



A G E N D A
CITY OF SEASIDE
PLANNING COMMISSION

REGULAR MEETING
440 HARCOURT AVE (COUNCIL CHAMBER)
Wednesday, January 14, 2026
6:00 PM

Virtual Participation Guide: <https://www.ci.seaside.ca.us/129/City-Council-Committee-Agendas>
<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/81555467580> | WEBINAR ID 815 5546 7580 | (669) 900-9128

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. ROLL CALL - PLANNING COMMISSION

William Silva	Chair
Keith Dodson	Commissioner
John Owens	Commissioner
Arlington La Mica	Commissioner
Dave Evans	Commissioner
Danny Huynh	Commissioner
Gonzalo Quintero Alcaraz	Commissioner

3. REVIEW OF AGENDA

If there are any items that arose after the 72-hour posting deadline, this is the point in the meeting where a vote may be taken to add the item to the agenda. (A 2/3-majority vote is required).

4. PUBLIC COMMENT

Members of the public wishing to address the Commission on matters within the jurisdiction of the City of Seaside, but not on this agenda, may do so during the Public Comment period for up to three (3) minutes. Comments on specific agenda items are heard under that item. For the public record, please state your name.

5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. APPROVE MINUTES FROM DECEMBER 10, 2025

6. BUSINESS ITEMS

A. ZONING ORDINANCE AMENDMENT ZOA-2026-001: AN AMENDMENT TO THE SEASIDE MUNICIPAL CODE TO MODIFY THE DEFINITION OF PUBLIC SAFETY FACILITY TO INCLUDE CONTRACTED PUBLIC SAFETY FACILITIES. THE PROPOSED ACTION CONSISTS OF A RECOMMENDATION ONLY AND IS THEREFORE NOT SUBJECT TO THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA) PURSUANT TO SECTION 15061(B)(3) OF THE CEQA GUIDELINES.

RECOMMENDATION: Adopt the Attached Resolution

B. SPECIFIC PLAN AMENDMENT SPA-2025-002: A RESOLUTION RECOMMENDING THAT THE SEASIDE CITY COUNCIL APPROVE AN AMENDMENT TO THE CAMPUS TOWN SPECIFIC PLAN MODIFYING THE REVIEW PROCESSES AND SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS FOR DEVELOPMENT APPLICATIONS. THE PROPOSED ACTION CONSISTS OF A RECOMMENDATION ONLY AND IS THEREFORE NOT SUBJECT TO THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA) PURSUANT TO SECTION 15061(B)(3) OF THE CEQA GUIDELINES.

RECOMMENDATION: Approve the proposed Resolution recommending that the City Council adopt SPA-2025-002.

7. REPORTS FROM COMMISSIONERS

8. REPORTS FROM STAFF

This is a time specifically set aside for the Staff Liaison to provide updates on non-agendized requests from the Commission, and to provide brief information on topics under the purview of the Commission.

9. ADJOURNMENT

Next Regularly Scheduled Meeting:
January 28, 2026
6:00 PM

The City of Seaside is committed to providing accessible facilities and accommodating people with disabilities in all of its services programs and activities. If special considerations are needed by any person to fully participate in this meeting, contact the City Clerk at 899-6707 no fewer than two business days prior to the meeting to allow reasonable arrangements. Agendas are posted at:

<http://www.ci.seaside.ca.us/129/City-Council-Committee-Agendas>

Agenda-related writings or documents provided during public meetings are available for public inspection during the meeting or from the office of the City Clerk. This agenda is posted in compliance with California Government Code Section 54954.2(a) or Section 54956.



FINAL MINUTES

CITY OF SEASIDE
PLANNING COMMISSION

REGULAR MEETING
COUNCIL CHAMBER
Wednesday, December 10, 2025
6:00 PM

1. **CALL TO ORDER**

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

2. **ROLL CALL – PLANNING COMMISSION**

PRESENT: ALCARAZ, DODSON, EVANS, LA MICA, OWENS
ABSENT: SILVA

3. **REVIEW OF AGENDA**

4. **PUBLIC COMMENT**

None

5. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Approve Minutes from September 24, 2025

On motion by Commissioner Evans, and second by La Mica, and carried by the following vote, the Planning Commission moved to approve the Minutes from September 24, 2025 meeting, subject to the correction of striking Item #7, sentence 3.

RESULTS: 4-0-1-1
AYES: Alcaraz, Evans, Dodson, La Mica
NOYES: None
ABSENT: Chair Silva
ABSTAIN: Vice Chair Owens

ACTION: APPROVED & ADOPTED RESOLUTION

6. **BUSINESS ITEMS**

A. USE PERMIT APPLICATION UP-2025-002. EUGENE F AND ROSEMARIE PASQUALE FAMILY TRUST, PROPERTY OWNER, AND VILMA MENDOZA, APPLICANT, REQUEST APPROVAL OF A MEETING FACILITY AT 795 BROADWAY AVENUE (APN 011-558-005) IN THE MIXED USE (MX) ZONING DISTRICT OF THE WEST BROADWAY URBAN VILLAGE SPECIFIC PLAN. THE PROJECT IS CATEGORICALLY EXEMPT (CLASS 1) FROM THE

CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA) PURSUANT TO SECTION 15301(A) OF THE CEQA GUIDELINES.

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends approval of Use Permit UP-2025-002 subject to the conditions of approval and project plans.

Eric Azriel, Associate Planner, gave a PowerPoint presentation on the Use Permit (UP-2025-002) and Architectural Review (AR-2025-022) for 795 Broadway, and referenced eight conditions of approval.

