next meeting. PCC Walker stated that the commission has addressed parking concerns before and asked if this would be

considered a conditional use. PC Foster stated that right now it is a standard, so they would have to meet the standard and there is currently no ability to vary from the standard. PCC Walker asked what the requirements were right now. PC Foster stated that a 2000 sq ft building would require 7 spaces. He said when the space next to the Fish Market is developed, it would have to add another 7 parking spaces. PCC Walker asked if the parking could be addressed later when there are plans to develop the next space. Mr. Daughtry stated that when an applicant comes to town, they don't want to get a conditional use permit, they want to come in and meet the code. He stated that in discussions with CP Foster and CR Woosley that requirement flexibility was reviewed and determined that certain areas in town could be used for community parking. He stated his concern with losing the best views of the property to parking spaces.

Mr. Daughtry stated that the Port is starting conceptual designs with the Park View property and are running into problems with how much parking they have to provide on that site. PCM Brostoff asked about parking on the south or north side of WaNaPa to keep the views. He also asked what properties were being considered for a municipal parking lot. PC Foster stated that currently there is a parking lot at the mall area that Mr. Daughtry has been interested in potentially making into a municipal parking lot and there is also the bank area that could be removed to expand. PC Foster also stated that if expanded it could be used as a private and municipal parking lot. He stated that there would be a certain amount of spaces assigned for downtown parking that properties could take credit for parking spaces.

PC Foster stated that with the focus on the emphasis of Cascade Locks being a pedestrian, bike and hike hub, we really want to shift the focus from driving down Highway 30 to parking and being pedestrian focused. PCM Brostoff asked if PC Foster was considering one large parking lot or several small areas through out town. PC Foster stated that there were others in town that have been thinking about this longer then he has and that he is looking at helping get this mechanism into the CDC. He stated that his main concern would be the downtown area initially but there are some other areas that could be reviewed. PCM Cramblett asked that if we were to go forward with the downtown parking, would that eliminate parking in the rear of the business. PC Foster stated that with the exception of a handicap parking space, all business have to comply with the federal regulations. He stated if credit could have been given for three parking spots on the street, three spots could have been eliminated in the back. He stated that the code is not too far out of balance but need to get creative to use land to the best advantage long term for the citizens, which would not be a parking lot. PCM Brostoff raised some concern about the busy intersection at the parking lot of the mall, the parking lot of the post office, and the cross walk and what that would add if made into a municipal parking lot. PCC Walker asked if PC Foster needed commission direction to go forward and work on the code. PC Foster stated that he would like to start working on this soon as it takes 120 days to work through the legislative process to amend the CDC. He also stated that because it is legislative we would have to get final approval from the council.

PC Foster stated that there is one other thing that needs to get taken care of right away. He stated that there is a code prevision that requires an applicant to hold a pre-application meeting with the community. He stated that this meeting can not be submitted in the record. PC Foster questioned whether or not that is truly legal. He recommended making this an advisory step and not mandatory to hold a pre-application community meeting. PCC Walker stated that this was a recommendation from Larry Epstein's report. PC Foster said that it's not a bad idea to have in the code, but should be changed so that it is not mandatory. He asked the commissioners to talk to their neighbors about parking ideas. PCC Walker asked if there was a consensus to have PC Foster work on researching these two items and bring back to the Planning Commission, there was a consensus.

CR Woosley asked the commissioners if they would like to continue meeting on the second Thursday of the month. The Planning Commission agreed that this would work for them. PCC Walker stated now that there is a City Planner he would like to start working on the "laundry list" of items that

the Planning Commission had started on before they discontinued their meetings. PC Foster said that if the commission could give him direction on these code issues, he could then draft potential language. He stated that he would like the commission to give him direction first on anything they would like him to work on. PCC Walker suggested September to start having regular meetings. CR Woosley advised the commission that the next meeting will be September 13th, 2012.

PCC Walker adjourned the meeting at 8:07pm.

