

MINUTES SEASIDE PLANNING COMMISSION

October 5, 2021

CALL TO ORDER: Vice Chair Montero called the regular meeting of the Seaside Planning Commission to order at 6:00 p.m.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

ATTENDANCE: Commissioners present: Vice Chairman Robin Montero, Jon Wickersham, Kathy Kleczek, Chris Rose, and Seth Morrissey. Staff present: Kevin Cupples, Planning Director, Jordan Sprague, Administrative Assistant, Jeff Flory, Transient Rental Compliance Officer, Anne McBride, Community Development Assistant. Absent: Lou Neubecker

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: September 7, 2021 minutes were amended by Commissioner Kleczek to correct the date on the submitted minutes, add that she had stepped down from the dais for the public hearing of 21-061 PDSUB, and requested that verbiage to be added on written public comment.

INTRODUCTORY STATEMENTS

This is the time duly advertised for the Seaside Planning Commission to hold its monthly meeting. Agenda items can be initiated by the general public, any legal property owner, Seaside City Council, City staff, and the Seaside Planning Commission.

Vice Chair Montero asked if there was anyone present who felt the Commission lacked the authority to hear any of the items on the agenda.

PUBLIC HEARING PROCEDURES, EX PARTE CONTACTS & CONFLICTS OF INTEREST:

Vice Chair Montero stated it is standard procedure for the members of the Commission to visit the sites to be dealt with at these meetings. She then asked if any of the Commissioners wished to declare an ex parte contact or conflict of interest. Commissioner Kleczek stated that she would like to declare a conflict of interest because she is an abutting property owner for project 21-061PDSUB. Commissioner Morrissey declared a conflict of interest for the same project as he also owns an abutting property.

AGENDA:

PUBLIC HEARING REQUIREMENTS:

The following public hearing statements were read by Vice Chair Montero:

1. The applicable substantive criteria for the hearing items are listed in the staff report(s) prepared for this hearing.
2. Testimony and evidence shall be directed toward the substantive criteria listed in the staff report(s) or other criteria in the plan or land use regulation, which you believe applies to the decision.
3. 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 to the Land Use Board of Appeals on that issue.
4. The applicant will testify first, then any opposition will testify, and then the applicant will be given time for rebuttal.

PUBLIC HEARING

- A. Continuance of 21-061 PDSUB:** A Planned Development Subdivision request by **Sunset Ridge, LLC**, represented by Mark Mead. The subject property (**T6-R10-S22AB-TL# 8100**) is located north of the intersection of Hemlock St. and Aldercrest St. and it is approximately 6.62 acres in size. The subject property is zoned **Low Density Residential (R1)** and the request will allow the creation of 17 lots for residential development and one large open space tract. The proposed development lots range in size from 6,943 sq. ft. to 14,825 sq. ft. and the open space tract will be approximately

1.93 acres. The access would be provided by extending the north end of Hemlock St. through the creation of Hemlock Ct. and Fern Ct. Kevin Cupples, City Planning Director, stated during the last Planning Commission meeting, the public hearing was closed and the commission approved a continuance to the October 5th meeting based on testimony from the neighboring property owners. This allowed staff to provide the applicant with a list of issues that should be addressed and would require submittal of additional information. In addition, a number of neighboring property owners submitted additional comments and indicated that there were more neighbors that would like to comment on the request, either verbally or in writing. With the Public Hearing closed prior to the continuance, the submittal of new comments and evidence would not be allowed until or unless the Commission reopened the record to allow the applicant and the public to provide new evidence or testimony. The applicant had formally requested, in writing, the Commission reopen the public hearing and the record in order to allow the applicant to provide additional evidence that may help address the neighboring property owners' concerns. The applicants also requested a continuance to the next regularly scheduled Planning Commission meeting on November 2nd, 2021 at 6 p.m. in the council chambers and they indicated they would waive the 120 time limit for the City to issue a final decision. At their request, the decision clock start over at the November 2nd meeting. By reopening the public comment period this would allow the public to provide additional written or verbal testimony and evidence prior to and during the next commission meeting. Any information submitted by the applicant prior to the meeting would be available for the public to review in the Community Development Department. Staff would provide a link with the November 2nd packet where any additional information submitted would be made available. Commissioner Wickersham added that he was not present at the September meeting, but has reviewed the materials and watched the YouTube recording of the meeting and is comfortable being involved in the decision making process going forward. Vice Chair Montero stated that a motion would be required to open public comment and the record. Commissioner Rose motioned to reopen the public hearing. Commissioner Wickersham seconded the motion. The motion passed 3-0 with Commissioners Kleczek and Morrissey not voting and Commissioner Neubecker absent.

