

## CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION

CENTRAL COAST DISTRICT  
725 FRONT STREET, SUITE 300  
SANTA CRUZ, CA 95060  
PHONE: (831) 427-4863  
EMAIL: CENTRALCOAST@COASTAL.CA.GOV  
WEB: WWW.COASTAL.CA.GOV



# F13b

**Prepared October 6, 2025 for October 10, 2025 Hearing**

**To:** Commissioners and Interested Persons

**From:** Kevin Kahn, Central Coast District Manager  
Breylen Ammen, Coastal Planner

**Subject: Additional hearing materials for F13b  
LCP Amendment Number LCP-3-MCO-25-0034-1-Part A**

This package includes additional materials related to the above-referenced hearing item as follows:

Additional correspondence received in the time since the staff report was distributed

**From:** [Patte Kronlund](#)  
**To:** [ExecutiveStaff@Coastal](#); [CentralCoast@Coastal](#)  
**Cc:** [Ryne Leuzinger](#); [Rachel Goldberger](#)  
**Subject:** CABS Comment Letter, Agenda Item F13b: LCP Amendment No. LCP-3-MCO-25-0034-1-Part A-ADU Update  
**Date:** Friday, October 3, 2025 2:43:01 PM  
**Attachments:** [CABS Comment Letter LCP-3-MCO-25-0034-1-Part A-ADU Update.pdf](#)

---

You don't often get email from [patte@cabigsur.org](mailto:patte@cabigsur.org). [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Executive Staff, Chair Harmon and Commissioners,

The attached comment letter is for the Agenda Item F13b: LCP Amendment No. LCP-3-MCO-25-0034-1-Part A - Accessory Dwelling Unit Update.

Thank you for this opportunity to comment,

Patte Kronlund, Ryne Leuzinger, the CABS Staff and Board of Directors

Logo



**Patte Kronlund**

Executive Director

[Community Association of Big Sur](#)

[Fire Adapted Big Sur](#)

831-595-0072

[patte@cabigsur.org](mailto:patte@cabigsur.org)





## Caring for the coast for 60 years

*Community Association of Big Sur is a 501 (c) 3 (EIN 77-0091132). Our shared mission is to protect and defend the rural and residential character, and to preserve the natural and aesthetic beauty of the Big Sur coast; to provide for the health, safety, and welfare of the Big Sur Community; to encourage community service and otherwise act in the interests of the residents and property owners of the community. CABS is committed to a collaborative approach towards responsible land stewardship. CABS believes that an effective partnership between private and public property owners is essential for a sustainable and healthy community.*

### STAFF

#### Executive Director

Patte Kronlund

#### Program Managers

Rachel Goldberger

Rayner Marx

### EXECUTIVE BOARD

Ryne Leuzinger, Bd Chair

Martin Palafox, Vice Bd Chair

Colin Twohig, Treasurer

Shelley Dearhart, Secretary

### BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Tom Collins

Katie Day

Mike Gilson

Butch Kronlund

Melissa Morris

Pam Peck

Peery Sloan

### COMMUNITY ADVISORS

Mike Caplin

Martha Diehl

John Handy

Kate Novoa

Richard "Dick" Ravich

October 2, 2025

Megan Harmon, Chair

California Coastal Commission

455 Market Street

San Francisco, CA 94105

Via Email: ExecutiveStaff@coastal.ca.gov , CentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov

Re: Agenda Item F13b: LCP Amendment No. LCP-3-MCO-25-0034-1-Part A - Accessory Dwelling Unit Update

Dear Chair Harmon and Commissioners,

We are writing on behalf of the Community Association of Big Sur (CABS), a local nonprofit organization that serves the Big Sur community and its visitors in a variety of ways. As the housing crisis in coastal communities like Big Sur worsens, our staff and board have been especially focused on housing issues. We see the proposed amendment to be an important step forward in addressing the housing crisis in Monterey County which is particularly severe in Big Sur. **The Community Association of Big Sur supports the Commission staff's recommendation to certify LCP Amendment No. LCP-3-MCO-25-0034-1-Part A - Accessory Dwelling Unit Update** and we strongly recommend taking action during the October 10 hearing rather than delaying a decision on this important amendment.

