

**Minutes of the  
CANNON BEACH PLANNING COMMISSION**  
Thursday, May 26, 2022

Present: Chair Clay Newton, Commissioners Barb Knop, & Mike Bates, in person; Charles Bennett, Aaron Matusick, 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

Other Attendees: Michael Duncan from ODOT; Eduardo Montejo and Ryan Farncomb from Parametrix

CALL TO ORDER

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

ACTION ITEMS

**(1) Approval of Agenda**

Motion: Knop moved to approve the agenda as presented; Bates seconded the motion.

Vote: Kerr, Matusick, Knop, Bates, Moritz, Bennett and Chair Newton voted AYE; the motion passed unanimously.

**(2) The board and Staff thanked Daryl Johnson for his service on the Planning Commission.**

**(3) Consideration of the Minutes for the Planning Commission Meeting of April 28, 2022**

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

Vote: Kerr, Matusick, Knop, Bates, Moritz, Bennett and Chair Newton voted AYE; the motion passed unanimously.

**(4) Public Hearing and Consideration of CP#22-01 Adoption of the Cannon Beach Transportation System Plan (TSP), as supporting material to the Comprehensive Plan.**

Jeff Adams on behalf of the City of Cannon Beach, seeks the adoption of the Cannon Beach Transportation System Plan (TSP), as supporting material to the Cannon Beach Comprehensive Plan. The TSP is in accordance with Oregon Revised Statutes OAR 660 Division 12, Transportation Planning Rule, which implements Statewide Planning Goal 12. The request will be reviewed against

the criteria of the Cannon Beach Comprehensive Plan and Municipal Code, Section 17.86.070.A, Amendments, Criteria.

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

Adams read the background from the staff report and went over the objectives of the TSP (see staff report in packet for full details). Adams discussed the process. He noted that all of the project materials and public comment are on the TSP website. He also noted that this is a hearing for the PC to recommend the plan to Council. Adams turned the discussion over to Eddie Montejo from Parametrix.

Eddie provided an overview of what the plan is and touched on some issues that were brought up in the Joint Work Session that was held a couple of weeks ago. Montejo emphasized that the TSP allows the community to get grants and other funding for proposed improvements. Montejo went over the memo that Parametrix submitted to address issues brought up in the last Joint TSP session.

The meeting was opened up to questions from the Commission.

Moritz asked about the specifics of funding.

Montejo said that how they obtain funding depends on the grant opportunities available. He noted that many grants require that the proposal be part of an adopted plan.

Kerr had a question about how many respondents there were to online surveys.

Montejo said that they had a total of 266 unique survey submissions. He noted that surveys were an open link on the website so they could go to full-time residents and second homeowners.

Adams discussed the email lists that they used to reach participants.

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

Bates had a question about safety and tsunami risks being under the transportation system plan. He thought that there might be a better place for these plans and that the TSP might not be the right venue for them.

Adams noted that the City's Emergency Manager was on the PAC and gave extensive feedback during the TSP process. Adams also noted that a lot of funding opportunities are tied to emergency management.

Bates had concerns about the plan being driven more by safety than by community access. He said that he did not want a plan driven by safety concerns. He said that safety is not part of the Oregon TSP that is being developed.

They discussed having safety in the TSP rather than other documents.

Michael Duncan, a Transportation Planner for ODOT, said that safety is part of the mission for ODOT and a foundational element of everything they do.

Kerr asked if they could add a provision to the TSP to never have motorized scooters in Cannon Beach.

Montejo said that was possible.

Ryan recommended that the City have a policy related to emerging transportation devices. He thought a policy related to new mobility devices would be more effective than a ban on scooter because it would cover any new transportation device, not just scooters.

Adams said that the City is already moving forward on scooters and have a discussion scheduled with Council.

Matusick had concerns about banning something in a blanket matter.

They discussed how scooters could fit into the plan.

Bruce St. Dennis said they are getting lots of requests from companies who would like to bring motorized scooters to Cannon Beach. He said that the City wants to act right away to be in a position to say no. He noted that they can fine tune that at a later date.

Newton asked if the Commission would have access to the Parametrix team moving forward.

Montejo said that they have requested additional funding from ODOT to continue to stay engaged with the project.

Newton proposed a 5-minute break before taking public testimony.

After the break, Chair Newton called for public testimony.

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

Chair Newton called for opponents of the request.

Lolly Champion spoke in opposition to the TSP. She noted that she incorporated comments from an email group that she is part of. Champion asked how the term 'may' is used in the plan. Does this give the City latitude to do any of these things? Champion wanted to make sure that any project from the plan that is selected to be completed came back before the PC. She also had concerns about trees that would need to come down to build proposed trails, as well as maintenance and safety. Champion suggested they have a trail day for any proposed trails for community members to ask questions and give feedback. Champion asked how much the 4-way stop at Warren Way was. She thought the cost of that would be helpful to get an idea of the cost for future potential stops. Champion also had questions about what would be used to make the trails and future trail locations. She had questions about what is planned within the Urban Growth Boundary. Champion also had concerns about funding and the City's debt load.

Bates agreed with Champion that it would be good to look at the consistency and use of modal verbs in the plan.