1. Architectural Review components must be completed as part of the Use Permit.
2. Additional Architectural Review requirements must also be satisfied as part of the Use Permit.
3. The project shall incorporate measures to promote site vibrancy.
4. The project shall include measures to prevent the formation of bird colonies.
5. The surrounding area—including the building exterior, parking lot, and adjacent sidewalks—shall be properly maintained.
6. Sidewalks and surrounding areas shall be kept free of litter and debris.
7. To mitigate parking impacts, the number of persons on site shall be limited to the lesser of 30 persons or the maximum occupancy permitted for the use.
8. To mitigate parking impacts, meeting facility operations shall be limited to the following days and hours: Thursday, Friday, and Sunday, from 6:30 p.m. to 8:30 p.m.

B. ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW APPLICATION AR-2025-022. EUGENE F AND ROSEMARIE PASQUALE FAMILY TRUST, PROPERTY OWNER, AND ERIC WYNKOOP, APPLICANT, REQUEST APPROVAL OF A NEW TRASH ENCLOSURE AT 795 BROADWAY AVENUE (APN 011-558-005) IN THE MIXED USE (MX) ZONING DISTRICT OF THE WEST BROADWAY URBAN VILLAGE SPECIFIC PLAN. ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW IS NOT AN ACTIVITY SUBJECT TO THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA) PURSUANT TO 15061(B)(3) OF THE CEQA GUIDELINES.

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends approval of Architectural Review Application AR-2025-022, subject to the conditions of approval and project plans.

Eric Azriel, Associate Planner, gave a PowerPoint presentation on the Architectural Review for the trash enclosure and removal of an external door, including associated exterior changes (AR-2025-022). The Architectural Review was recommended for approval with two conditions:

1. Exterior Door Removal: The external door shall be removed and replaced with a wall constructed and finished with materials consistent with the adjacent existing walls, and painted to match.
2. Trash Enclosure Finish: The trash enclosure shall be properly prepared and primed prior to painting, in accordance with standard industry practices. Any paint that flakes or weathers poorly shall be repaired within 30 days of receiving notice from the City. The enclosure shall receive a final exterior coat

of graffiti-resistant paint, subject to approval by the Planning Department.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Guillermo Domingues, the applicant’s representative and painting contractor, stated that the parking area is vacant during the proposed hours of use. He asked whether the trash enclosure could be constructed of stucco instead of metal. If metal is required, he noted that a zero-rust primer would be applied to protect it from weather exposure.

He also mentioned that birds currently nest on the rooftop at 795 Broadway, extending from the Goodwill store past 795 Broadway. He noted that the city may have previously accessed the site and taken measures to prevent nesting, though he was not certain.

Additionally, he stated that the building’s paint color will be changed to be more aesthetically pleasing and to better match the overall character of the WBUV area.

Eric Wynkoop, applicant, discussed the trash enclosure and identified a suitable prefabricated model.

On motion by Commissioner La Mica, and second by Evans, and carried by the following vote, the Planning Commission moved to approve Use Permit UP-2025-002, of a meeting facility at 795 Broadway Avenue (APN 011-558-005) in the Mixed Use (MX) Zoning District of the West Broadway Urban Village Specific Plan.

RESULTS: 5-0-1-0

AYES: Vice Chair Owens, Alcaraz, Evans, Dodson, La Mica

NOYES: None

ABSENT: Chair Silva

ABSTAIN: None

ACTION: APPROVED & ADOPTED RESOLUTION

On motion by Commissioner Alcaraz, and second by Dodson, and carried by the following vote, the Planning Commission moved to approve Architectural Review AR-2025-022, a new trash enclosure at 795 Broadway Avenue (APN 011-558-005) in the Mixed Use (MX) Zoning District of the West Broadway Urban Village Specific Plan

RESULTS: 5-0-1-0

AYES: Vice Chair Owens, Alcaraz, Evans, Dodson, La Mica

NOYES: None

ABSENT: Chair Silva

ABSTAIN: None

ACTION: APPROVED & ADOPTED RESOLUTION

C. ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW APPLICATION AR-2025-023. ABRAHAM MARTINEZ, PROPERTY OWNER AND APPLICANT, REQUESTS APPROVAL OF A SECOND-STORY ADDITION FEATURING TWO BALCONIES TO AN

EXISTING SINGLE-STORY, SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENCE LOCATED AT 1841 YOSEMITE STREET (APN 012-851-007) IN THE RS-12 SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL ZONING DISTRICT. ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW IS NOT AN ACTIVITY SUBJECT TO THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA) PURSUANT TO 15061(B)(3) OF THE CEQA GUIDELINES.

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends the approval of Architectural Review AR-2025-023 subject to the conditions of approval and the project plans.

Beth Rocha, Senior Planner, gave a PowerPoint presentation requesting that the Commission consider approval of Architectural Review application AR-2025-023, in accordance with Seaside Municipal Code Section 17.62.030. A copy of which is on file with the Community Development Department.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Abraham Martinez, the homeowner, spoke about the proposed addition for his family and stated that he has been mindful of minimizing impacts to neighboring properties by adhering to height limits and maintaining the existing roofline.

On motion by Commissioner Dodson, and second by La Mica, and carried by the following vote, the Planning Commission moved to approve Architectural Review AR-2025-023, of a second story addition featuring two balconies to an existing single-story, single-family residence located at 1841 Yosemite Street (APN 012-851-007) in the RS-12 single family Residential Zoning District

RESULTS: 5-0-1-0

AYES: Vice Chair Owens, Alcaraz, Evans, Dodson, La Mica

NOYES: None

ABSENT: Chair Silva

ABSTAIN: None

ACTION: APPROVED & ADOPTED RESOLUTION

D. SPECIFIC PLAN AMENDMENT SPA-2025-002. A RESOLUTION RECOMMENDING THAT THE SEASIDE CITY COUNCIL APPROVE AN AMENDMENT TO THE CAMPUS TOWN SPECIFIC PLAN MODIFYING THE REVIEW PROCESSES AND SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS FOR DEVELOPMENT APPLICATIONS. THE PROPOSED ACTION CONSISTS OF A RECOMMENDATION ONLY AND IS THEREFORE NOT SUBJECT TO THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA) PURSUANT TO SECTION 15061(B)(3) OF THE CEQA GUIDELINES. *RECOMMENDED TO BE CONTINUED TO JANUARY 14, 2026*