We strongly agree with the following assertion in the Coastal Commission staff report:

"Big Sur has an acute lack of affordable housing, particularly for the employees who are critical for the functioning of Big Sur's visitor-serving economy . . . it is also an area of extraordinary coastal resource and public recreational access value, with appropriately protective LUP policies to ensure development is carried out consistent with these values . . . adding additional housing in in the form of ADUs/JADUs in existing developed areas and adjacent to existing residences is an important way to address the region's acute need for more employee housing."

We also appreciate the acknowledgement that:

"Many workers in coastal Monterey's visitor-serving economy live far inland, commuting significant distances daily on congested roads because the housing that would be affordable to them is simply absent. Put another way, housing affordability on the Monterey coast is, at least in part, a public access issue . . . the proposed IP changes would benefit public access, which can be found consistent with the LUPs' public access and affordable housing provisions."



This amendment contains practical changes in policy that will benefit both the Big Sur community and the millions of people who visit Big Sur each year. CABS perspective is aligned with Commission staff in seeing this amendment as “a robust ADU program that should provide for critically needed housing in a manner protective of the region’s extraordinary resource values.”

CABS strongly supports the following Big Sur specific areas of the amendment:

- Removal of the existing 50-unit ADU cap (thereby allowing ADUs and JADUs on every parcel where residential use is allowed)
- Removal of the current 2-acre minimum parcel size limit for ADUs in Big Sur
- Allowance for ADUs and JADUs on land with Watershed and Scenic Conservation and Rural Residential land use designations
- Short-term rental use of JADUs and ADUs would be prohibited with a required rental length in Big Sur of 90 days or more
- ADUs continued requirement to meet the LUP’s “critical viewshed” requirements, which prohibits new development within view of Highway 1 and other public areas
- Streamlining the permitting process for ADUs and JADUs

It will be important to ensure that this amendment is having its anticipated effect and we appreciate that the Commission notes that it intends to “closely monitor implementation to see how the market responds to the new regulations in terms of facilitating critically needed employee housing, and encourages the County to do the same, including to pursue future LCP amendments as appropriate to modify ADU regulations in Big Sur.”

There is one important element regarding ADUs that we would like to suggest be considered for inclusion by Monterey County staff and the California Coastal Commission – we believe that non-brick and mortar structures merit consideration for inclusion in the category of ADUs. This could include yurts and “tiny homes” on wheels. Tiny homes in particular are commonplace elsewhere in California and across the US and have been shown to be effective in increasing access to affordable housing. Yurts and tiny homes have the following assets: they can be quickly constructed, they are available at a modest cost and they can be moved as needed. Given increasing fire risk in California due to climate change it is judicious at this point in time to *ensure that regulatory bodies like the California Coastal Commission and County of Monterey are exploring all viable options for increasing housing in areas like Big Sur.* An allowance for these types of structures as types of ADUs would of course be contingent on being connected to water and electricity and meeting the same environmental considerations that apply to brick and mortar structures. Were these structures included as types of ADUs we understand that they could be utilized by homeowners as options instead of brick and mortar structures rather than in addition to brick and mortar structures. In other words, this recommendation aligns with the current practice that there is a cap of one ADU per property. We believe that categorizing these types of structures as ADUs can be aligned with the LUP’s coastal resource protection policies, including as related to environmentally sensitive habitat areas (ESHA), visual resources, slopes, and hazards.

Lastly, in the Commission’s staff report on the proposed amendment there is acknowledgment of the possibility of a one year extension for a decision on this matter. Given the depth and clarity provided in the Coastal Commission’s staff report we strongly recommend taking action during the October 10 hearing rather than delaying a decision on this important amendment.

