

**Minutes of the
CANNON BEACH PLANNING COMMISSION**
Thursday, January 27, 2022

Present: Chair Daryl Johnson & Commissioner Barb Knop in person
Commissioners, Janet Patrick, Charles Bennett, Clay Newton, Lisa Kerr and Anna Moritz via Zoom

Excused:

Staff: Director of Community Development Jeff Adams, Land Use Attorney Bill Kabeiseman, City Planner Robert St. Clair and Administrative Assistant Katie Hillenhagen

CALL TO ORDER

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

ACTION ITEMS

(1) Approval of Agenda

Motion: Kerr moved to approve the agenda as presented; Bennett seconded the motion.

Vote: Kerr, Newton, Knop, Moritz, Bennett and Chair Johnson voted AYE; the motion passed

(2) Consideration of the Minutes for the Planning Commission Meeting of December 2, 2021

Motion: Knop moved to approve the minutes; Newton seconded the motion.

Vote: Kerr, Newton, Knop, Bennett and Chair Johnson voted AYE; the motion passed

(3) Consideration of the Minutes for the Planning Commission Meeting of December 21, 2021

Kerr had an edit for the first paragraph on page 4.

Chair Johnson had an edit for page 5. He wanted to clarify that he brought up the option of a folding ladder to show that there are options to the proposal that were not given to them.

Knop had an edit for page 5. Knop, her name was misspelled.

Motion: Kerr moved to approve the minutes; Bennett seconded the motion.

Vote: Kerr, Knop, Bennett and Chair Johnson voted AYE; the motion passed

(4) Election of Officers

Chair Johnson asked for nominations for vice chair.

Kerr asked if Johnson could stay till the end of his term and then the new chair would take over. Kerr thought they should elect someone who could serve as chair for a while, someone who's term was not ending soon.

The other commissioners agreed that Johnson should stay on till he finished his term in April. Kabeiseman and Adams said that they would check but they did not think that there was a problem with this option.

Motion: Kerr nominated Johnson as chair until April, at which time they will have elections for a new chair; Knop seconded the nomination.

Vote: Kerr, Knop, Newton, Bennett, Moritz and Chair Johnson voted AYE; the motion passed

Motion: Kerr nominated Knop as the vice chair; Newton seconded the nomination.

Knop said she would serve as long as there was a new election in April.

Vote: Kerr, Knop, Newton, Bennett, Moritz and Chair Johnson voted AYE; the motion passed

(5) Chair Johnson noted that remands were rare, and this would be considered as a continuance with new information being added to the record.

Remand of AA# 21-01, Jeff & Jennifer Harrison request for an Appeal of an Administrative Decision to approve a building/development permit for M.J. Najimi at 544 N. Laurel Street

Remand of the Jeff and Jennifer Harrison appeal of the City's approval to issue a development/building permit for 544 N Laurel Street. The property is located at 544 N Laurel Street (Tax Lot 07000, Map 51019AD), and in a Residential Medium Density (R2) zone. The request will be reviewed pursuant to Municipal Code, Section 17.88.160, Review consisting of additional evidence or de novo review and applicable sections of the zoning ordinance, conditions of approval of the Cannon Beach Preservation Planned Development Subdivision and approved plat.

No one objected to the jurisdiction of the Planning Commission to hear this matter at this time. Chair Johnson asked if any Commissioner had any conflict of interest. There were none. Chair Johnson asked if any Commissioner had personal bias to declare. There were none. Chair Johnson asked if any commissioner had any ex parte contacts to declare. There were none. The commissioners declared their site visits.

Adams read his staff report (see staff report in packet for full details). Adams gave a brief history of the matter. The Planning Commission decision was appealed to the City Council. Council remanded it back to the PC in light of new evidence. Adams noted that the Harding garage is scheduled to be demolished. He also noted that Mr. Harrison proposed a condition of approval requiring the full demolition of the garage before the issuance of the building permit. Adams said he would read Mr. Harrison's comment into the record later. Alterman gave an alternate condition requiring the Harding garage to be completely demolished before the Certificate of Occupancy is issued.