Prepared by:

Approved:

Megan Webb
Deputy City Recorder

Bob Walker
Planning Commission Chairman

STAFF REPORT 2 of two

Date Prepared: September 12, 2012

For Planning Commission Meeting on: September 13,

2012

TO: Planning Commissioners

PREPARED BY: Stan Foster, Contract Planner

SUBJECT: Scheduling upcoming land-use hearing at the earliest possible date and a review of the, tracking sheet for Planning Commission discussion.

SYNOPSIS ONE: Staff is recommending that we consider scheduling our next public meeting/hearing earlier than our regular meeting. This will be a hearing on the proposed Jackson Coffee Shop and could be set for an earlier date, based on notification requirements to allow the applicant to engage in construction activity at the earliest possible time ahead of inclement weather.

Commission Options:

1. Approve the hearing at a earlier date, per Megan's recommendation
2. Deny the change and set the hearing at the regular time..

SYNOPSIS TWO: Staff has reviewed the tracking sheet and have outlined the issues which were identified by previous planners and the Planning Commission for deliberation and action. Those items which seem to be of interest but not included in the proposed scope of work provided in Staff Report #1 are as follows.

1. Action on Medium Density Residential (MDR) 6-10 homes per acre and High Density Residential (HDR) 10-20+ homes per acre. Staff is unaware of what the issue might be with these zones, the MDR zone would allow minimum lot sizes of 4,356 square feet and the HDR zone could allow for a minimum lot size of 2,178 square feet. There is 43,560 square feet in an acre.
2. Amendment of the Downtown Zone Plan façade remodel. Section 8-6.070.120 (C) of our code states that "No existing building within the zone shall be altered by construction, painting, remodeling, or other means in a manner inconsistent with there design standards." The code continues that building facades shall have Section 8-6.070.120 (J); 1. "ornamental devices; 2. Alcoves, porches, arcades, etc.; and 3. Traditional store front elements. Staff is

unsure of the issue which may be of concern to the Planning Commission and community, but this was identified as an issue to be addressed.

3. Transportation Systems Plan amendment. The City of Cascade Locks has a trail plan, a Transportation System Plan, and other plans which need to be incorporated by reference into our comprehensive plan to ensure that these documents are considered when considering a land-use request which may impact these resources. Staff would recommend that we review all other plans to incorporate a reference where appropriate to other existing plans which are part of the planning considerations of the city.

Commission Options:

1. Approve specific items for incorporation into our proposed work plan for this coming year with the recommendation going to City Council for approval.
2. Deny the inclusion of these items into our scope of work for the coming year.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

Staff has heard from the Port of Cascade Locks about the need to fast track the coffee shop request and is willing to act upon this request pending approval of the Planning Commission. Staff has reviewed the Planning Commission tracking sheet and has found three areas which are not discussed in the proposed scope of work provided in staff report number one and would like direction from the Planning Commissioners on how they would like to proceed.