COMMUNITY  
ASSOCIATION



OF BIG SUR

Community Association of Big Sur  
PO Box 59, Big Sur, CA 93920

In conclusion, CABS strongly agrees with Commission staff that the proposed amendment would allow for an increase in available housing stock in Big Sur while maintaining all existing coastal resource protections for Big Sur's extraordinary landscape. Therefore, CABS urges your approval of the Commission staff's recommendation to certify the Monterey County LCP Amendment Number LCP-3-MCO-25-0034-1-Part A (Accessory Dwelling Units) at the California Coastal Commission hearing on 10/10/2025.

Sincerely,

Patte Kronlund  
Executive Director

Ryne Leuzinger  
Board Chair

# Treebones Resort

A California Limited Liability Corporation

71895 Highway 1 Big Sur, CA 93920  
www.treebonesresort.com

(310) 503-0778  
handyjc@mindspring.com

I applaud the efforts of The CCC's Central Coast Staff for the recommendations amending the LCP to ease restrictions on allowing ADUs, especially in Big Sur.

I am writing not only as a business owner but as a long time resident of Big Sur's South Coast Community. My family and I built and run Treebones Resort a small eco resort on the coast with 31 employees

Outside of the housing we provide on-site, there is not a single place on the Big Sur Coast for an employee to rent. This not only applies for employees of hospitality businesses but also for teachers and administrators of our local Big Sur Unified School District. It is my opinion that solving the affordable, workforce housing crisis in Big Sur is of paramount importance. This proposed amendment is a wonderful first step towards the solution.

It is helpful that the plan would ease some of the regulations that currently make it unpractical to create workforce housing. Enacting these amendments would offer a flexible, cost-effective, and context-sensitive solution.

I suggest that the ADU definition also include Tiny Houses with Wheels "THOWS". THOWs offer mobility and minimal site impact, aligning with the Big Sur LUP's goals to preserve the area's scenic and natural character.

- By allowing THOWs under the umbrella of "employee housing," Monterey County can uphold visual standards while providing desperately needed housing options.

## Precedents

Monterey County zoning laws already allow THOWs (as mobile homes) that meet state building standards. They are explicitly allowed as agricultural employee housing in farm-zoned areas.

Several California counties have already enacted forward-thinking ordinances recognizing THOWs' as affordable housing alternatives:

San Luis Obispo County allows THOWs as ADUs and recently approved a tiny home cluster development called Waterman Village.

- Nevada County has approved THOWs ( $\leq 400$  sq ft) as primary dwellings, ADUs, and units within dwelling groups. This new flexibility directly addresses housing needs and enhances affordability.

- Santa Cruz County permits one THOW per parcel as an ADU, with DMV registration and utility requirements.

- San Benito, Mendocino, Placer, Los Angeles (unincorporated), San Diego, San Jose (Santa Clara), and Humboldt counties also allow THOWs, typically as ADUs under defined safety/design standards.

#### Suggested Ordinance Language for Big Sur

I respectfully encourage the County to incorporate language such as:

“Tiny Houses on Wheels (THOWs), defined as movable structures no larger than 400 square feet and equipped with kitchen, bathroom, and sleeping facilities, may be permitted as employee housing—either as primary dwellings, Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs), or grouped workforce housing—by right in Big Sur zones where employee housing is allowed, subject to standards for durability, utility services, aesthetic compatibility, and safety (e.g., ANSI certification, DMV registration, utility hookup, and site placement guidelines).”

Thank you for your consideration. I would welcome the opportunity to discuss this proposal further.

Sincerely,

John Handy, owner Treebones Resort, Big Sur

**From:** [Brienne Hall](#)  
**To:** [CentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:CentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Public Comment on October 2025 Agenda Item Friday 13b - Monterey County LCP Amendment No. LCP-3-MCO-25-0034-1-Part A (Accessory Dwelling Units).  
**Date:** Friday, October 3, 2025 2:56:31 PM  
**Attachments:** [Public Comment on August 2025 Agenda Item Wednesday 15a - Monterey County LCP Amendment No. LCP-3-MCO-24-0039-1 \(Vacation Rentals\) .pdf](#)

---

You don't often get email from [b.herself@gmail.com](mailto:b.herself@gmail.com). [Learn why this is important](#)

## **Public Comment on Monterey County LCP Amendment LCP-3-MCO-25-0034-1-Part A (Accessory Dwelling Units)**

To the California Coastal Commission and Monterey County Planning Staff:

Thank you for working to update Monterey County's Local Coastal Program to comply with state ADU law while protecting the unique character of Big Sur. Balancing housing needs with preserving our extraordinary coast is critical, and I appreciate the challenge this presents. Below are some key areas I have concerns with and urge the commission to request changes to the document as written.