RECOMMENDATION: Continue Item to the January 14, 2026 Meeting

Andrew Myrick, Housing and Planning Manager, requested that Item D be continued to the next scheduled meeting on January 14, 2026

PUBLIC COMMENT:

None

On motion by Commissioner Evans, and second by Alcaraz, and carried by the following vote, the Planning Commission moved to continue Item 6D. to the January 14, 2026 Meeting

RESULTS: 5-0-1-0

AYES: Vice Chair Owens, Alcaraz, Evans, Dodson, La Mica

NOYES: None

ABSENT: Chair Silva

ABSTAIN: None

ACTION: APPROVED & ADOPTED RESOLUTION

7. REPORTS FROM COMMISSIONERS

Vice Chair Owens, inquired about the former motor sports building, noting that although permits had been issued to Meals on Wheels, he had heard that individuals may be living in the upstairs area.

Commissioner Dodson expressed concern regarding the ongoing bird issues, and Andrew Myrick responded that the City is implementing remedies Citywide. He added that at 795 Broadway both the property owner and tenant are responsible for preventing bird nesting. City staff is exploring the use of falconers, and other potential remedies on a Citywide basis as well.

Commissioner Alcaraz asked who the developer for the Campus Town project is, and Andrew Myrick responded that KB Bakewell is the primary developer.

Commissioner Evans asked whether local labor is being used on the project, and Mr. Myrick stated that he was unsure.

8. REPORTS FROM STAFF

Andrew Myrick reported that the City Council has taken action to remove Danny Huynh from the Planning Commission. As a result, there is now one vacancy, and the City Clerk’s Office is currently accepting applications.

9. ADJOURNMENT

With no further business the meeting adjourned at 7:08 p.m.

On motion by Commissioner La Mica, and second by Alcaraz, and carried by the following vote, the Planning Commission moved to adjourn

Respectfully submitted,

**Andrew Myrick, Community Development
Housing and Planning Manager**

William Silva, Chair



**CITY OF SEASIDE
STAFF REPORT**

Item No.: 6.A.

TO: Planning Commission

BY: Andrew Myrick, Housing & Planning Manager

DATE: January 14, 2026

SUBJECT: ZONING ORDINANCE AMENDMENT ZOA-2026-001: AN AMENDMENT TO THE SEASIDE MUNICIPAL CODE TO MODIFY THE DEFINITION OF PUBLIC SAFETY FACILITY TO INCLUDE CONTRACTED PUBLIC SAFETY FACILITIES. THE PROPOSED ACTION CONSISTS OF A RECOMMENDATION ONLY AND IS THEREFORE NOT SUBJECT TO THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA) PURSUANT TO SECTION 15061(b)(3) OF THE CEQA GUIDELINES.

RECOMMENDATION

Adopt the Attached Resolution

BACKGROUND

Chapter 17.98 ("Definitions") of the Zoning Ordinance is one of the Ordinance's most critical components. This is because whether a proposed use is allowed is determined based upon the Use Classifications Tables that specify whether a proposed use is permitted, permitted with permits, or not permitted at various locations throughout the City. Determining which definition a proposed project falls under is therefore a critical determination, as it determines whether the project will be allowed and, if so, what types of permits and process would be required in order to move forward.

The County of Monterey contracts with a private party, AMR Medical Response, to provide ambulance services on a County-wide basis. No public agency provides ambulance service. The City has received inquiries about the use of a property in the City of Seaside for use by AMR to store its ambulances and medical supplies.

Operationally, when employees arrive at the site, they would collect medical supplies

as needed and take an ambulance to pre-determined locations throughout the area. They would then dispatch from those locations, rather than from the site itself. No employees would be working from the site.

In reviewing Chapter 17.98, the Zoning Administrator has determined that there are two potential definitions that this could fall under: Public Safety Facility or Specialized Transportation Dispatch Facility. These uses are defined as follows:

Public Safety Facility. *A facility operated by a public agency including fire stations, other fire prevention and fire fighting facilities, police and sheriff substations and headquarters, including interim incarceration facilities. May include ambulance dispatch facilities on the same site.*

Specialized Transportation Dispatch Facility. *A base facility where ambulances, taxis, limousines, armored cars, tow trucks and similar vehicles for specialized transportation are stored, and from which they are dispatched, and/or where ambulance vehicles and crews not based at a hospital or fire department stand by for emergency calls. Does not include storage facilities for towed vehicles, which is classified under "Vehicle Storage."*

Each of these definitions appear to generally refer to the type of use proposed but include language that is contrary to the proposed use. In the case of Public Safety Facility, the definition includes the language "operated by a public agency," which is not the case here. For a Specialized Transportation Dispatch Facility, the use is not consistent because it refers to a location "from which they are dispatched, and/or where ambulance vehicles and crews...stand by for emergency calls." As noted previously, ambulances would not be dispatched, and crews would not be stationed at the site waiting for emergency calls.

Since there is no definition that fits the proposed use exactly, staff is proposing to modify the definition of "Public Safety Facility" to also include private companies providing public safety services under contract with a public agency. This definition was selected because it is more consistent with the intent of the use (the purpose of the operation is to enhance public safety). Public Safety Facilities may be considered with a Use Permit in any Commercial district; Specialized Transportation Dispatch Facilities may be considered only in the Heavy Commercial (CH) Zoning District. This would remain unchanged under the proposed Zoning Ordinance Amendment. Any future proposal for a specific site would be reviewed based on the merits of the particular application as part of the Use Permit process.

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission recommend that the City Council amend the Zoning Ordinance to modify the language of Chapter 17.98.P as noted in the attached Resolution.

FISCAL IMPACT

There is no fiscal impact associated with this Item.

