

From: Kristen Hura <kristen.hura@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 8, 2021 7:53 PM
To: cdadmin@cityofseaside.us
Subject: Public comments from 12/7 planning commission meeting

RECEIVED

12/9/21

AM

Hi planning commission,

Sending along a written statement pertaining to my public comments at last evening's planning meeting related to opposition of the vista ridge II proposed development.

Thank you for the opportunity to speak on the record and share our concerns about the Vista Ridge II proposed development, which include:

1. First, with regards to the architectural plan submission – the applicant didn't create the plans and none of them are designed around the actual location or terrain.
 - a. The applicant provided architectural plans that were screen captured from a website, scanned in, and submitted.
 - b. They weren't prepared for this project, are not site-specific, and are smaller than almost every other house in either Vista Ridge 1 or Sunset Hills.
 - c. The submission of these plans don't conform to the ordinances.
 - d. The proposal of an average of 1600 square foot houses in an area where the average size is of all the other houses is 2500 square feet will devalue the surrounding neighborhoods.
 - e. And there are no guarantees any houses will be built at all.
2. Second, there is the cost estimate – they suggest that the houses could be affordable.
 - . The construction worksheet that was submitted calculated a \$275K cost basis, which seems very unrealistic.
 - a. The worksheet does not specify the style and finish of the calculations and there have been recent significant increases in both labor and materials cost due to inflation and supply chain issues brought on by the pandemic.
 - b. The houses will also need to be consistent with the surrounding neighborhoods and designed for the terrain, neither of which are contemplated by the worksheet.
 - c. Any houses that might be built will not be affordable.
3. Third, we have the CC&Rs – The CC&Rs included are seemingly an attempt to convince the commission that the houses won't be say purple and devalue the adjacent neighborhoods.
 - . But the CC&Rs submitted lack the kind of rigor expected for a development of this scale and on this sensitive terrain.
 - a. Also, they are generally unenforceable meaning both the current owners and potential future homeowners can completely disregard them and face no consequences.
 - b. For example, they could cut trees right up to the edge of the salmon stream.
4. Fourth, there is the subpar application – the applicant is spending almost zero dollars to get this application slipped through and will try to justify it by saying we've always done it that way.
 - . It would be wrong for the applicant to say that the reports and details that are described in the larger report weren't included because they are not required by ordinances, or that they aren't required for a Planning Commission review.
 - a. A thorough application would have included those reports, prepared with deep expertise and attention to detail to ensure any proposed development would be suitable to the terrain, respectful to the community, and with the most minimum of disturbances to the sensitive ecosystem.
 - b. It is suspect that they didn't include it.

5. And fifth and final, in the Planning Commission work session that was held in late September the primary topic of discussion was about the ability of the Commission to actually plan.
 - . This application provides the perfect opportunity for the Commissioners to do just that.
 - i. Dig deep into the reports and details provided.
 - ii. Read every word.
 - iii. Take a lot of notes.
 - iv. And then deny the application.

Thank you.

Kristen Hura

Demand Marketing Leader

415.734.7848

kristen.hura@gmail.com