### **Opposition to 90-Day Rental Minimum**

The imposition of a 90-day minimum rental period for ADUs and JADUs in Big Sur is out of step with California law and common practice. State law clearly requires a minimum rental period of 30 days for these units, as reinforced by the California Department of Housing and Community Development's review of the City of San Marino's ADU ordinance. HCD states:

- "A minimum 90-day rental requirement imposes rental requirements for JADUs that are inconsistent with state law, which only requires a minimum rental term of 30 (thirty) days for ADUs and JADUs built pursuant to Government Code section 66323. Therefore, the City must amend its ordinance to clarify that JADUs rental term must be longer than 30 days consistent with Government Code section 66323 subdivision (d)." [HCD letter to San Marino, August 26, 2024, p. 4]

The County's proposed 90-day rental term is similarly inconsistent and should be revised to align with state law and common practice.

### **Opposition to ADU Size Reduction**

Reducing the maximum allowable ADU size in Big Sur from 1,200 to 1,000 square feet may seem minor but it is a roughly 17% reduction that significantly impacts livability and housing viability. This size decrease offers little additional environmental or coastal resource protection beyond existing setbacks, height limits, and habitat safeguards. Instead, it restricts affordable housing options and deters construction when we need housing most.

### **Concerns Regarding Short-Term Rental Prohibitions**

State law prohibits short-term rentals in new ADU construction to protect long-term housing, which is reasonable. However, for existing grandfathered ADUs—such as small cabins not suited for long-term rentals—short-term rental use, especially where the owner lives onsite, should be permitted. Blanket prohibitions remove needed flexibility, restrict property owner rights, and will unintentionally reduce available coastal visitor accommodations that sustain our local economy (many others like myself depend on rentals for income in retirement and will be forced to sell to a likely second home owner who will not provide coastal access for employees nor visitors).

I urge the Commission to consider the attached public comment I submitted on August 8, 2025, which explains how carefully managed short-term rentals have been successfully regulated without coastal harm in other counties like Sonoma and San Luis Obispo. Historic cabins and existing permitted rentals that contribute to Big Sur's visitor-serving economy deserve protection as part of any balanced STR policy. By allowing them under this LCP amendment will set up the county to be able to make adaptive changes to their ordinance in the future, especially if litigation is pursued.

### **Compliance with Assembly Bill 2533**

Finally, the County should incorporate language ensuring compliance with Assembly Bill 2533 (AB 2533), which took effect January 1, 2025, requiring streamlined legalization of unpermitted ADUs and JADUs built before January 1, 2020, with limited permit fees and only health and safety standards per California Health and Safety Code section 17920.3. Including this language will facilitate greater housing legalization and affordability.

### **Conclusion**

To support housing, community, and coastal resource goals, the Commission and Monterey County should:

- Align rental minimums with state law's 30-day requirement,
- Maintain the 1,200 square foot maximum ADU size,
- Permit short-term rentals in existing, grandfathered ADUs where appropriate,
- Explicitly adopt AB 2533 compliance language,
- Heed the attached August 8 public comment advocating balanced STR regulations.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,  
Brienne

Big Sur Coast Resident & Community Member



Brianne Hall &lt;b.herself@gmail.com&gt;

## Public Comment on August 2025 Agenda Item Wednesday 15a - Monterey County LCP Amendment No. LCP-3-MCO-24-0039-1 (Vacation Rentals).

Brianne Hall &lt;b.herself@gmail.com&gt;

Sun, Aug 10, 2025 at 4:35 PM

To: CentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov

August 8, 2025

Public Comment on August 2025 Agenda Item Wednesday 15a - Monterey County LCP Amendment No. LCP-3-MCO-24-0039-1 (Vacation Rentals).