ATTACHMENTS

- 1. Attachment 1 - ZOA-2026-001 PC Resolution
-
-

RESOLUTION NO. 26-XX PC

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF SEASIDE RECOMMENDING THAT THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SEASIDE APPROVE AN AMENDMENT TO THE SEASIDE MUNICIPAL CODE TO MODIFY THE DEFINITION OF PUBLIC SAFETY FACILITY TO INCLUDE CONTRACTED PUBLIC SAFETY FACILITIES. THE PROPOSED ACTION CONSISTS OF A RECOMMENDATION ONLY AND IS THEREFORE NOT SUBJECT TO THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA) PURSUANT TO SECTION 15061(b)(3) OF THE CEQA GUIDELINES.

WHEREAS, the City of Seaside allows Public Safety Facilities in all commercial zones with a Use Permit; and

WHEREAS, Chapter 17.98 of the Seaside Municipal Code provides that only those facilities operated by a public agency may be considered to be Public Safety Facilities; and

WHEREAS, some public safety operations, such as ambulance services, are now contracted out to private entities; and

WHEREAS, the City of Seaside desires to provide potential locations for Public Safety Facilities, whether operated directly or indirectly by a public agency; and

WHEREAS, since this action constitutes only a recommendation it is not subject to CEQA pursuant to Section 15061(b)(3) of the CEQA Guidelines.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION HEREBY FINDS, DETERMINES, AND RESOLVES AS FOLLOWS:

1. The Planning Commission finds that: a) the facts set forth in the recitals in this Resolution are true and correct and incorporated by reference; b) the recitals constitute findings in this matter and, together with the staff report, other written reports, public testimony, and other information contained in the record are an adequate and appropriate evidentiary basis for the action taken in this Resolution; c) the provisions in this Resolution and the proposed Amendment are consistent with applicable federal and state law; and d) this Resolution will not be detrimental to the public interest, health, safety, convenience, or welfare.

2. The Planning Commission hereby recommends that the City Council adopt the attached Zoning Ordinance Amendment modifying the definition of "Public Safety Facility" in Section 17.98.P of the Municipal Code as described in the attached Exhibit "A."

PASSED AND ADOPTED at a meeting of the Planning Commission of the City of Seaside, State of California, on the 14th day of January, 2026, by the following vote:

AYES:
NOES:
ABSENT:
ABSTAIN:

APPROVED:

Will Silva, Chairperson

ATTEST:

Andrew Myrick, Secretary

Attach:

Exhibit "A" – Zoning Ordinance Amendment

Exhibit "A"

Public Safety Facility. A facility operated by a public agency or another entity operating under contract with a public agency including fire stations, other fire prevention and fire fighting facilities, police and sheriff substations and headquarters, including interim incarceration facilities, and similar facilities. May include ambulance dispatch facilities on the same site.



**CITY OF SEASIDE
STAFF REPORT**

Item No.: 6.B.

TO: Planning Commission

BY: Andrew Myrick, Housing & Planning Manager

DATE: January 14, 2026

SUBJECT: SPECIFIC PLAN AMENDMENT SPA-2025-002: A RESOLUTION RECOMMENDING THAT THE SEASIDE CITY COUNCIL APPROVE AN AMENDMENT TO THE CAMPUS TOWN SPECIFIC PLAN MODIFYING THE REVIEW PROCESSES AND SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS FOR DEVELOPMENT APPLICATIONS. THE PROPOSED ACTION CONSISTS OF A RECOMMENDATION ONLY AND IS THEREFORE NOT SUBJECT TO THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA) PURSUANT TO SECTION 15061(b)(3) OF THE CEQA GUIDELINES.

RECOMMENDATION

Approve the proposed Resolution recommending that the City Council adopt SPA-2025-002.

BACKGROUND

The Campus Town development is located in northern Seaside. To provide for orderly development of this project, in March 2020 the Seaside City Council adopted the Campus Town Specific Plan. The Specific Plan overrides the City's Zoning Ordinance and provides for a specific development pattern within the project area consisting of approximately 1,485 residential units, 250 hotel rooms, 75 youth hostel beds, 150,000 square feet of retail/dining/entertainment uses, and 50,000 square feet of office/light industrial uses, as well as parks and other amenities. Ground-breaking for the first phase of the project has already occurred and construction is expected to follow shortly.

Chapter 6 of the Specific Plan discusses the implementation of the Specific Plan.

Particularly, Section 6.3 outlines the process for the review of development applications. This process differs significantly from the "standard" review processes provided in the Zoning Ordinance. Most significantly, almost all allowed uses within the Specific Plan are ministerial in nature, which means that there are no public notifications or hearings associated with development applications within the Specific Plan. Instead, the City's Zoning Administrator is supported by a "Peer Reviewer," defined as being a licensed architect doing business within 75 miles of the City of Seaside and appointed by the Zoning Administrator to conduct a secondary review of all development applications.

While staff is supportive of the use of a ministerial process in most circumstances within the Campus Town Specific Plan area, staff also believes that the Peer Review process is unnecessary in certain circumstances. For example, grading permits, encroachment permits, and other site preparation work would not typically benefit from review by an outside architect. Further, in a subdivision, many of the homes are replicated using several model home types. While the initial review of the models would still be subject to Peer Review, it would not be necessary to repeat the Peer Review for every home built using those plans throughout the subdivision. Eliminating the Peer Review for those circumstances where there is little for an architect to review would reduce processing time and costs for those applications while maintaining the third-party review for those projects that would benefit from such a review.

Other changes that would be made include:

- Modifying language regarding the posting of decisions in the Agenda for Zoning Administrator Hearings. As Zoning Administrator Hearings have been eliminated, this language has been changed to require the posting of decisions as part of the Planning Commission Agenda.
- Modifying submittal requirements to eliminate submittals of physical material in favor of digital files.
- Consolidation of the currently-separate application completeness and compliance reviews into a single review that examines both completeness and compliance.
- Addition of language clarifying that the City Council may amend the Specific Plan via Resolution (as opposed to amendments requiring an Ordinance).