Newton asked about the timeline of the demolition.

Adams said the demo permit had been issued. He noted that the firm doing the demo is also doing another project in town. Once that is done, they will have it removed. They have prepped the site for removal.

Chair Johnson stated that the pertinent criteria were listed in the staff report and criteria sheets next to the west door; testimony, arguments and evidence must be directed toward those criteria; 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 Planning Commission 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.

Chair Johnson asked if the applicant wished to make a presentation.

Dean Alterman, 805 SW Broadway St. Suite 1580, Portland, OR. Alterman said that he is here on behalf of Mr. MJ Najimi. Alterman pointed out that the easement that allowed the Harding garage to be built has been modified so that a building cannot be there. He thought that a compromise for the condition of approval could be that once the demolition starts the building permit can be issued. He asked that they allow Mr. Najimi to begin construction either immediately or when the demolition begins. He asked them to keep in mind that there are not many contractors on the Oregon Coast.

Chair Johnson called for proponents of the request. Adams read Harrison's comments (for details see comments attached at the end of these minutes). Harrison urged the commission not to approve the building permit until the demolition is finished.

Dean Alterman said that he appreciates the points that Mr. Harrison made, but those are comments for the developer. He pointed out that the max square footage for all lots within the development is smaller than what would otherwise have been allowed in the R2 zone. He also said that the size of this house will be balanced out in another lot where the max square footage is 600. Alterman urged them to approve with either his or Mr. Hathaway's condition of approval.

Chair Johnson closed the hearing.

Newton moved to issue the building permit with the condition that the Certificate of Occupancy not be issued until the garage is completely removed.

Kerr said that they should not issue a building permit until the garage is removed. She thought that there was a matter of broken trust on this property. She thought a compromise could be to approve the building permit once the demolition has begun.

Chair Johnson and Knop agreed that they should not issue a permit until the garage is removed. Newton and Moritz said that was fine with them.

Kabeiseman asked if there was a second to Newton's motion. There was not so Kerr proposed a new motion.

Motion: Kerr moved to issue the building permit once the demolition of the Harding garage is complete; Knop seconded the motion.

Vote: Kerr, Newton, Knop, Moritz, Bennett and Chair Johnson voted AYE; the motion passed

(6) Public Hearing and Consideration of CU# 21-03, Jacqueline O. Brown request, for a Conditional Use Permit for shoreline stabilization at 116 N. Laurel St.

Jacqueline O. Brown Revocable Trust request for a Conditional Use permit to replace approximately 50 cubic yards of sand that has eroded the bank on the west side of the property. The property is located at 116 N. Laurel St. (Tax Lot 04000, Map 51019DD) in a Residential Medium Density (R2) and Oceanfront Management Overlay (OM) zone. The request will be reviewed under Cannon Beach Municipal Code 17.14.030 Conditional Uses Permitted, 17.42.060 Specific Standards and 17.80.230 & 360 Shoreline Stabilization & Preservation Grading.

Chair Johnson stated that the hearing has been postponed until the February meeting anyone who wishes to make comment can send comment or attend the next meeting.

(7) Public Hearing and Consideration of CU# 21-04, LBC Trust request, for a Conditional Use Permit for shoreline stabilization at 4664 Logan Ln.

Mike Morgan, on behalf of The LBC Trust, Mark Smith, Trustee, request for a Conditional Use permit for shoreline stabilization. The property is located at 4664 Logan Lane (Tax Lot 03401, Map 41006CB) in Residential Lower Density (RL) and Oceanfront Management Overlay (OM) Zone. The request will be reviewed under Cannon Beach Municipal Code 17.10.030 Conditional Uses Permitted, 17.42.060 Specific Standards and 17.80.230 & 360 Shoreline Stabilization & Preservation Grading.