Dear Commissioners,

I urge you to vote NO on Monterey County's proposed ban on Coastal Visitor Rentals (CVRs) in Big Sur.

The regulations are not aligned with the Coastal Act and fail to balance the public's right to access the coast, especially south of Carmel. Even the staff report concedes there is "little evidence" that banning CVRs will increase workforce housing. In reality, this proposal restricts coastal access without preserving coastal resources. Some key points to take into consideration:

### 1. Visitor Experience and Coastal Connection

Short-term rentals are not just about the price, although they are often more affordable than hotels when you include kitchens, parking, and no extra resort fees.

They provide something hotels cannot:

- Immediate proximity to nature, hiking trails, and the ocean
- A peaceful, residential setting that helps visitors connect with the coast and the community

If the goal of the Coastal Act is to foster public appreciation and stewardship of the coast, keeping this kind of visitor experience is essential.

### 2. Coastal Commission Precedent

A total ban would conflict with Commission precedent in places like Sonoma and San Luis Obispo Counties, where the Commission approved small-scale, permitted STRs including guesthouses and ADUs while protecting coastal resources. These models keep existing permitted units in operation instead of eliminating them.

### 3. Traffic and Resource Use

While the county doesn't mention it in their regulation, a large part of their discussion during public meetings focused on the traffic and resource impacts of STRs.

- Traffic: STR guests are already in the area and travel at non-peak times. Removing local accommodations will increase day-trip traffic from the Monterey Peninsula and farther away, adding congestion and emissions.
- Resource Use: STRs are occupied fewer days per year than long-term rentals, meaning less water, septic, and energy use. They are also maintained to higher standards.

### 4. False Access Claims

The County's "Limited Rental" model would reduce meaningful access:

- Whole house rentals capped at three groups per year are not viable for owners and would not convert to long-term housing.
- Currently, 24 STRs on the Big Sur coast host about 4,000 visiting groups annually, including families, writers, and couples who experience the coast's unique remoteness and lack of cell service.
- The proposed model would reduce this to a fraction of current levels and remove the kind of special access Big Sur offers.

### 5. The Hosted Rental Myth

There are no hosted rentals on the coast today, and there is no reason to expect them in the future. Few owners will share living space with strangers, and most guests prefer privacy. Rates for hosted rentals are too low to cover cleaning costs, making them economically unrealistic. This so-called compromise will not create meaningful coastal access.

## 6. No Proven Housing Benefit

In markets where STR bans were enacted, there is no evidence that rents decreased or long-term housing supply increased. Many homes simply became second homes, which reduced both housing availability and public access.

## 7. Better Models Exist

Other coastal counties with similar natural resources, including Marin, Santa Cruz, and San Luis Obispo, manage STRs without outright bans:

- Grandfather existing units that were legally operating.
- Allow guesthouses and historic cabins already used as STRs to continue without forcing \$7,000 Coastal Development Permits.
- Limit only new STRs, similar to the Sonoma County approach.

Historic Big Sur cabins often lack space and amenities for long-term tenants but are ideal for short visits. This keeps public access strong while protecting housing stock.

## 8. Displacement of Community

I can vouch that this regulation will force me to sell my property to a second or third homeowner, like many others I know. I have no impact on my neighbors and depend on the income for my livelihood as I don't have any retirement. This blanket ban is unjust and will negatively impact many retirees that depend on STRs to survive in one of the most expensive places to live in California. We are a part of our community and live here year round providing jobs and revenue to the county.

### **In conclusion:**

A ban is not balance and will negatively impact the community. It is an overreach that serves the political interests of a few at the expense of the public's right to enjoy the coast. The Commission should instead adopt a limited, grandfathered model that protects existing STRs, guesthouses, and ADUs while preventing uncontrolled growth. This approach meets the Coastal Act's mandate for public access and supports the community's environmental values.