Jan Siebert-Wahrmund, PO Box 778, spoke on behalf of herself and her husband Les Wahrmund. Siebert-Wahrmund had concerns about the support numbers that were given. She said that only 33 citizens filled out the final survey. She was concerned that this was not enough of a turnout to provide meaningful feedback. Siebert-Wahrmund read a letter from herself and her husband. The letter asked the PC to consider a cap on the number of visitors to Cannon Beach during the peak season. They also had concerns about the plan being viewed as a menu. Siebert-Wahrmund mentioned the water master plan as an example of a similar plan from the past. They felt this plan was used as a task list rather than a menu. Siebert-Wahrmund expressed concern that city staff is taking over the direction of the City and asked Commissioners to look at the plan closely and take out objectionable items, such as paving roads.

Randy Neal, PO Box 1092. Neal said that he is a proponent for many of the concepts and an opponent to other sections. He said he feels great about the work that Adams and Montejo and his team have put in but was not sure how it got translated into the final TSP document. He felt the TSP is not telling the people what it really is. He thought the plan should provide a vision of where they would like to be in 20 years. Neal thought the document should include suggestions to the State for the management of Tolovana Park and Ecola Park as well as plans for ROW parking. Neal discussed other things he thought should be in the TSP. He felt that the survey was tilted towards support and thought more community input was needed. Neal brought up the earlier mentioned idea to limit the number of visitors coming into Cannon Beach. He thought they should look at how the number of people visiting Cannon Beach could be limited and how they could have a pleasant visit without the full-time residents feeling overwhelmed.

Newton asked for Neal's suggestion on managing something like parking. He did not see how you could micromanage while maintaining a village character. He asked to hear Neal's input on that.

They discussed the idea of traffic and parking being self-limiting. Neal felt that the people who will be most frustrated in this scenario are the people who live in Cannon Beach. Neal also felt that pedestrian traffic was a big issue.

Chair Newton asked for additional Public Comments. There were none.  
Chair asked for a further response from Staff or Parametrix.

Adams responded to some of the public comment made. He noted that the details for proposed trails are not locked in at this level of analysis.

Newton said that he picked up a few themes from the comments. One theme he noticed was a need for more input from community. Another was a need for a stronger sense of a control of the process, so that it is not a blanket approval. Newton said that he liked Bates proposed language.

Bates discussed language he drafted that could be added to the plan (get comments and add them). Bates said that with this language they as the community have the ability to object to any future plans.

Newton agreed that that made him feel more comfortable with the plan.

Kabeiseman asked for time to rework the language to make sure that everyone understands what the proposed language means. He thought they should spell out what full administrative review means for certain kinds of projects.

Kerr suggested removing the options that they don't like in addition to adding the language that Bates suggested.

St. Denis commented on the recent 4-way stop that went in and the water projects that are moving forward. He said that these projects are replacing asbestos pipes and putting in pipes that can withstand seismic events. He noted that the City provides many opportunities for input, but it is hard to get people involved in the process.

Bates responded and reiterated that he wants people to feel like they have a say in things.

Newton noted that the water and sewage projects were critical infrastructure. He asked if St. Denis thought any of the projects in the TSP could also be viewed as critical infrastructure.

St. Denis said that there are things that they consider important, but all of those things go before City Council.

They discussed the approval process for different projects.

Bates said that he wanted the PC involved and not just Council.

Adams and St. Clair said that the projects that are under their jurisdiction do go to the PC.

Kabeiseman discussed the different roles of entities within the City including Council, the City Manager and the PC. He read the purview of the PC. Kabeiseman noted that the role of the PC included land use matters and other issues that the Council delegates to them. He said that there are a lot of things that are not land use. He reiterated that they need to clarify what comes back to the PC and said that it is important to find a balance between too much process and not enough process.

Bates asked Kabeiseman to refine the language he had proposed.

Karen La Bonte discussed how the water and waste master plans were created.

Newton asked how people felt about taking some things off the menu, eliminating some options from the TSP.

Farncomb from Parametrix said that this community has been the most engaged of any community he has worked in. He cautioned that removing items might remove things that the PAC and the public want included in the TSP.

Duncan echoed what Ryan said on public involvement, he felt it was very strong for this project. He noted that this is a policy document. Duncan said that there has been a process that helped them whittle down to this point. He spoke to the proposed language and emphasized that there is a place for more input when they get to project development.

Newton suggested coming back to the TSP at a later date. The rest of the Commission agreed.

Moritz suggested that each member come back with goals and points so that they can get it done at the next meeting.

Newton noted that the feedback from the community included a lot of great comments.

Adams noted that the raw survey data is on the website where anyone can read survey responses to open ended questions. He emphasized that the project has had good turnout and there is a lot of good data.

Newton thank everyone for their comments and encouraged them to continue to give feedback.

#### INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

##### **(5) Tree Report**

Bates said it was great that 19 trees were planted. He asked where they were planted.

Knop commented on where they were planted.

##### **(6) Ongoing Planning Items**

Adams let people know that the Code Audit 'Village Character' Survey is available on the website.

Bates asked if they could bring the Tree Ordinance forward in the Code Audit so it could be taken care of more immediately.

Adams said that was possible.

They discussed the process for how that would happen.

Kerr asked why the City does not post building permits on site and why the applications are not posted in ePermitting.

Adams said that the City does not currently do electronic plan review. Jurisdictions that have electronic plan review have those files available to post. Adams noted that Cannon Beach working on moving in that direction.

Moritz asked for clarification on what will be on next months agenda.

Adams said there are 5 applications requested for the next agenda.

They discussed the agenda load for the June meeting.

**(7) Good of the Order**

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 8:46 pm.



---

Administrative Assistant, Katie Hillenhagen