Mr. Cupples stated that staff recommends public comments and testimony be held until additional information was submitted, to provide the public time to review the new information. This does not mean the public is unable to speak during this hearing, just a recommendation for the public to be able to review the new information and documents and testify at the November 2nd meeting. Mark Mead stated that the applicants wanted to reopen the public hearing and record because consultants, like Ecological Land Services, were going to be providing a wetland study and other information to be submitted. Vice Chair Montero stated that she agreed with Mr. Cupples about having public comments be delayed until the November 2nd meeting, as the public will have the submitted information and documents before the meeting. Mr. Cupples added that the public will have an opportunity to speak at the next public meeting, and is able to provide written comments before the meeting. Vice Chair Montero stated that public comment will be held until the November 2nd meeting.

Vice Chair Montero opened the discussion to the Commission. Vice Chair Montero asked Commissioner Rose if he had any comments about the project. Commissioner Rose stated that he did not have any at this time, and would wait until the submission of additional documents. Vice Chair Montero stated that the current plan is very aggressive, but with adjustments it would make a beautiful addition to the Seaside Hills. She continued to provide a list of concerns for Mr. Mead to answer with the new information and documents. What type of planned development is this? Does the original developer have total control from the beginning to the end of the project? Will there be CC&Rs, which is presumed as it's being called out as an HOA. Who is developing the homeowner guidelines? The Commission has been told the developer is proposing one and two story houses, but noted there were specific styles identified at this time. Will there be guidelines per the CC&Rs or is it an actual planned development? What type of housing is being proposed? Either luxury, median, affordable or mixed? Will the proposed development be cleared all at once or will it be in stages? Vice Chair Montero also stated that additional plans should be submitted to show a comprehensive plan addressing the concerns of the natural habitat of streams and displacement of wildlife, a soil erosion and stability plan, a plan for the

retention ponds, a fish and wildlife protection plan, a wetlands protection plan, a logistics plan for the construction equipment, a City engineer report, a neighborhood protection plan, all development plans subject to the City's emergency agencies, and an updated site plan to remove lots 12, 13, 14, and 15, a lighting plan for the neighborhood, and a walking path plan with an open space for wildlife viewing where topographically allowed. Vice Chair Montero also requested a website be created for the project, which includes the project vision, development intro, location, housing opportunities, disclosure and transparency of ownership, contact information, showing the development in real time along with a secure portal for neighbors to contact the developer with concerns and/or questions. Vice Chair Montero stated that the project would be continued to the meeting on November 2nd and the record would remain open.

- B. 21-028VRD:** A conditional use request by **Elaine Albrich** for a **two (2)** bedroom Vacation Rental Dwelling with a maximum occupancy of **six (6)** persons over the age of three, no more than ten persons regardless of age. The property is located at **1210 S Columbia St.** (T6-R10-21DB-TL17700) and it is zoned **Medium Density Residential (R2)**. Kevin Cupples, City Planning Director, presented a staff report, reviewing the request, decision criteria findings, conditions, and conclusion. Vice Chair Montero asked if there was anybody who would like to speak in favor. Elaine Albrich, 1210 S Columbia, gave her thanks for the City staff helping her with the process, and will be obtaining a local contact and will have the compliance inspection performed.

Vice Chair Montero asked if there was anybody else who would like to speak in favor. There were none.