Planning Commission Tracking Sheet
CODE & COMP PLAN Amendments

Agenda Item No 5c

#	Description	Reason	Initiated	Current Status
CA 09-01	Artisan foundries in a Commercial Zone as CU	Applicant request	Yes	Incorporated into Code Ordinance 399 March 2009
CA 09-02	Allow drive-throughs in Downtown Zone	Citizen Request	Yes	Incorporated into Code Ordinance 403 December 2009
CA 09-03	Require public meeting by developer before application	Andersen — Epstein rec.	Yes In April 09	Incorporated into Code Ordinance 405 in April 2010
CA 09-04	Off-site development scrutiny	Andersen — Epstein rec.	Yes In April 09	Traffic moved ahead separately as CA 10-01, Remainder pending to be Scheduled for discussion before Planning Commission
CA 09-05	Planned Developments	Andersen — Epstein rec.	Yes In April 09	Draft PD adopted by PC Nov. 15, 2010 Waiting to get on Council calendar
CA 09-06	De novo review	Andersen — Epstein rec.	Yes In 2008	Incorporated into Code in Sept. 2008 Ordinance 396
CA 09-07	MDR/HDR clarification	Council referred to PC in August 2008	Yes PC in April 09	Pending to be Scheduled for discussion before Planning Commission
CA 09-08	Mediation	Andersen — Epstein rec.	No	9/10/09-PC Decided to not initiate
CA 09-09	Eliminate parking standards in Downtown Zone	Citizen request	Yes In Sept. 09	Pending to be Scheduled for discussion before Planning Commission
CA 10-01	Traffic Impact Analysis	CA 09-04	Yes In April 09	Incorporated into Code Ordinance 408 November 2010
CA 10-02	Amendment of DT Plan Façade remodel	Council initiation	Yes on 11/8/10	TO BE SCHEDULED
COMP 10-01	Zone Change (done as part of LU 10-012)	City	Yes on 11/24/10	Change made to City Comp Plan Map Ordinance 410 Dec. 27, 2010
COMP 10-02	Transportation System Plan Amendment	IAMP, Council initiation	Yes, on 11/8/10	On Hold, at Planning Commission level

(

(

(

STAFF REPORT 1 of two

Date Prepared: September 12, 2012

For Planning Commission Meeting on: September 13,

2012

TO: Planning Commissioners

PREPARED BY: Stan Foster, Contract Planner

SUBJECT: Proposed Grant Application to Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD).

SYNOPSIS: Staff is recommending that we provide a recommendation to the City Council to request an \$8,000 grant to DLCD to be matched with \$2,000 of City money budgeted for contract planning work this fiscal year. This grant would cover the cost of a community based process to amend the City zoning ordinance and make corresponding adjustments to the Comprehensive Plan to complete the following scope of work.

1. Complete a downtown parking survey and adjust our zoning parking requirements to take credit for existing on-street parking and alternative parking options to maximize our commercial density without overbuilding parking in our high value downtown commercial district.
2. Revise the Architectural Review Process to allow for a pre-application design review process which would be completed by a three person committee appointed by the City Council which would have a Planning Commission member, a representative of the Downtown zone and a design professional. This committee would review and recommend action on the proposed design elements in the Downtown zone.
3. Make adjustments to the Downtown zone (and/or other appropriate zones) for seasonal and temporary food carts as a permitted use under a set of criteria and conditions acceptable to the Community.
4. Incorporate new Trail plan into design considerations and development requests to protect and enhance connectivity to the surrounding pedestrian, bicyclists and hiking trails and support Cascade Locks as a hub for these types of activities.
5. Review Economic development goals for Cascade Locks and adjust code requirements to support economic development goals while expediting permit processing and public access to understanding requirements for development in commercial and industrial zones.
6. Remove and replace current requirements of the code which may be considered excessive and onerous and incompatible to a transparent land-use system which allows the majority of the public to understand requirements and steps necessary to seek development approval (e.g. requiring a public meeting which cannot be made part of the public record).

7. Make whatever other housekeeping changes to the zoning code that are deemed appropriate to support a viable commercial, industrial and business sector for Cascade Locks.
8. Work with the Port of Cascade Locks to master plan key parcels of property in the Downtown area so that these sites can be considered “shovel-ready” for appropriate pre-approved commercial development, allowing the Port to more readily market these properties to prospective developers.
9. Manage all changes through a public process which provides for community work sessions, Planning Commission hearings and recommendations to City Council, and public hearings and adoption by City Council. It is estimated that this process will take 180 days from initiation.

Commission Options:

1. Approve the recommendations and send to Council for approval
2. Recommend any changes to the document
3. Disapprove the recommendations and send a negative recommendation to Council.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

Staff has met with representatives of the Department of Land Conservation and Development to discuss these matters. Her contact information is:

Karen Swirsky, AICP | Central Oregon Regional Representative
Community Services Division
Oregon Dept. of Land Conservation and Development
Central Regional Solution Center
650 SW Columbia Street, Millpoint Bldg. 7100 | Bend, OR 97702
Cell: (541) 325-6927
karen.swirsky@state.or.us | www.oregon.gov/LCD

Ms Swirsky has recommended two alternative approaches which are extracted from her communication and appear below.