Staff's recommendation is that the Planning Commission recommend that the City Council approve the proposed changes.

The entirety of the Specific Plan may be found at the following webpage: [Attachment-5a---Campus-Town-Specific-Plan-Book](#).

FISCAL IMPACT

There is no fiscal impact associated with this Item.

ATTACHMENTS

- 1. SPA-25-02 PC Resolution
 - 2. SPA-25-02 PC Reso Exhibit A
-
-

RESOLUTION NO. 26-XX PC

A RESOLUTION RECOMMENDING THAT THE SEASIDE CITY COUNCIL APPROVE AN AMENDMENT TO THE CAMPUS TOWN SPECIFIC PLAN MODIFYING THE REVIEW PROCESSES AND SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS FOR DEVELOPMENT APPLICATIONS.

WHEREAS, in March 2020 the Seaside City Council adopted the Campus Town Specific Plan; and

WHEREAS, Chapter 6 of the Specific Plan includes provisions for the processing of land use applications; and

WHEREAS, these provisions are in many cases inconsistent and less efficient than current procedures for the processing of land use applications; and

WHEREAS, the City desires to streamline development within the Campus Town Specific Plan by reducing permit processing times; and

WHEREAS, the proposed changes to the Specific Plan would only effect processes for the review of applications and would not modify the amount, type, or style of development within the Specific Plan area; and

WHEREAS, since this action consists only of a recommendation, it is not subject to CEQA pursuant to Section 15061(b)(3) of the CEQA Guidelines.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION HEREBY FINDS, DETERMINES, AND RESOLVES AS FOLLOWS:

1. The Planning Commission finds that: a) the facts set forth in the recitals in this Resolution are true and correct and incorporated by reference; b) the recitals constitute findings in this matter and, together with the staff report, other written reports, public testimony and other information contained in the record, are an adequate and appropriate evidentiary basis for the action taken in this Resolution; c) the provisions in this Resolution and the proposed Amendment are consistent with applicable federal and state law; and d) this Resolution will not be detrimental to the public interest, health, safety, convenience, or welfare.
2. The Planning Commission hereby recommends that the City Council adopt the attached Specific Plan Amendment as described in the attached Exhibit "A."

PASSED AND ADOPTED at a meeting of the Planning Commission of the City of Seaside, State of California, on the 14th day of January, 2026, by the following vote:

AYES:
NOES:
ABSENT:
ABSTAIN:

APPROVED:

Will Silva, Chairperson

ATTEST:

Andrew Myrick, Secretary

Attach:

Exhibit "A" – Specific Plan Amendment

Implementation

6.1 Purpose and Applicability

The Campus Town Specific Plan is intended to guide and regulate development within the Specific Plan Area. The Plan anticipates new development in the Specific Plan Area facilitated by a significant investment in infrastructure and public amenities. This chapter provides the framework for the development review process, including a detailed implementation program.

6.2 Specific Plan Adoption and Required Actions

This Specific Plan has been prepared and adopted in a manner consistent with California Government Code section 65451, as well as all pertinent sections of the Seaside Municipal Code. Adoption of this Specific Plan is by Ordinance (Section 65453) of the City Council.

It is anticipated that the following approvals/actions may be required to implement the Specific Plan:

- Certification of the EIR and Adoption of the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program
- Specific Plan Approval/Adoption
- Zoning Map and Text Amendment
- FORA Consistency Determination
- Vesting Tentative Map(s) and Final Map(s)
- ~~Conditional~~ Use Permit(s)
- Other Development Application Approval(s)
- Minor Deviations and/or Deviation(s)
- Improvement Plans
- Development Agreement

- Disposition and Development Agreement with Successor Agency
- Affordable Housing Plan
- Building Permits
- Grading Permits
- Tree Removal Permits
- Encroachment Permits

6.3 Development Process

This section outlines the development review and approval process for all proposed development within the Campus Town Specific Plan Area.

By approving the Campus Town Specific Plan, the City has established the legislative policies applicable to the Specific Plan Area. In order to implement those policy decisions, the City will review Development Applications for development within the Specific Plan Area pursuant to this Chapter. The scope of review of Development Applications will consist of review for substantial conformance with the Specific Plan, as provided in Section 6.3.3.1.B.C. The development review process for projects proposed within the Campus Town Specific Plan Area is streamlined based on required conformance with the policies, Standards, and Guidelines established by the Specific Plan.

6.3.1 Administration and Interpretation

Approval of development within the Campus Town Specific Plan Area shall be subject to the review process set forth in this section.

A. Relationship to Seaside Municipal Code

The Campus Town Specific Plan constitutes the applicable zoning, including development standards and regulations, for development within the Specific Plan Area. Title 17 (Zoning) of the Seaside Municipal Code (SMC) shall apply only to matters not covered in this Specific Plan. If there is any conflict or inconsistency between the provisions of this Specific Plan and the SMC (including without limitation Municipal Code Section 8.54.070 (Trees), Title 17 (Zoning) and/or Title 16 (Subdivisions)), the provisions of this Specific Plan shall take precedence. All applicable state and federal standards and codes also apply to development within the Specific Plan Area. The Zoning Administrator or designee shall prepare a report on trees and views based on these plans and site inspection of the land.

1. Tree Removal and Replacement. Each Development Application shall specify any tree to be removed or altered and shall demonstrate compliance with the Coast Live

Oak and Monterey Cypress tree replacement policies in this Specific Plan. Such application shall identify the Lot or off-site location on which the tree is located, or to be planted, provide a perimeter outline of an existing or proposed building on the Lot, specify the location of the tree, and furnish a brief statement of the reason for the request. The following finding must be made if it is determined that any of the trees recommended for preservation should be removed: the preservation of the tree(s) would impair the implementation of the Base Reuse Plan, the General Plan, and/or the Specific Plan on the site in question, and/or the preservation is not feasible due to the health of the tree (including disease or pests). Final approval of a Conformance Determination with respect to any Development Application indicating any trees to be removed shall constitute a permit to remove or alter any trees so designated, subject to tree replacement requirements solely to the extent required by Section 3.5 of this Specific Plan. Appeal of such permit shall be subject to the same provisions as appeal of

a Conformance Determination, as provided herein.