Respectfully,

Brianne

Big Sur Coast Resident & Community Member

**From:** [Lucas Handy](#)  
**To:** [CentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:CentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Public Comment on October 2025 Agenda Item Friday 13b - Monterey County LCP Amendment No. LCP-3-MCO-25-0034-1-Part A (Accessory Dwelling Units).  
**Date:** Saturday, October 4, 2025 1:21:25 AM

---

You don't often get email from handytwin2@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Commissioners,

My name is Lucas Handy, and I serve as the South Coast Representative on the Big Sur Multi-Agency Advisory Council (BSMAAC). I am writing on behalf of the entire South Coast community of Big Sur to express strong support for the staff recommendation on this agenda item.

Our community is in the midst of a critical housing crisis. Service workers, small families, and long-time residents are being displaced as property values rise and absentee ownership increases in our community. Without access to more ADU permits, Big Sur risks losing the very people who sustain our schools, staff our small businesses, and provide essential services to both residents and visitors.

Removing the restrictive cap and allowing ADUs under the staff's proposed framework is extremely essential. It would create desperately needed housing for our local workforce and families while maintaining the environmental safeguards that protect this treasured coastline.

For these reasons, we strongly urge the Commission to adopt the staff recommendation and ensure that Big Sur remains not only a place of natural beauty but also a living, thriving community.

Sincerely,

Lucas Handy

South Coast Representative

Big Sur Multi-Agency Advisory Council

**From:** [Heidi Hopkins](#)  
**To:** [CentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:CentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Agenda Item F13b: LCP Amendment  
**Date:** Friday, October 3, 2025 12:55:10 PM

---

[You don't often get email from h2hopkins@gmail.com. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification> ]

Dear Commissioners:

As a landowner and long-time resident of Big Sur, I write in support for the LCP Amendment No. LCP-3-MCO-25-0034-1-Part A - Accessory Dwelling Unit Update. Big Sur faces an excruciating affordable housing shortage despite -- or as a result of -- the area being a prime tourist attraction. My support for the Amendment is contingent on the Amendment also prohibiting use of ADUs for short-term rentals. Short-term rentals (currently illegal, but still possibly ongoing) are among the activities that exacerbate the current housing shortage.  
Heidi Hopkins

**From:** [Trey Kropp](#)  
**To:** [Ammen, Breylen@Coastal](mailto:Ammen, Breylen@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Re: Public Comment on Monterey County LCP Amendment No. LCP-3-MCO-25-0034-1-Part A (Accessory Dwelling Units).  
**Date:** Friday, October 3, 2025 7:19:08 PM  
**Attachments:** [image002.png](#)

---

You don't often get email from [treykropp@gmail.com](mailto:treykropp@gmail.com). [Learn why this is important](#)

Hello Breylen,

Thank you. I really appreciate your reply. While I understand that LUAC review is a County process outside the scope of the LCP amendment, my concern is with the practical effect of approving a **streamlined CDP process** for ADUs in Big Sur.

Under Monterey County's current process, a **standard CDP is discretionary** — it requires findings, staff analysis, and is almost always referred to the LUAC for review before action is taken. That LUAC review has been the consistent safeguard ensuring projects in Big Sur are measured against the Land Use Plan and evaluated with local knowledge.

By contrast, the proposed “**streamlined**” **Coastal Administrative Permits** are intended to be handled as **non-discretionary approvals** based only on “objective standards.” These permits are processed by staff without a hearing, and almost never referred to the LUAC because there is no discretionary judgment to trigger a referral.

This is the core problem: while the amendment still requires CDPs, the shift to the administrative track effectively removes LUAC review from the process. In Big Sur, that means the community loses its only meaningful avenue for early input on ADUs.

I believe the Commission should acknowledge this consequence when considering certification. Approving this amendment is not just about ADUs — it is about whether the unique system of local review in Big Sur will be bypassed through a change in process.

Please include this email in the public record for Agenda Item so Commissioners can weigh how streamlining will function on the ground in Big Sur.