“Here’s the lowdown on the Code Assistance opportunities. There are 2 ways to go; the city can use the updated Model Code (should be online next month) with their own consultant (you). The document is available for their use free of charge.

Or, if the city wants to apply for Code Assistance and are awarded a project, then they will need to use one of our three consultants. I can get you the names of the consultants, if you’d like.”

The state has funds available and with Karen’s support we should be able to secure these funds in the next 30-45 days.

STAFF REPORT

Date Prepared: September 5, 2012

For Planning Commission Meeting on: September 13, 2012

TO: Planning Commissioners

PREPARED BY: Megan Webb

APPROVED BY:

SUBJECT: Proposed Guidelines for Potential Architectural Review Committee

SYNOPSIS: The potential Architectural Review Committee would follow the CDC and the Downtown Design Standards. Staff has put together a proposed Design Review "Check-Off List" (Exhibit A) that committee members would use to make sure the applicant is meeting all of the required site plan provisions. The "Check-Off List" would then be given to CP Foster to be included in the final approval process.

Commission Options:

1. Approve the Architectural Review Committee review document
2. Recommend any changes to the document
3. Disapprove the Architectural Review Committee review document

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

Currently the Architectural Review Process is done by CP Foster. By moving the responsibility of this task to a committee, we are doing our due diligence to the applicant by cutting down the cost and the time of the CP to complete the review process.

(

(

(

The following standards shall be used for reviewing proposed site and building designs:

1. Buildings, landscaping, and site design, shall be consistent with the goals and objectives of the Cascade Locks Downtown Development Plan and Strategy.
2. All buildings shall be of an architectural style consistent with the historical character of the Community. **Acceptable styles include Classic Revival, Craftsman, Cascadian, and Arts and Crafts.** Unacceptable architectural styles include any modern style that was not commonly used in the 1920's and 1930's.
3. To maintain and enhance the pedestrian scale, buildings shall be oriented to the street. By orientation, this includes the building entrance, window treatment, sign orientation and other architectural improvements that create an entrance onto the street.
4. Building entries must comply with the accessibility requirements of the Oregon State Structural Specialty Code.
5. Buildings located at the intersection of two streets shall consider the use of a corner entrance to the building.
6. Pedestrian environment may be enhanced by street furniture, landscaping, awnings, and movable planters of seasonal flowers.
7. New buildings shall be within 25% of the average height of existing buildings located on the same street side within the zone.

Building Materials & Colors:

1. Facades shall be varied and articulated to provide visual interest to pedestrians. Within larger projects, variations in facades, floor levels,

architectural features, and exterior finishes shall create the appearance of several smaller buildings.

2. Where masonry is used for exterior finish, decorative patterns must be incorporated. Examples of these decorative patterns include multicolored masonry units such as brick, stone, or cast stone, in layered or geometric patterns, or split-faced concrete block to simulate a rusticated stone-type construction.
3. Wood siding must be bevel, shingle siding, or channel siding and must not be applied in a diagonal or herringbone pattern. T1-11 style siding is not permitted.
4. Preferred colors for exterior building finishes are earth tones, creams and pastels of earth tones. High-intensity primary colors, metallic colors and black may be utilized as trim and detail colors but shall not be used as primary wall colors.