Vice Chair Montero asked if there was anybody who would like to speak in opposition. There were none.

Vice Chair Montero opened the discussion to the Commission. Commissioner Kleczek stated that she was only able to see 1 parking space. Mr. Flory stated that the applicant's parking pad is 18 ft. by 26 ft. This would incorporate the two 9 ft. by 18 ft. required parking spaces. Commissioner Kleczek responded that this would only allow for 1 parking space, as the County map has the parking pad as 15 ft. by 22 ft., but does not include the electric power lines that are attached to the ground restricting the access to and size of the parking space. Mr. Flory stated that he has not performed a site inspection on this property yet. At the time of the site inspection, the parking pad will be measured. Commissioner Kleczek stated that the parking pad appears to be shorter and narrower than what is submitted. Ms. Albrich responded that there is sufficient room for the two parking spaces and will be proved at the time of the compliance inspection. There is gravel around the existing parking pad that allows for the required parking spaces. Commissioner Kleczek asked if the access has to be ADA compliant. Mr. Flory responded that the alley is gravel, the City does not require the paving of the parking spaces until the alleyway is paved. If the Commission would like to have the applicant improve the parking area to designate the specific parking spaces, that would be at in the Commission's conditional approval. Commissioner Kleczek stated that the Commission approve a rental at the house next door and doesn't want to start creating a domino effect for parking spaces. Mr. Cupples added that the parking is addressed in the conditions of approval. When an applicant has access off of a gravel road way, the standard condition states that if the gravel road is improved, the applicant would have to improve the parking and bring it up to the current standard. Commissioner Morrissey asked if the Commission approved the application, would the parking be verified to ensure both spaces were created. Mr. Cupples responded that Mr. Flory would go out and check the parking as part of his inspection. Vice Chair Montero stated that she went out to measure the concrete pad and found the pad to be 22 ft. deep and 14 ft. 6 in. wide. If this VRD is to be approved, it raises the percentage of vacation rentals in the 100 foot radius to 46%, which is over the City's threshold. Ms. Albrich stated that if the Commission was going to suggest denial, she would request the Commission to delay the hearing and be allowed time to work with staff to address the concerns. Vice Chair Montero responded that the Commission would have to take a vote on the project first. Commissioner Morrissey asked for clarification of the threshold for vacation rentals. Mr. Cupples responded that the Planning Commission's policies regarding density is that

once a property has a density of more than 20%, it becomes a Planning Commission review item. The Planning Commission set a policy that if there was a request in a neighborhood where there was more than 40% in some areas, staff would not support the application. Mr. Cupples continued to state that the density is determined at the time of the application and it would not include the applicant's property. Commissioner Wickersham motioned to approve 21-028VRD based upon the recommendations in the staff report. Commissioner Rose seconded the motion. The motion passed 3-2 with Vice Chair Montero and Commissioner Kleczek voting no, and Commissioner Neubecker absent.

- C. **21-063VRD:** A conditional use request by **Alan Kratz** for a **three (3)** bedroom Vacation Rental Dwelling with a maximum occupancy of **nine (9)** persons over the age of three, no more than 10 persons regardless of age. The property is located at **1221 S Prom** (T6-R10-21DB-TL15800 & 16900) and it is zoned **Medium Density Residential (R2)**. Kevin Cupples, City Planning Director, presented a staff report, reviewing the request, decision criteria findings, conditions, and conclusion. Vice Chair Montero asked if there was anybody who would like to speak in favor. Alan Kratz, 109 Vancouver Place, stated that he had recently purchased the property as a vacation home for his family and would like to continue the existing vacation rental use of the property.

Vice Chair Montero asked if there was anybody else who would like to speak in favor. There were none.

Vice Chair Montero asked if there was anybody who would like to speak in opposition. There were none.