No one objected to the jurisdiction of the Planning Commission to hear this matter at this time. Chair Johnson asked if any Commissioner had any conflict of interest. There were none. Chair Johnson asked if any Commissioner had personal bias to declare. There were none. Chair Johnson asked if any commissioner had any ex parte contacts to declare. There were none. The commissioners declared their site visits.

St. Clair read the staff report (see staff report in packet for full details). He noted that state representatives suggest that any new stabilization take a more natural approach.

Chair Johnson asked if there was any additional correspondence.

Comment had been submitted by the Friends of the Dunes and Dianna Turner said that she was available to answer questions if there were any.

Chair Johnson called for public testimony.

Chair Johnson stated that the pertinent criteria were listed in the staff report and criteria sheets next to the west door; testimony, arguments and evidence must be directed toward those criteria; 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 Planning Commission 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.

Chair Johnson asked if the applicant wished to make a presentation.

Mike Morgan, PO box 132 Cannon Beach. Morgan stated that he is the planning consultant for the LBC Trust. He spoke to his qualifications. Has been a planner in Cannon Beach for approximately 48 years. He has had a lot of experience with dune issues. He is also a licensed nurseryman and has planted extensively with willow and beach grasses. He is not an engineering geologist; he is a planner. Mike McEwan is an engineer and a contractor with many years of experience in Cannon Beach. Morgan noted that McEwan would be doing the cobble berm. He said that he appreciates the staff recommendation for approval. He read the Friends of the Dunes letter and thinks he can address most of their concerns. Morgan said that anyone who has walked the beach in the last 6 months to a year can see the damage that the king tides have done. It is clear that people are going to start losing structures and their yards. He noted that most of Tolovana is protected by riprap. The properties between the riprap are the ones that are getting hammered. Morgan noted that the use of the cobbles has been recommended by groups such as the Oregon Coast Alliance. The two applicants tonight are willing to try the cobble berm rather than riprap, because it is a more natural approach. He noted that they had success with willows on a nearby property and that there are no plans to import sand. What is excavated for the berm will be replaced over the berm. He also noted that this is the time of the year that willow stakes will propagate most readily. He said that the jute netting will stabilize the area while the willows are given a chance to establish themselves. Morgan said that they will use signage to discourage people from sliding down the dune or otherwise furthering erosion. In relation to the Friends of the Dunes comment he thought there would be room to tighten up standards but did not think an expensive study or engineer would be needed. He said that to perform the work they would enter the beach from the Tolovana wayside. Morgan finished by stating that he thought they had met all of the applicable criteria.

Chair Johnson called for proponents of the request. There were none.

Chair Johnson called for opponents of the request. There were none.

Chair Johnson asked for further comments from staff.

Staff recommended approval based on the conditions of approval provided in the staff report. Adams added that any signed would need to be approved.

Morgan said that was ok.

Chair Johnson closed the hearing and moved to consideration.

Newton said that he would like to see more detail around criteria 4. He would also like to see how things are moving along the shoreline in general. He would like to see aerial photos, maybe a drone could be used. Newton thought it would be helpful to see data on how things are progressing to help with future conversations and decisions.

Adams said that is a great idea. He noted that the City has recently acquired a drone for emergency management that could be used.

Newton asked about the City's role once work begins.

Adams said they get notified from the State for the drive on permit. He said that usually he or Trevor goes on site when they begin work.

Newton said that was great. He thought it would be good to have someone to be out to verify that what is being proposed is what is being used, such as 50 square feet of cobble.

Kerr suggested that that monitoring by the City be included as a condition.

Newton asked how long this project would take.

Morgan said it took a day to place the cobbles and another 1-2 days to spread the jute and plant the willows.

Adams said that Kerr could amend the motion to add onsite monitoring by staff.

Motion: Newton moved to approve the request with the conditions in the staff report and the additional condition that staff be on site to monitor the work; Kerr seconded the motion.

Knop asked if this would include technology monitoring on an annual basis.

Adams said he hoped the City could do annual runs of the beach to see if these projects are achieving their goals, but that would not be a condition of this permit.

