

## Jordan Sprague

---

**From:** Marnie Murray <marnie.murray@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, April 8, 2024 7:14 PM  
**To:** Jordan Sprague; Marnie Murray  
**Subject:** Written comments on Vacation Rental Dwellings

Caution! This message was sent from outside your organization.

[Allow sender](#) | [Block sender](#)

This email is my written comments on the Proposed Updates to the Seaside Zoning Ordinances and the changes to the Business Licenses to accommodate Vacation Rental Dwelling Units.

First, the website indicates that Seaside will only approval one VRD license per owner. Why this restriction? If I'm financially able to purchase more than one property in Seaside, why should I be prevented from using them both as Vacation Rentals?

I am using the version of the ordinance available at chrome-extension://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcglclefindmkaj/https://www.cityofseaside.us/sites/g/files/vyhlf6311/f/uploads/short\_term\_rental\_ordinance.pdf

120.03.1 paragraph: a waiting period of 180 days after an expired application is excessive. Who knows what issues may be discovered by a Community Development inspection or how long it may take to fix the issues? Recommend 30 days maximum.

120.03.2 An Application Fee of \$500 is excessive. The standalone Inspection Fee is \$100, which makes the fee to process the paperwork \$400. If the paperwork is so complicated that it takes \$400 of a clerk's time to process it, then paperwork should be simplified. I recommend a reduction of the Application Fee to \$200, if which, \$100 is the paperwork process fee and \$100 is the Inspection Fee.

120.03.3 Please include a link to the location of the Business License.

120.03.4 Remove this requirement. Add a requirement that the new owner of the property must apply to change the name and contact information for the short-term rental license. Otherwise, the house is unchanged and the existing rentals are allowed to continue for a 90-day period, therefore there is no reason to make the short-term rental license non-transferable and void.

120.03.5 This clause is unclear. What does it mean "renting ... is required to be accessory to the primary, residential use of the dwelling?" Also, explain what documentation would satisfy "applicants must demonstrate, by written documentation" ?

120.03.6 Remove the 90-day waiting period for new Vacation Rental Dwellings. There is no reason to delay an approved licensed other than to make the process lengthy and difficult, and to prevent a homeowner from deriving income from their property. Likewise, remove the 2-year waiting period after issuance of Certificate of Occupancy for a newly constructed building. There is no reason to delay application for a Vacation Rental Dwelling for a newly constructed building, other than to make the process arbitrarily lengthy and difficult, and to prevent a homeowner from deriving income from their property.

120.05.5 State the amount of the Re-inspection Fee.

120.06.2 Remove 30% and 50% densities and make the entire Vacation Rental Area 100%. Failing that, change the Spatial Density of the 30% Zone to 50%.

In addition, for any Spatial Density that is being used, change the calculation from using Vacation Rentals and Tax Lots within 100 ft to using Total Number of Vacation Rental Dwellings as a percentage of the Tax Lots within the entire Zone, as follows: (Total number of VRDs) % (Total Number of Tax Lots).

120.06.4 The term "residential appearance" is subjective and open to interpretation. Once person's opinion of what is acceptable can be very different to another person's opinion. So, remove this sentence: "Front, side, and rear yards must maintain a residential appearance by limiting off-street street parking within yard areas." Retain the "50% of each yard area that is not occupied by buildings must be permanently landscaped" which is measurable.

120.06.6 Remove the prohibition "shall not exceed three person per bedroom". It's arbitrary. If someone has a vacation rental containing a bedroom with two bunk beds, meaning four persons could be in that room, where is the justification for restricting it to 3 people? Or if there are 4 bedrooms that can house 3 people each, where is the justification for saying only 10 people can stay there, not 12? Requiring an automatic fire suppression sprinkler system to have 12 people puts it out of reach of nearly every dwelling. After all, how many houses in Seaside actually contain these?

Remove the restriction that vacationers cannot invite people to the Vacation Rental if it increases the number of people in the house over the maximum people allowed. What, they can't invite a few friends for a quiet dinner together, or to watch a movie in the evening? What is the problem that you are trying to solve with this regulation? Why not address it directly, rather than penalizing every vacationer for some action they may never do.

120.06.7 This is very specific to the type of activity being performed. Let me guess that what is being attempted is to reduce noisy activities out of doors late at night in a residential area. By this clause, people could be outside on a deck or play beach volleyball in the backyard, and any noise generated would not be a problem, because it isn't by a fire ring or fire place, etc. If there is an applicable Seaside noise ordinance, it might be better to state: "As per Seaside Ordinance xx.xx.x outdoor activities of a noisy nature must stop during the hours of ..."

120.06.9 Remove this clause.

120.10 All of the fines are excessive and look punitive. Two offenses and their license is revoked? REALLY? This should be reserved for an owner or property manager who is flagrantly and deliberately contravening the regulations. The actions with regard to licenses escalate to soon and too fast, and an owner loses their license for 6 months after only two, possibly minor, offenses.

120.10.1 \$250 for a first offense should be reduced to \$100.

120.10.2 Change fine to \$100. Remove the "suspension of the short-term rental license for 6 months".

120.10.3 Change to \$250 fine. Remove everything after "fine"

120.10.4 Change to: "\$500 fine and suspension of short-term rental license for a period of 6 months, or if unlicensed, a six-month waiting period before a license may be issued."

120.10.5 The current clause in 120.10.5 says "Subsequent offenses within a one-year period: \$2000 fine." The previous clause, 120.10.4, permanently revokes the short-term license with that owner. Doesn't that mean the process stops at clause 120.10.4 and never reaches 120.10.5?

My recommendations would have the owner returning back to vacation rental after having their license revoked for 6 months. At this point, the count is reset and the owner starts back at the beginning of the process with an offense count at 0.