Vice Chair Montero opened the discussion to the Planning Commission. Commissioner Kleczek stated that there was construction being performed on this house and if that construction would change the layout and surfaced that are being presented. Mr. Kratz responded that the construction was taking place on the house next door. The only construction planned is the paving of the driveway. Commissioner Kleczek motioned to approve 21-063VRD. Commissioner Morrissey seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously with Commissioner Neubecker absent.

- D. **21-064VRD:** A conditional use request by **Alberto Zaporteza** for a **three (3)** bedroom Vacation Rental Dwelling with a maximum occupancy of **six (6)** persons over the age of three, no more than 10 persons regardless of age. The property is located at **1630 S Edgewood St.** (T6-R10-21DC-TL07114) and it is zoned **Medium Density Residential (R2)**. Kevin Cupples, City Planning Director, presented a staff report, reviewing the request, decision criteria findings, conditions, and conclusion. Vice Chair Montero asked if there was anybody who would like to speak in favor. Alberto Zaporteza, 1630 S Edgewood St., stated that he had purchased the house for his family and was looking for a vacation rental approval to leverage the cost.

Vice Chair Montero asked if there was anybody else who would like to speak in favor. There were none.

Vice Chair Montero asked if there was anybody who would like to speak in opposition. There were none.

Vice Chair Montero opened the discussion to the Planning Commission. Commissioner Kleczek asked if the Commission had received a letter regarding this address. Vice Chair Montero stated that the letter was for the next project. Commissioner Rose stated that he didn't see anything that would prevent this property from being a VRD aside from the concern of the neighbor that does not want the traffic noise within the neighborhood. Commissioner Kleczek stated that approving this VRD application would be against some of the goals of Seaside for long term rentals, but there are no direct violations for this application. Vice Chair Montero stated that her concern was the curb cut would interrupt the two parking spaces up the driveway. Would the garage be usable to the renters?

Mr. Zaporteza replied that it would be made available. Vice Chair Montero recommended the applicant remove the curb cut so it would not interfere with the parking spaces. Commissioner Kleczek motioned to approve 21-064VRD. Commissioner Wickersham seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously with Commissioner Neubecker absent.

- E. 21-065VRD:** A conditional use request by **Adam Brozowski** for a **two (2)** bedroom Vacation Rental Dwelling with a maximum occupancy of six (6) persons over the age of three, no more than 10 persons regardless of age. The property is located at **1860 S Edgewood St.** (T6-R10-28AB-TL03100) and it is zoned **Medium Density Residential (R2)**. Kevin Cupples, City Planning Director, presented a staff report, reviewing the request, decision criteria findings, conditions, and conclusion. Mr. Cupples added that a letter was submitted for this project and Mr. Flory had provided an addendum which is suggested to incorporate in the information into the conditions of approval. Vice Chair Montero asked if there was anybody who would like to speak in favor. Adam Brozowski, 601 Summit Ave E, Seattle, WA, stated that this house was in his family and will keep the house in the family, but will use the rental to offset the cost of repairs and costs of owning the property.

Vice Chair Montero asked if there was anybody else who would like to speak in favor. There were none.

Vice Chair Montero asked if there was anybody who would like to speak in opposition. There were none.

Vice Chair Montero opened the discussion to the Planning Commission. Vice Chair Montero asked if Mr. Brozowski is the current owner, or is his father the current owner. Mr. Brozowski replied that he is the current owner of the property. Vice Chair Montero stated that the house currently has parking on either side of the front door and walkway, and asked if there was a plan to move the parking into one continuous area. Mr. Brozowski replied that the area to the right to be set as the parking area, while the other area is to be landscaped. Vice Chair Montero asked what the timeline was to install the landscaping. Mr. Brozowski replied that he believes he would have a year, but would start as soon as possible once the approval was granted. Commissioner Kleczek asked if the parking was to be paved or if gravel would be maintained. Mr. Brozowski responded that concrete, asphalt or paver stones would be installed based on what looks better for the property. Commissioner Kleczek stated that the water meter and a new mailbox was installed in the area of the parking. Mr. Brozowski replied that the mailbox post was installed in the wrong spot and would be moved. Commissioner Morrissey motioned to approve 21-065VRD. Commissioner Kleczek seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously with Commissioner Neubecker absent.