Vote: Kerr, Newton, Knop, Moritz, Bennett and Chair Johnson voted AYE; the motion passed

Johnson stated the project is approved.

(8) Public Hearing and Consideration of CU# 21-05, Martin and Maxine Siegel Living Trust request, for a Conditional Use Permit for shoreline stabilization at 3915 Ocean Ave.

Mike Morgan, on behalf of the Martin and Maxine Siegel Living Trust, request for a Conditional Use permit for shoreline stabilization. The property is located at 3915 Ocean Ave. (Tax Lot 00400, Map 41006BC) in Residential Moderate Density (R1) and Oceanfront Management Overlay (OM) Zone.

The request will be reviewed under Cannon Beach Municipal Code 17.10.030 Conditional Uses Permitted, 17.42.060 Specific Standards and 17.80.230 & 360 Shoreline Stabilization & Preservation Grading.

No one objected to the jurisdiction of the Planning Commission to hear this matter at this time. Chair Johnson asked if any Commissioner had any conflict of interest. There were none. Chair Johnson asked if any Commissioner had personal bias to declare. There were none. Chair Johnson asked if any commissioner had any ex parte contacts to declare. There were none. The commissioners declared their site visits.

St. Clair read the staff report (see staff report in packet for full details).

Chair Johnson asked if there was any additional correspondence. There was none.

Chair Johnson called for public testimony.

Chair Johnson stated that the pertinent criteria were listed in the staff report and criteria sheets next to the west door; testimony, arguments and evidence must be directed toward those criteria; 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 Planning Commission 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.

Chair Johnson asked if the applicant wished to make a presentation.

Mike Morgan spoke as a representative for the owners. Morgan reiterated St. Clair's point that when the house was built in '07 the contractor installed 50 cubic yards of imported beach sand. He then wrapped it in netting and planted beach grass. That has since washed away. Morgan agreed that it was a good idea to use a drone to document erosion on an annual basis. He noted that during the king tides a large chunk of land was taken out near the City steps. He said that this stabilization would protect these steps as well. Morgan said that they would like to bring in sand and pack it in behind the berm to get the willows going. He said that Mike McEwan will be the contractor in this case as well.

Mimi and Marty Siegel thanked the Planning Commission for entertaining their request. Mimi said that they thought their approach was environmentally appropriate and noted that it is supported by the neighbors.

Chair Johnson called for proponents of the request. There was none.

Chair Johnson called for opponents of the request. There were none.

Chair Johnson asked for further comments from the staff.

Staff recommended approval based on the conditions in the staff report. Adams added onsite staff monitoring as a condition, as was suggested in the previous application.

Newton asked Morgan if the property adjacent had rip rap.

Morgan said that it does.

Newton asked if the willows being used were the same as on that property.

Morgan said that it was.

Moritz asked about the material behind the berm.

Morgan confirmed that it would be imported sand. He said that technically this is a repair of something that was done in '07.

Adams noted that commissioner Patrick had joined the meeting.

Chair Johnson closed the hearing and moved to consideration.

Newton asked if anyone had any comments.

Patrick said that she went by the site, and she thought they should approve it.

Motion: Newton moved to approve the request with the conditions in the staff report and a condition requiring staff oversight during work; Knop seconded the motion.

Vote: Kerr, Newton, Knop, Moritz, Patrick, Bennett and Chair Johnson voted AYE; the motion passed

Johnson stated the project is approved.

(9) Continuation and Consideration of SR# 21-06, David Vonada request, on behalf of John Henry, for a Setback Reduction of the rear-yard setback requirement for a deck-stairs in conjunction with an addition to an existing residence.

David Vonada, on behalf of John Henry, application to allow a setback reduction to reduce the rear yard setback from the required 15'0" to 11'6" to build a new exit stair onto a reconstructed second floor deck, according to chapter 17.14 Residential Medium Density Zone of the Municipal Code. The property is located at 1688 S. Hemlock St. (Tax Lot 04103, Map 51030DA), and in a Residential Medium Density (R2) zone. The request will be reviewed against the Municipal Code, Section 17.64.010, Setback Reduction, Provisions established.