2. Subdivisions. Unless otherwise specifically provided for in this Specific Plan, the regulations set forth in Title 16 (Subdivision) of the SMC, entitled "Subdivisions," shall apply to all divisions of land hereafter made of property within the Campus Town Specific Plan Area. Subdivision will be accomplished through recordation of multiple phased maps to facilitate the full implementation and buildout of the Specific Plan Area. Phasing plans shall provide all infrastructure necessary to support each phase in substantial conformance with the Specific Plan.

B. Administration of Specific Plan

The primary administrator of this Specific Plan is the City's Zoning Administrator. Following review of each Development Application as provided herein, the Zoning Administrator shall have authority over approval of Development Applications, as provided in Section 6.3.31.B. The Zoning Administrator shall have the responsibility to interpret the provisions of the Specific Plan. If an issue or situation arises that is not sufficiently provided for in the



Specific Plan, the Zoning Administrator shall be guided by the purpose, goals, and policies of the Specific Plan and the interpretation provisions of the Title 17 (Zoning) of the SMC.

6.3.2 Peer Review

~~All~~ Development Applications which include the approval of a site plan, floor plan, and/or building elevations (but excluding plot plans for residential units when a design for the unit has already been approved) shall be subject to review by a Peer Reviewer appointed by the Zoning Administrator. The Peer Reviewer shall at a minimum be a licensed architect, doing business within 75 miles of the City of Seaside. Grading Permits, Encroachment Permits, Tentative or Final Maps, Specific Plan Amendments, Residential Plot Plans, and similar Development Applications shall not be subject to the Peer Review process.

6.3.3 Development Applications

6.3.3.1 Application Procedures

The applicant shall submit a Development Application to the Planning Division consistent with the SMC.

A. Submittal Requirements

For each Development Application, the applicant, at its election, may submit a Development Application for Substantial Conformance Review in either a single step or a two-step process, ~~pursuant to Section 6.3.2.1.C below.~~ If an applicant selects a single step process, the Development Application submittal requirements shall be those set forth in Section 6.3.23.1.A.2 for Final

~~Substantial Conformance~~ Review; if an applicant selects a two-step process, the Development Application submittal requirements shall be those set forth in Section 6.3.23.1.A.1 for Preliminary ~~Substantial Conformance~~ Review and ~~those set forth in section 6.3.2.1.B.2 for Final Substantial Conformance~~ Review.

1. Submittal Requirements for Preliminary Substantial Conformance Review are as follows:
 - a. ~~CD or other electronic format~~ Containing digital files of all materials listed below:
 - b. APPLICATION - One (1) copy
 - c. SCHEMATIC DESIGN PLANS - One (1) full-size 24"X 36" set and two (2) 11"X 17" reductions.
 - d. COVER SHEET
 - Applicant name, address and phone number.
 - Project site address, or map of all sites where this building is to be constructed.
 - Vicinity Map 1/2 mile radius street system with project site(s) highlighted.
 - Total ~~minimum~~ area of site in square feet.

- Applicable Building Types and Frontage Types per Sections 4.6.2 and 4.6.3, respectively.
- Number of proposed new buildings with total square footage for each (including parking structures).
- Square footage for each building's footprint and the maximum percentage of the site covered by the building(s).
- Number of stories for each building.
- Number of parking and loading spaces and garage tiers, if provided in a structure.
- Landscaped areas and percentage of the total site dedicated for landscaping (typical).
- Paved area and percentage of the total site dedicated for hardscape/paving (i.e., driveways, walkways, courtyards, and trash storage) (typical).
- Existing Regulating Plan designation, Sub-Area

- designations, and Sign District designations.
 - Number of pages included in the plan set.
- e. SITE PLAN: Proposed site plan, including existing buildings within one block of the Lot Line, in all directions.
- f. SCHEMATIC PROJECT SITE PLAN
 - Lot Lines.
 - Setbacks (Front Yard and Side Street Setbacks measured from face of curb).
 - Internal and external rights-of-way and any vehicular access or other easements, including new Streets and Alleys.
 - Sidewalk/planter dimensions (from face of curb to back of sidewalk).
 - Existing buildings (if applicable) to be retained and proposed building locations and dimensions with uses labeled.
 - Location and purpose of proposed open space.
 - Location of structures on adjacent properties and their uses (if applicable).
- Topography and/or any existing site-specific conditions that must be addressed.
- Dimensions of driveway widths, existing and proposed curb cuts, parking spaces (use arrows to indicate traffic circulation).
- Sidewalks and walkways (include existing and proposed).
- Walls and fences (include materials and dimensions for existing and proposed). Indicate walls and fences to be removed (where applicable).
- Preliminary location of all exterior mechanical equipment.
- Street lights (where applicable).
- Trees: show existing trees with accurate canopies and overlap, if any, between proposed building footprints and canopy/root system of existing street trees.
- Preliminary joint trench and utility plan that includes conceptual location of electrical vault (where applicable), gas and electrical meters, fire sprinkler valves, backflow preventer, HVAC condensers, etc.
- g. SCHEMATIC FOOTPRINTS: Existing (if to be retained) and proposed building footprints, including perimeter dimensions and openings in exterior walls.
- h. SCHEMATIC ROOF PLAN: Roof pitch and material.
- i. SCHEMATIC ELEVATIONS
 - Building elevations (in color and black and white)
 - Building heights in stories
 - Proposed materials
 - Proposed locations of signs
- j. SCHEMATIC SITE/BUILDING SECTIONS
 - In the case of a housing unit to be repeated - provide examples representing the range of Thoroughfare types or public spaces it is intended to front.
- k. PRELIMINARY LANDSCAPE PLAN
 - Softscape (including trees and shrubs) showing typical conditions.