- F. 21-066PCR:** A request by **Phil Warmbrodt** to allow 2,560 sq. ft. accessory building to replace the mower building that previously destroyed by fire. The property is located on the Seaside Golf Course property at **451 Avenue U** (T6-R10-S28-TL300) and it is zoned **Open Space Parks (OPR)**. The Seaside Zoning Ordinance allows accessory buildings over 1000 sq. ft. subject to approval by the Planning Commission as being consistent with and enhancing the residential nature of the property. Kevin Cupples, City Planning Director, presented a staff report, reviewing the request, decision criteria findings, conditions, and conclusion. Mr. Cupples added that a letter was submitted in support and a letter was submitted in opposition. Vice Chair Montero asked if there was anybody who would like to speak in favor. Mark Mead, 89643 Ocean Dr., stated that the building that had been there had recently burned down. If the structure was rebuilt behind the duplex, it wouldn't allow for a view from the neighbors so the only spot to build this new building is adjacent to the duplex. The building would be set back 10 feet from the property line to provide a buffer for the duplex. The size of the new building is larger than the original, but not by a lot. The increase of size is based on the increase of equipment to maintain the golf course. The fuel tank is located close to Edgewood for Fire Department and access.

Vice Chair Montero asked if there was anybody else who would like to speak in favor. Philip Warmbrodt, 415 Ave U, stated that keeping the fuel tank closer to the gate would keep the fuel away from the neighbors. The neighbors have a 14 foot tall hedge that extends 70', so their view would not be obstructed severely by this building.

Vice Chair Montero asked if there was anybody else who would like to speak in favor. Mr. Mead added that the fuel tanks are a fire rated fuel tank. During the fire, the fuel tank did not catch fire because of this fire rating.

Vice Chair Montero asked if there was anybody else who would like to speak in favor. There were none.

Vice Chair Montero asked if there was anybody who would like to speak in opposition. There were none.

Vice Chair Montero opened the discussion to the Planning Commission. Commissioner Wickersham asked if this new building was replacing the same use as the last building that burned down. Mr. Mead replied that it was replacing the existing use. Mr. Warmbrodt added that this was going to allow separation from the R3 zoning and the golf course. Commissioner Wickersham asked if the tank location was for ease of access for the Fire Department. Mr. Warmbrodt stated that during the fire, the Fire Department had to go around to the backside of the building to access the fuel tanks, so this will make the tanks easier to access. Commissioner Kleczek asked what the height of the current garage was. Mr. Mead responded that the current garage had an eight or 10 foot high door, so this new garage will be taller to allow equipment to maneuver into and out of the garage. Commissioner Kleczek asked for the height of the building not the door. Mr. Mead responded that the original building was roughly 12 feet tall and the new building will be 14 feet tall. Vice Chair Montero stated that the new building is 13 ft. 6 in. to the eve. She asked if building will have a concrete floor. Mr. Mead responded that the floor will be crushed rock for now. Commissioner Kleczek asked if the existing mower building would be removed. Mr. Warmbrodt responded that the garage was allowed to remain temporarily by the Building Official, Bob Mitchell, as long as the building is weatherproof and sided, but would stay as a footprint of the existing home. Vice Chair Montero asked if the garage would be a personal use, not for the golf course. Mr. Warmbrodt stated that it's being turned into personal parking. Commissioner Kleczek stated that the plans indicate that the old mower building would be removed and replaced with a new smaller garage. She added that she was concerned with the height of the building in relation to how close it would be located to the duplex. Mr. Mead responded that the back half of the old mower building was burned to the ground, and the front half is being rebuilt. Commissioner Kleczek stated that it doesn't match the drawing. Mr. Mead stated that it will closely match the drawings submitted but doesn't know for sure what will happen to the building. Mr. Warmbrodt stated that the previous garage left equipment outside in the yard, making the area look like a junkyard. The neighbors have an existing 14' hedge hiding roughly 70 feet of the building. Mr. Warmbrodt continued that the new shop would be an improvement of a view from what was previously on the property. Commissioner Kleczek stated that the Commission could allow a larger outbuilding if it contributes to the residential nature of the area, but this structure gives an appearance of a commercial zone, not residential. Mr. Warmbrodt stated that the size of the lot is 100 acres and all he is asking for is a 2,400 square foot structure for their equipment to go inside instead of sitting outside under a tarp. Mr. Warmbrodt continued to state that if he needed to extend the hedge, he was willing to block the neighbor's view of the golf course to provide the hedge. Commissioner Kleczek asked why the sand storage was being proposed against the existing block wall. Mr. Mead stated that the area could be moved, it was chosen to be placed there because there was an existing wall that could be utilized for the storage area. Vice Chair Montero asked if it was going to be a metal building. Mr. Mead responded that if the Planning Commission wanted to put conditions for the siding, then they will follow through with the conditions. Commissioner Rose stated that he would prefer the building to have a residential look with siding and roofing. Vice Chair Montero asked if the neighbors maintain the existing hedge or if the golf course maintains it. Mr. Warmbrodt said the hedge is the neighbors, but the golf course maintains the portions that overhang on to the golf course property. Mr. Warmbrodt added that if the sand storage would be moved, the new open area could be used for employee parking. Vice Chair Montero stated that if the sand storage would be moved, it could be possible to plant arborvitae to continue the existing hedge down the property line. Mr. Warmbrodt stated that he could put the vegetation in. Vice Chair Montero stated that the existing gas tank was as tall as she is and asked if the new tank would be locked. Mr. Warmbrodt responded that the new fuel tank was downgraded from a 500 gallon to a 275 gallon tank and the