No one objected to the jurisdiction of the Planning Commission to hear this matter at this time. Chair Johnson asked if any Commissioner had any conflict of interest. There were none. Chair Johnson asked if any Commissioner had personal bias to declare. There were none. Chair Johnson asked if any commissioner had any ex parte contacts to declare. There were none. The commissioners declared their site visits.

Adams read the staff report (see staff report in packet for full details). Adams noted that this has been continued and that the commission had asked for more information. Mr. Vonada responded to that request and that response is in the packet. Adams noted that Mr. Vonada is also on the zoom meeting.

Chair Johnson asked if there was any additional correspondence. There was none.

Chair Johnson called for public testimony.

Chair Johnson stated that the pertinent criteria were listed in the staff report and criteria sheets next to the west door; testimony, arguments and evidence must be directed toward those criteria; 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 Planning Commission 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.

Chair Johnson asked if the applicant wished to make a presentation.

David Vonada of Tolovana Architects introduced himself and said that he is representing the Henry family in this issue. Vonada thanked the PC for the continuance. He noted that the PC had asked for alternatives. He said that he believes that his testimony and drawings show that the proposed stairway is the most reasonable option. Vonada said that this project started out as an enhanced access to Forest Lawn, but as he worked on the project it became clear to him that this was also an issue of safety. Vonada said that the house is already built to the 5-foot side yard setbacks so any alternative to the stair would still need a setback reduction. They are asking for a setback on the side of the house with the largest setback from the property line. He said that he felt the location where they have the stair is the most reasonable solution. He also noticed that the Forest Lawn right of way has shifted to the left so the perceived setback is greater than the required 15-foot setback. He did not think that portable ladders were a reasonable alternative.

Chair Johnson said that he was thinking that if they took a portion of the deck out and brought the stairs straight down, they would not need to ask for a setback. He also thought they could expand the deck in other areas.

Vonada said he did not see how that could be done and leave a portion of usable deck. He noted that the living room is angled which would still cause the stair to project into the required rear yard.

Moritz asked how big the deck is and how big it would need to be reduced to keep the stairs within the required setback.

Vonada said that it is about 8' x 10' now. He said that in order to meet the setback the stair would need to be angled and would reduce the deck to about 6 feet. He said that the deck would end up being a trapezoid of about 5 by 6 by 8.

Chair Johnson called for proponents of the request. There were none.

Chair Johnson called for opponents of the request. There were none.

No further response from staff.

Chair Johnson asked if the applicant wished to make additional statements.

Vonada said he did not identify any alternatives in the application because he did not consider any of them to be reasonable.

Kerr asked if there was support from the neighbors.

There was comment in support by the neighbors.

Patrick said she thought the request was reasonable for safety reasons.

Motion: Patrick moved to approve the request; Bennett seconded the motion.

Vote: Kerr, Newton, Knop, Moritz, Patrick, and Bennett voted AYE; Chair Johnson voted NAY; the motion passed

Johnson stated the project is approved.

Authorization to Sign the Appropriate Orders

Motion: Kerr moved to authorize the Chair to sign the appropriate orders; Patrick seconded the motion.

Vote: Kerr, Newton, Knop, Moritz, Patrick, Bennett and Chair Johnson voted AYE; the motion passed

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

(10) Tree Report

No comments.

(11) Ongoing Planning Items

Adams spoke about planning priorities. He reminded people that the Feb 3rd TSP open house is at 6pm and will cover preferred alternatives. He said that the report will likely be posted tomorrow.

Adam spoke about the Code Audit. He reported that City Council passed getting rid of planned development and combining lots, but they tabled the other issues. Those issues should come back the first

of March. Hopefully those dates will be out next week. That will be a joint meeting between DRB, PC and CC.

(12) Good of the Order

Kerr asked about the pot shop at 279 N Hemlock. She wanted to know how much of the lot is covered by impervious materials.

Adams said he did not know off the top of his head. Adams said that 10% has to be softscape.