- Hardscape (identify proposed materials) showing typical conditions.
 - Preliminary Landscape Palette.
- I. FIRE MASTER PLAN to show how the proposed project reduces the risk from wildfires.
 - m. CONCEPTUAL GRADING PLAN: Show all typical cases and cuts and fills needed
 - n. DIGITAL MASSING MODEL simple digital building form/massing model of the project. Internal building elements, landscaping, people, cars, etc. not required.
2. Submittal Requirements for Final Substantial Conformance Review are as follows:
- a. RESPONSE TO PRELIMINARY SUBSTANTIAL CONFORMANCE REVIEW COMMENTS (if applicable). Point by point reference guide citing to the specific plan sheets that respond to comments provided at the conclusion of the Preliminary Substantial Conformance Review process.
 - b. FINAL DESIGN PLANS - One (1) full-size 24"X 36" set and two (2) 11"X 17" reductions.
 - c. ~~CD or other electronic~~ The following in digital format:
APPLICATION, COVER SHEET, SITE PLAN, PROJECT SITE PLAN, FLOOR PLANS, ROOF, PLAN, ELEVATIONS, SITE SECTIONS, FIRE MASTER PLAN, GRADING PLAN, DIGITAL MASSING MODEL, as required for Preliminary Substantial Conformance Review, except that all schematic items for Preliminary Substantial Conformance Review must be in final form for Final Substantial Conformance Review.
 - d. BUILDING SECTIONS (cross and longitudinal)
 - Building walls
 - Freestanding walls
 - Floor-to-floor dimensions
 - e. DESIGN DETAILS
 - Gutters and downspouts (indicate the location and colors of gutters and downspouts on the building elevations).
 - Mechanical plans showing locations of exterior equipment, through-the-wall vents, and ventilation shafts.
 - f. LANDSCAPE PLAN
 - Planting plan showing location, spacing, common name, botanical name, container size, quantity of all proposed new plant material with distinct plant symbols for each specimen.
 - Landscape layout plan for construction, including dimensions, materials, and finishes (drawings, catalog cuts, and/or photographs and an existing installation).
 - Hardscape details (including paving, trash enclosure, raised planters, water features, fences, walls, site furniture, etc.).
 - Exterior lighting (including type of fixture and catalog cut sheets)
 - Tree inventory of all trees with a 4-inch diameter or greater.
 - g. EXTERIOR SIGNS AND OTHER GRAPHICS
 - Location, dimensions, type (including illuminated or non-illuminated) and use (i.e., building sign, tenant sign, wayfinding sign).

- Include light fixtures, electrical raceways (conduit), and all other designs, materials, lettering font, graphics, and colors used as identification or for calling attention to the project or tenant. Include color and material samples on the color and material board.

~~h. COLORS AND MATERIALS BOARD~~

~~One (1) 11" x 17" copy.~~

- ~~Identify board with project address, architect name, address, telephone number, email address, and date. Include samples of all proposed exterior materials, paint colors, and materials for glazing and paving (except clear glass).~~
 - Identify all samples with manufacturer name and item specification number (including catalog cut - photographs of existing installation may be accepted in place of project literature).
- i. FIRE MASTER PLAN to show how the proposed project reduces the risk from wildfires
- j. GRADING PLAN

- k. PHASING PLAN (for multi-phased projects)
- l. DIGITAL MASSING MODEL Simple digital building form/massing model of the project. Internal building elements, landscaping, people, cars, etc. not required.

~~B. Completeness Review~~

The Zoning Administrator shall review each Development Application for completeness/conformance in accordance with ~~the Permit Streamlining Act and the SMC provisions regarding review for completeness.~~

~~C. Substantial Conformance Review~~

~~Following a determination that the Development Application is complete, the Zoning Administrator and his or her designee shall conduct "Substantial Conformance Review." Substantial Conformance Review~~ This shall consist of an evaluation by the Zoning Administrator ~~with input from the City's Peer Reviewer~~ of whether each complete Development Application is (i) consistent with the General Plan; (ii) in Substantial Conformance (as defined below) with this Specific Plan; and (iii) in compliance with applicable law. A Development

Application is in "Substantial Conformance" with the Specific Plan if it substantially conforms with the Standards of the Specific Plan (including the applicable Land Use and Sub-Area Standards) and does not materially conflict with the applicable Guidelines of the Specific Plan.

During ~~Substantial Conformance~~ Review, the Zoning Administrator, Peer Reviewer and the applicant shall work collaboratively to address any comments that the Zoning Administrator and the Peer Reviewer may have on the Development Application ~~with respect to Substantial Conformance~~, such that the applicant is provided with opportunities to respond to the comments and to facilitate the ~~Substantial Conformance~~ Review within the time periods provided for in this Section.

At the end of the ~~Substantial Conformance~~ Review, ~~and no later than 30 days after the a Development Application is deemed complete in accordance with Section 6.3.31.B,~~ the Zoning Administrator shall provide the applicant with a written determination ("Conformance Determination") of whether the Development Application is (i) consistent



with the General Plan; (ii) in Substantial Conformance with this Specific Plan; and (iii) in compliance with applicable law. ~~A Conformance Determination by the Zoning Administrator shall not require notice or a public hearing.~~

If the ~~Review Conformance Determination~~ indicates that the Development Application is (i) consistent with the General Plan; (ii) in Substantial Conformance with this Specific Plan; and (iii) in compliance with applicable law, the Zoning Administrator shall approve the Development Application. Notice of the Zoning Administrator's approval shall be provided as an informational item on the agenda for the next regularly scheduled public meeting of the ~~Planning Commission Zoning Administrator~~. The public's right to appeal and procedures to do so shall be posted on the agenda for the public meeting.