new tank will have a locking mechanism with an electronic shut off for the night. Commissioner Kleczek asked if the Commission was going to add a condition for the type of siding and roofing material to appear more residential. Vice Chair Montero stated that it could be added. Commissioner Kleczek asked if the Commission was going to define what materials to be used. Mr. Cupples stated that there were currently 3 conditions of approval in the staff report regarding the type of siding and roofing material to be used, along with the location of the above grade fuel tank location. Vice Chair Montero asked if the one hour fire rating would be applicable to the shorter sides of the building. Mr. Mead responded that the fire wall is dependent on the distance to the property line. If the building has a distance of 20 feet from the property line to the building, a fire wall would not be required for that portion of the building. Vice Chair Montero asked if the placement of the fuel tank would require a fire wall for that portion of the building. Mr. Warmbrodt stated that the location of the fuel tank could be moved depending on the request of the Fire Department. Mr. Mead added that the location of the fuel tank would be subject to the Building Official and Fire Marshall. Commissioner Kleczek asked what the setback requirements are for the proposed structure. Mr. Cupples responded that the setback from the adjacent property line would be 5 feet. Commissioner Kleczek stated that the plans are confusing because it only shows the new proposed building and the existing building being removed, not what the applicant had previously stated about the existing building remaining. Mr. Cupples stated that the setbacks in question are if the new structure meet the required 5 foot setback from the adjacent property line. The existing building was to be repaired and would not have to meet setbacks. Commissioner Kleczek asked where the access into the existing garage would be from. Mr. Cupples replied that the two properties are under a common ownership, so the owner would be able to give an access easement to the garage if the properties were sold off. Vice Chair Montero asked if there was enough space for an emergency vehicle to access the property between the two buildings. Mr. Mead responded that it provides enough room for the vehicles. Commissioner Kleczek motioned to approve 21-066PCR with the amended condition to have the above ground fuel tank comply with the street side yard setback, the sand storage area would be moved to align with the back of the proposed building and not higher than the existing wall, and adding fast growing vegetation to continue the existing hedge to the remainder of the property line along the adjacent property line provided its acceptable to the neighboring property owner. Commissioner Morrissey seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously with Commissioner Neubecker absent.