Patrick asked if a decision the Planning Commission made caused this to happen.

Adams said no. He said that that is due to Design Review Board code.

Patrick asked about another property and if it could be covered by blacktop.

Adams said that it will be required to have 10% softscape as well.

They discussed being able to change this standard in the Code Audit. Adams noted that he and the DRB would like to see the 10% increased.

Adams thanked Patrick for her service (it was her last meeting as her term was coming to an end) and hoped she would stay engaged with the Code Audit.

The Commissioners thanked Patrick for her time serving on the PC.

Patrick asked about parking.

Adams said that will be part of the Transportation System Plan meeting in February. He said that he expects parking to be a top priority as the TSP continues.

Patrick said that she has noticed that there were boulders around the City that have been placed where parking could be. She said she would be interested in serving on the DRB.

Adams said he would send her the application.

Newton thought maybe the City could talk to the state about what they require for credentials for dune or similar work.

Adams said that they need to look at thresholds at when certain things and reports are required. He said CREST is also a good resource to ask.

Kerr asked for follow-up on view ordinances and view corridors.

Adams said that he forwarded it to the code audit consultants to look at.

Adams noted that the Georgia Bulldogs won the championship. Go Dogs!!!!

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 7:52 pm.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, consisting of stylized, overlapping loops and lines, positioned above a horizontal line.

Administrative Assistant, Katie Hillenhagen

Katie Hillenhagen

From: Jeff Harrison <jshpub1@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, January 27, 2022 4:44 PM
To: Planning Group; Jeffrey Adams; Katie Hillenhagen
Cc: Greg Hathaway
Subject: Statement in lieu of oral tonight at Planning Commission - AA #21-01

I apologize this written statement is not submitted before noon. I had planned to speak tonight but am unable to do so. Please provide this to the Commissioners prior to the hearing for AA #21-01 tonight
Jeff

Dear Mr. Chair and Cannon Beach Planning Commissioners,

We are sorry we are unable to attend the conclusion of AA #21-01 but my wife's health must come first today. I know you all understand. We hope you will accept this in lieu of our planned oral statement for tonight.

We hope you have read and agree with attorney Hathaway's proposed condition. We don't believe it will harm Mr. Najimi but also feel there should be no more margin for failings here. We believe extra diligence is needed. Please do not approve a building permit until the existing garage is completely demolished and cleaned up. This will ensure there is no zoning violation.

We feel this is a good time to refresh the Commission and staff that the Nicholson PUD is not a regular subdivision and can never be treated as such. This is a "planned unit development". Therefore, additional code and conditions must be followed in order to avoid additional zoning violations.

A good example of how this Planned Unit Development differs from a regular subdivision can be found in the Shared Access and Maintenance Agreement. This agreement was required by PUD Approval Condition #2 and dictates approved uses and activities for the required "Common/Shared Outdoor Living Spaces" identified on the PUD. The proposed deck that Mr. Najimi is proposing to build in the required rear yard to the west of Lot 1 in one of these common/shared outdoor living spaces. This means that the deck, although on the Najimi's lot, is available for use by all of the PUD owners. It cannot be exclusionary for use only by the owners of Lot 1 and must remain available for all to enjoy as they wish. The same goes for all other such spaces on all of the lots in the PUD.

We believe there will be other examples of how this common/shared outdoor living space cannot be considered private or exclusionary. While the PUD owners may at some point modify the SAMA, the areas designated as common/shared outdoor living areas, available to all owners, cannot be changed without future zoning violations and would place the PUD out of compliance. We bring it up now in hopes of avoiding such foreseeable issues in the future.

Last, we wanted to remind the Commission that Nicholson promised, and Council approved, "a cottage" to be built on this lot. At 3,745 sq ft, we are a long way from a cottage or even a building that is, "generally small in scale and appropriate to its setting".

Thank you for your attention to this issue and thank you for your service to Cannon Beach.

Jeff and Jennifer Harrison
539 N Laurel
PO Box 742