Sincerely,

Trey Kropp

Big Sur Resident

On Fri, Oct 3, 2025 at 2:13 PM Ammen, Breylen@Coastal <[breylen.amm@coastal.ca.gov](mailto:breylen.amm@coastal.ca.gov)> wrote:

Dear Trey,

Thank you for your interest in this LCP amendment; I hope this response helps provide some clarity on how the proposed amendment relates to LUAC review.

The LUACs are entities by created by a County; as I understand it, their charters are created by the County Bord of Supervisors. The LUAC review process is therefor a County process outside of the LCP. The existing ADU regulations do not require LUAC review, and nor does the proposed amendment. While we greatly appreciate the input of the LUACs on projects, particularly in Big Sur, any changes to the scope of LUAC review for ADUs is in the County's hands and is outside the scope of this amendment and outside the scope of the Commission's authority. Please feel free to reach out if you have any questions.

Kind Regards,



Breylen Ammen

Coastal Planner | Monterey County

CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION

725 Front Street, Suite 300

Santa Cruz, CA 95060

(831) 427-4863

---

**From:** Trey Kropp <[treykropp@gmail.com](mailto:treykropp@gmail.com)>

**Sent:** Saturday, September 27, 2025 8:28 AM

**To:** CentralCoast@Coastal <[CentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov](mailto:CentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov)>

**Subject:** Public Comment on Monterey County LCP Amendment No. LCP-3-MCO-25-0034-1-Part A (Accessory Dwelling Units).

You don't often get email from [treykropp@gmail.com](mailto:treykropp@gmail.com). [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Chair and Commissioners,

I am writing from Big Sur regarding the proposed Monterey County LCP amendment on Accessory Dwelling Units. While I understand and support the state mandate to expand housing opportunities, I must strongly object to the portion of this ordinance that

“streamlines” Coastal Development Permit review in a way that bypasses Local Land Use Advisory Council oversight.

In a place like Big Sur, LUAC review is not an inconvenience — it is essential.

- **Local knowledge matters.** LUAC members live here, know the land, and understand the impacts of development on viewsheds, slopes, fire safety, water, and sensitive habitats in ways that cannot be captured by administrative review alone.
- **Absentee ownership is rising.** Increasingly, properties are owned by individuals who do not live in Big Sur and are not part of the community. LUAC review is often the only mechanism by which projects are vetted by people who are accountable to this community and who experience the impacts of development directly.
- **Transparency is owed to the public.** LUAC meetings provide a forum for neighbors and stakeholders to raise concerns before permits are issued. To remove this layer of review is to remove the community’s seat at the table.

The Coastal Commission and the Monterey County LUP have always recognized that Big Sur is an extraordinary and fragile coastal resource. The critical viewshed, ESHA protections, and rural character policies exist because this place is unique and cannot be treated the same as suburban Carmel or North County. That uniqueness demands stronger public oversight, not less.

It is not a big ask to require LUAC review for ADUs in Big Sur. In fact, it is owed to our community as part of the balance that the Coastal Act promises: development may occur, but only when consistent with resource protections and the character of local communities.

I urge the Commission to amend this ordinance to **restore LUAC review for all ADUs in Big Sur**. Streamlining may be appropriate in urban areas where development patterns are uniform, but in Big Sur, it is unacceptable. Our community’s voice must not be cut out of decisions that directly shape its future.

Respectfully,

Trey Kropp  
Big Sur, CA

--

\*Trey Kropp\*  
Wilderness Wireless  
PO Box 139  
Big Sur, CA 93920  
(831)-238-2141

**From:** [Norman Boccone](#)  
**To:** [CentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:CentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Public Comment on October 2025 Agenda Item Friday 13b - Monterey County LCP Amendment No. LCP-3-MCO-25-0034-1-Part A (Accessory Dwelling Units).  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 30, 2025 9:24:21 PM

---

You don't often get email from norm@sjrugby.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

There is a significant housing shortage in North Monterey county:  
[https://chpc.net/wp-content/uploads/2024/05/Monterey\\_Housing\\_Report-2.pdf](https://chpc.net/wp-content/uploads/2024/05/Monterey_Housing_Report-2.pdf)

It has been years since CA changed the ADU laws; you should not delay this decision any longer.