ORDINANCE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. Cupples stated that he was hoping that staff would have received the final plat for the subdivision on N Wahanna Road so it could be reviewed by the Commission. Mr. Cupples asked the Commission if the next work session, October 19th, could be split into a public hearing to provide a vote for the final plat of the subdivision. Commissioner Kleczek asked for clarification what would be taking place at the work session. Mr. Cupples replied that the Commission would look at the final plat and saying that it substantially complies with the preliminary plat. Commissioner Kleczek stated that decisions can't be made at a work session. Mr. Cupples responded that at the start of the meeting, it would be stated that the meeting would be a special public hearing to allow for the review of the final plat. Commissioner Kleczek stated that there would be two meetings that night, not a work session. Mr. Cupples confirmed this statement, stating that there would be an extra meeting followed by a work session. Vice Chair Montero stated that she would not be able to attend October 19th meeting. Commissioner Kleczek asked what the date was for the November meeting. Vice Chair Montero stated the date would be November 2nd. Commissioner Kleczek asked what date the work session would be. Mr. Cupples replied October 19th. Mr. Cupples added that the Commission is still missing a Chairperson and has been working with only a Vice Chairperson. Vice Chair Montero requested that when an applicant submits a vacation rental application, pictures of the building and proposed parking area were to be submitted with the rest of the documents.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

Susan Coddington, 2152 Cedar St, stated that she was not attending this meeting as a homeowner talking about 21-061 PSUB nor as a member of the Sunset Empire Parks and Recreation District Board of Directors, but as the leader of the Seaside CERT program. Ms. Coddington gave a presentation on the Great American Shakeout. The first event would take place on October 12th at 7 p.m. at the Seaside Convention Center with speaker Tom Horning about preparation for a tsunami. The second event is the Oregon Shake Alert that is on October 21st. Fliers are available at City Hall and other areas in Seaside.

COMMENTS FROM COMMISSION/STAFF

Mr. Cupples asked for clarification from Commission Kleczek about the amendments to the minutes regarding the public comments that were submitted. Commissioner Kleczek stated that all written testimony should be included within the minutes, as the public comments are both verbal and written. Mr. Cupples stated that when the files were put together, the written comments were part of the file, which is the public record for that project. Commissioner Kleczek replied that the minutes should reflect that the comments were submitted as public comment for that subject. Mr. Cupples stated that the minutes need to reflect that written comment was submitted from an individual regarding the subject. Mr. Cupples stated that with VRD applications, within the findings it lists written public comments. Commissioner Kleczek requested minutes from the September 21st work session be written and submitted to the Commission to approve. Mr. Cupples clarified that what Commissioner Kleczek was requesting was a copy of the agenda and a summary of the information that was covered. Commissioner Kleczek stated that this information is what she was requesting. Vice Chair Montero stated that the work session was made available on the City's YouTube page if the public wanted to view the meeting. Vice Chair Montero stated that the Planning Commission is one Commissioner short. Commissioner Morrissey asked who was removed. Mr. Cupples responded that Teri Carpenter was granted a 6-month extension by the City Council to find a residence in Seaside, as it is difficult to find housing with the City's limits, therefore Teri was asked to step down from the Planning Commission. Vice Chair Montero stated that there is now an opening within the Commission. Mr. Cupples responded that the opening would be announced at the next City Council meeting. Vice Chair Montero asked if the Commission would like the wait to have the vacancy filled before elections or if the Commission wanted to vote for a new Chair and Vice Chair. Commissioner Kleczek asked how the Commission decides who is Chair and Vice Chair. Mr. Cupples replied that a Commissioner would nominate a Chair and Vice Chair and a vote would be taken. Commissioner Kleczek nominated Commissioner Montero to be Chair of the Planning Commission. Commissioner Morrissey asked if it would be appropriate for Commissioner Neubecker to be present for the vote. Mr. Cupples responded that he doesn't have to be at the meeting to nominate and appoint a Chair, but recommended to not nominate Commissioner Neubecker for a position when he was absent. Commissioner Morrissey seconded motion. The motion passed 4-1 with Vice Chair Montero voting no and Commissioner Neubecker absent. Vice Chair Montero motioned to appoint Commissioner Kleczek to the position of Vice Chair. Commissioner Rose seconded the motion. The motion passed 4-0 with Commissioner Kleczek abstaining and Commissioner Neubecker absent. Commissioner Morrissey stated that he believes the Commission is concerned with the proliferation of vacation rentals, and had spoken with the City Council about whose responsibility it is to refine the rules of vacation rentals. Commissioner Morrissey proposed a workshop or work session to dig into the vacation rental rules. Mr. Cupples responded that it hasn't been long time since the Planning Commission and City Council reviewed the policies to tighten the restrictions on vacation rentals. Mr. Flory stated that within the past two months, roughly five houses that have gone for sale on the market that are over the density threshold set by the Planning Commission and City Council. As the density starts filling in, more projects will be submitted to the Planning Commission because the 20% threshold is starting to fill in. Commissioner Morrissey stated that the City Council is very hands off with the topic of vacation rentals and the Planning Commission needs to spearhead the policies if they plan on tightening the policy or change it. Vice Chair Montero asked if any of the Commissioners were able to attend the County Commission Zoom meeting about their vacation rental policy. Commissioner Kleczek stated that she had attended the virtual meeting.