Roof Materials, Parapets & Roof Pitch

1. Pitched roof structures shall have a minimum roof pitch of 6:12.
2. Roof Designs - Rooflines shall establish a distinctive "top: to a building. Except where impractical due solely to the size of the building, all roofs shall be of a peak roof style. No flat, mansard or shed roof styles are allowed. On larger buildings where peak roofs cannot be used, architectural features shall be used that exhibit a peak roof style with facades, partial roofs and other techniques that meet the intent of the provisions. In building areas without a peak roof, a flat or shed roof shall be used. When flat roof areas are proposed, a cornice or frieze molding a minimum 12 inches high projecting a minimum 6 inches from the wall at the top of the wall or parapet shall be provided.
3. Parapet corners must be stepped or the parapet must be designed to emphasize the center or primary entrance(s), unless primary entrance is at the corner of the building.
4. Visible sloped roofs must be dark gray, black or dark brown.

5. Visible roof materials must be wood or architectural grade composition shingle or sheet metal with standing or batten seam.
6. All roof and wall-mounted mechanical, electrical, communications and service equipment, including satellite dishes and vent pipes, must be screened from public view by parapets, walls or by other approved means.

Building Orientation and Entrance Standards

1. All buildings shall have their primary entrance(s) facing the street. Alternatively, a building may have its entrance facing a side yard when a direct pedestrian walkway not exceeding 20ft in length is provided between the building entrance and the street right-of-way.
2. Building entrances must be visible from the street. This may be accomplished through architectural design, color schemes or similar design elements.
3. Due to the elevation difference between WaNaPa, and the rear portion of the properties on the north side of the street, daylight basement type of construction is preferred. This method of construction has the benefit of causing all materials stored below WaNaPa to be screened and secured behind sight-obscuring walls, adding to the attractiveness of the downtown area.
4. Buildings are required to be located at the corner of corner lots. No parking is allowed in these areas.

Parking Lots

1. For new development, the parking lots shall be located in the rear of all lots. For corner lots, this shall be identified as being opposite, and further from, the primary building access.
2. If it is determined that parking is to front on WaNaPa in a particular situation, it shall be limited to a maximum of one drive aisle with parallel parking spaces on one side.

3. If it is determined that a parking lot is to be appropriately located fronting on WaNaPa, it does not mean that the lot is to have access to the street. All access standards still apply.

Building Facades

1. Ornamental devices, such as molding, entablature and friezes, are required at the roofline. where such ornamentation is present in the form of a linear molding or board, the band must be at least eight inches wide.
2. Alcoves, porches, arcades, etc. Buildings must incorporate features such as arcades, roofs, porches, porticoes and awnings to protect pedestrians from the rain, wind, and sun. Awnings and entrances may be designed to be shared between two structures. If the building abuts the WaNaPa right-of-way, then the weather protection feature must be extended at least five feet over the sidewalk with appropriate easements or agreements with the City to allow placement within the right-of-way. If the building does not front on the right-of-way, the weather protection feature must be extended at least five feet along any pedestrian area between the building and street. The weather protection device shall be designed, through the use of gutters, downspouts, catchments, channelizations or other means, to prevent dripping or running of water onto the public sidewalk, including water falling as rain, or resulting from melting snow or ice.
3. Traditional Storefront Elements. For buildings designed to house retail, service or office businesses, traditional storefront elements are required. These elements include:
 - a. Front and side building walls placed within ten feet of abutting street right-of-way boundaries.
 - b. Clearly delineated upper and lower facades.
 - c. A lower facade dominated by large display windows and a recessed entry or entries.
 - d. Smaller, regularly spaced windows in the upper floor.
 - e. Decorative trims, such as window hoods, surrounding upper floor windows.
 - f. A decorative cornice near the top of the facade.
 - g. Change in Relief of Building. Buildings must include changes in relief on ten percent of their WaNaPa facades. Relief changes include cornices, bases, fenestration, fluted masonry or other treatments for pedestrian interest and scale.