If the ~~Review Conformance Determination~~ indicates that the Development Application is not (i) consistent with the General Plan, (ii) in Substantial Conformance with this Specific Plan, and/or (iii) in compliance with applicable law, the Conformance Determination shall include an explanation of the Zoning

Administrator's findings regarding any such inconsistency, lack of Substantial Conformance (including findings regarding qualification for a Minor Deviation pursuant to Section 6.3.3.2.A or Deviation pursuant to Section 6.3.3.2.B), and/or noncompliance, and a description of changes that would be necessary to bring the Development Application into consistency/Substantial Conformance/compliance. In such case, the ~~Zoning Administrator shall disapprove the Development Application and the~~ applicant may (1) revise the Development Application to achieve the required consistency/Substantial Conformance/compliance and resubmit the Development Application for another ~~Review Conformance Determination~~ following the process described above; (2) apply for a Minor Deviation or Deviation; or (3) appeal the Zoning Administrator's denial of the Development application. The ~~Conformance~~ Determination of the Zoning Administrator may be appealed to the Planning Commission and subsequently to the City Council pursuant to the procedures of the City's Zoning Code, regarding Appeals.

Any approval of a Development Application not exercised within two years after final approval shall expire and become void, except where an extension of time is approved as specified in the SMC or as otherwise provided for in a Development Agreement. After it has been exercised (meaning that construction plans have been submitted ~~and have not expired and/or construction has commenced~~), a Development Application approval shall remain valid and run with the land in accordance with the Specific Plan.

6.3.3.2 Deviation Procedures

The Specific Plan is a policy and planning framework for the ultimate buildout of the Specific Plan Area. Implementation of the Specific Plan requires a degree of flexibility to respond to site, market, and other factors that may arise in connection with specific development proposals. In order to ensure that implementation of the Specific Plan is feasible and to preserve the opportunity for variations that will result in superior development, the City may approve deviations from Specific Plan Standards and Guidelines as set forth in this Section 6.3.3.2.

A deviation will be considered a Minor Deviation or a Deviation, as defined below.

A. Minor Deviations.

1. Minor Deviations are variations to the Specific Plan Standards and Guidelines that do not materially affect the objectives of this Specific Plan and are minor in light of the Specific Plan as a whole. Minor Deviations do not constitute or require an amendment to the Specific Plan. If the Zoning Administrator deems a deviation to not be a Minor Deviation, the Development Application shall be

processed as a Deviation pursuant to Section 6.3.3.2.B below.

2. Upon written request by an applicant, the Zoning Administrator may approve, conditionally approve, or deny a Minor Deviation without public notice or a public hearing, in which case the decision of the Zoning Administrator shall be reported as an information item on the agenda for the next regularly scheduled public meeting of the Planning Commission ~~Zoning Administrator~~. Alternatively if the Zoning Administrator determines that the Minor Deviation is of significant public interest or raises significant policy issues, the Zoning Administrator may refer the Minor Deviation to the Planning Commission for a noticed public hearing. The following constitute examples of Minor Deviations:
 - a. To allow walls or fences to exceed the Height limit described herein by a maximum of two feet.
 - b. To allow a decrease not exceeding 10 percent of the required area for landscape coverage.
 - c. To allow a decrease not exceeding 10 percent of the

minimum lot dimensions described in Chapter 4.6.2.

- d. To allow an increase or decrease not exceeding 10 percent of minimum and maximum required front setbacks.
 - e. To allow an increase not exceeding 10 percent of maximum height.
 - f. To allow a decrease in required number of parking spaces based on quantifiable information provided by the applicant regarding shared parking, reduced demand, or alternative mobility strategies.
 - g. Deviations of a similar nature to those listed above that are deemed minor by the Zoning Administrator that are in keeping with the intent and objectives of this Specific Plan.
3. In approving a Minor Deviation, the Zoning Administrator or the Planning Commission, as applicable, may impose conditions as deemed necessary to protect the public's health, safety and welfare, and to assure compliance with the objectives of the Specific Plan.



4. The Zoning Administrator's determination on a Minor Deviation may be appealed to the Planning Commission pursuant to the appeal procedures of the Zoning Code. A decision of the Planning Commission on a Minor Deviation may be appealed to the City Council pursuant to the appeal procedures in the Zoning Code.

B. Deviations

1. Deviations are variations from the Standards or Guidelines of this Specific Plan that do not constitute Minor Deviations, but nonetheless do not materially affect the objectives of this Specific Plan. Applications for a Deviation shall be subject to review and approval by the Planning Commission following a noticed public hearing, and subject to appeal to the City Council in accordance with the appeal procedures of the City's Zoning Code. The Planning Commission (or the City Council on appeal) shall approve a Deviation if it makes the following findings:
 - a. The Deviation is consistent with the goals and policies of the Specific Plan.

- b. The Deviation is not detrimental to public health, safety or welfare.
- c. The Deviation does not create a nuisance or hazard.
- d. The Deviation does not have a significant adverse effect on adjoining properties or the immediate neighbors.

2. In approving a Deviation, the Planning Commission (or the City Council on appeal) may impose conditions as deemed necessary to protect the public's health, safety and welfare, and to ensure compliance with the objectives of the Specific Plan.

6.3.3.3 Amendment Procedures

This Specific Plan can be amended pursuant to the provisions of the California Government Code (Sections 65453-65454). Amendments to the Specific Plan may be done by Resolution of the City Council. Procedures of the SMC shall be followed for hearing, notice, and decision of a Specific Plan amendment.

6.3.4 Fees and Taxes

The City requires the payment of development impact fees and certain taxes to finance public improvements. The City also requires the payment of processing fees to offset the cost of processing Development Applications. Fees for development within the City apply to projects within the Campus Town Specific Plan Area, subject to any applicable Development Agreement. These fees include:

- Public Land Dedication
- School Land Dedication
- Park Development Fee
- Water and Sewer Tap Fees
- Potable Irrigation