Commissioner Morrissey added that the County had placed a moratorium on vacation rentals. Mr. Flory stated that the County had placed a moratorium on vacation rentals to make changes to the policy. Commissioner Wickersham stated that about two years ago, the Planning Commission had made changes to the policy, but the advice from the City legal staff was to not put on a moratorium on vacation rentals. Mr. Cupples responded that the City would rather see the Planning Commission and City Council restrict vacation rentals based on a policy rather than an ordinance change. Mr. Flory stated that he had a presentation for the City Council and was going to talk about the density requirement and how the City is seeing an effect on the houses that are going up on the market. Commissioner Wickersham requested that the Commission look at how to have more affordable housing and long-term rentals. He added that the City of Seaside is liberal with vacation rentals compared to other communities. Commissioner Morrissey stated that he saw articles which state Seaside is the place to invest in vacation rentals, making it a business model for people rather than owning a second home. Commissioner Kleczek stated that vacation rentals are starting to spread out from the concentrated area to the more residential areas. Vice Chair Montero suggested having a work session on November 16th. Commissioner Kleczek agreed that the Commission should have a work session in November. Mr. Flory stated that he would send out the document with the policies to the Commissioners. Commissioner Morrissey stated that he would not be able to attend the November 16th work session due to hunting season. Mr. Cupples seconded that he would not be able to attend the work session. Vice Chair Montero stated that Mr. Flory had created a continually updating VRD map for the public to view. Commissioner Kleczek asked if Mr. Flory had followed up with the Commission obtaining City email addresses. Mr. Flory responded that only City Councilors were allowed to have City email addresses, and the suggestion was for each Commissioner to create a private Gmail address to use for business pertaining to the Planning Commission. Commissioner Kleczek asked for ideas on how to provide an update to the comprehensive plan. Mr. Cupples stated that he had a discussion with Councilor Montero and the City Council had an update to the comprehensive plan is one of the goals. Vice Chair Montero asked if setting up the Gmail email address would be completed by Jordan Sprague, Administrative Assistant, or if they would have to create the email. Mr. Flory stated that the Commissioners would have to create their own email addresses. Mr. Cupples stated that as information is being emailed out to the Commissioners, when they reply back to staff do not reply back to the group. It could become an issue where the Commission could be interpreted as having discussion about a project outside of a public meeting or work session. The Commission can ask about projects if they email either Mr. Cupples or Mr. Sprague to provide additional details, but to exclude any other member of the Commission from the email.

ADJOURNMENT: Adjourned at 8:05 PM.

Robin Montero, Vice Chairman

Jordan Sprague, Admin. Assistant