

Debbie Kenyon

From: Christopher Schwindt <chris@cds-enterprise.com>
Sent: Wednesday, April 10, 2024 11:29 AM
To: cdadmin
Subject: Comments on proposed STR ordinances

Caution! This message was sent from outside your organization.

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

Dear Planning Commission:

These comments concern the proposed updates to City code concerning STRs / VRDs in the City of Seaside. My company currently owns property at 924 Ave H, Seaside.

I disagree with the proposed code changes. I have no issue with eliminating the Bed & Breakfast designation and streamlining the process through another department. The issue I have is with the limitations and quotas imposed on property owners concerning STR/VRD permits.

The City's proposal allows blanket 100% density approvals along the ocean front, which are the most valuable properties in town owned by the wealthiest owners. Then scaling it back from there not even to 101 and no one else in the City even gets to participate in the STR/VRD economy. This is so patently unfair and biased towards the wealthiest, best-positioned landowners I am shocked you would even propose this. I guess they probably pay the most local taxes too, but still. You are proposing to devalue every other landowner's property outside of the "anointed zone" and boost those within it tremendously. This is just totally unfair to your constituent landowner / taxpayers throughout the larger remaining area of Seaside. I also disagree with the City restricting STR/VRD use at all.

Inspections for safety and reasonable rules for operation to prevent nuisances for other landowners are OK. However, other restrictions amount to a taking without compensation at worst, and unnecessary, heavy-handed, diminution of value, economy-interfering regulation at best. You should allow the free market to do its own work of finding the right equilibrium among the possible uses of private property. Anything else is basically top-down, command and control economics, i.e., communism. What makes you the anointed ones to determine which individual economic decisions about use of private property are "best"? You pretend to know, but all you are doing is creating even worse distortions of the true economy, and there will be serious negative consequences, as there always are.

You should lift all restrictions other than common sense safety and nuisance related rules. The economy, through thousands of individual free-will choices, will determine the highest best use of individual private property. If you don't like the results, then take actions at the cost of the collective (taxpayers) to provide the benefit or amenity (e.g., low-income long-term housing) you think you can provide by just targeting the homeowners outside of your proposed "anointed zones" at their individual expense and the benefit of the selected few lucky landowners how somehow carried governmental favor. You should scrap this entire proposal and go back to the drawing board with free-market capitalism and constitutional rights at the forefront of your minds.

Regards,

Christopher Schwindt
Email: chris@cds-enterprise.com
Phone: (503) 810-6374

Mail: PO Box 80794, Portland, OR 97280