Windows

1. Windows which allow views to the interior activity or display areas are required. Windows shall include sills at the bottom and pediments at the top. Glass curtain walls, reflective glass, and painted or darkly tinted glass shall not be used.
2. Ground Floor Windows. All new buildings must provide ground floor windows along WaNaPa.
3. Required window areas must be either windows that allow views into working areas or lobbies, pedestrian entrances or display windows.
4. Required windows must have a sill no more than four feet above grade. Where interior floor levels prohibit such placement, the sill must be raised to allow it to be no more than two feet above the finished floor level, up to a maximum sill height of six feet above grade.
5. Glass curtain windows are not permitted fronting WaNaPa.
6. Darkly tinted windows and mirrored windows that block two-way visibility are prohibited as ground floor windows along street facades.
7. Any wall that faces WaNaPa must contain at least 50% of the total square footage of the ground floor wall area in the display areas, windows or doorways. Blank walls are prohibited.
8. Ground floor windows are also required on facades facing any public parking lot. The minimum requirement is 16 square feet per story, or six percent of the total square footage of the facade, whichever is greater.

Upper Floor Window Standards

1. Glass area dimensions shall not exceed 5'X7'. (The longest dimension may be taken wither horizontally or vertically.)
2. Windows must have trim or molding at least two inches wide around their perimeters.
3. At least half of all window area in upper floors must be made up of glass panes with dimensions no greater then 2'X3'. Windows that have 1'X1' grid inside double-pane glass are appropriate and are encouraged.

Streetscape/Street Furniture

1. All street furniture on either private property or within the right-of-way, including tables, chairs, walls, benches, kiosks, trash receptacles, garbage enclosures, signs and other

permanent or temporary fixtures no part of the building, shall conform with the Street Furniture design standards identified in the "Cascade Locks Downtown Plan and Strategy" adopted in 2003.

2. Benches and other streetscape items may be placed within the public right-of-way, but must not block free movement of pedestrians. A minimum pedestrian walkway width of five feet must be maintained at all times.

Lighting

1. All building entrances and exits must be well lighted.
2. Exterior lighting must be an integral part of the architectural design, and in keeping with the architectural standards contained in Section E.2.
3. The minimum lighting level for building entries is four foot-candles and the source light must be shielded to reduce glare.
4. All lighting shall be directed downwards and shall no shine into the sky.

Trash and Recycling Storage

1. Each structure shall provide for collection of its trash and recyclable materials within the boundaries of each parcel.
2. All trash collection area must be located within the structure or behind the building in an enclosure.

Signage

1. All standards of Chapter 8-6.144 of this Code shall apply in the D zone except for the following standards.
 - a. Freestanding pole signs are prohibited.
 - b. Internally illuminated signs are prohibited.
 - c. Pedestrian-oriented sign bonus. The City Administrator shall have authority to grant additional pedestrian oriented signs up to a total of 12 square feet for all such signs. The maximum size for any one pedestrian sign shall be 6 square feet. Pedestrian oriented signs include: window signs, small wall mounted or projecting signs located not more than 10 feet above grade, signs placed on awning valances, and signs suspended under canopies and awnings. Signs that are suspended above pedestrian walkways shall provide a minimum of 7.5 feet of vertical clearance.

Design Review Check List

Please use this sheet to determine if the applicant has met or not met each aspect of the Downtown Zone Design Standards.

Meets Does Not N/A
 Meet

 Building Materials & Colors

If no, please explain _____

 Roof Material, Parapets & Roof Pitch

If no, please explain _____

 Building Orientation & Entrance Standards

If no, please explain _____

 Parking Lots

If no, please explain _____

 Building Facades

If no, please explain _____

 Windows

If no, please explain _____

 Upper Floor Windows

If no, please explain _____

Meet **Does Not** **N/A**
Meet

 Streetscape/Street Furniture

If no, please explain _____

 Lighting

If no, please explain _____

 Trash & Recycling Storage

If no, please explain _____

 Signage

If no, please explain _____

Agenda Item No 6d

To review the Connect Cascade Locks Trail Plan please visit

www.connectcascadelocks.com

There you will find all of the information that has been gathered and put together, including the Final Plan document. The Celilo Planning Studio has also included maps of the proposed trail route.

