Exhibit E

This page intentionally left blank.

MINUTES
Carmel Unincorporated/Highlands Land Use Advisory Committee
August 3, 2026

1. Meeting called to order by Donna Kostigen **at** 4:00 pm

2. Roll Call

Members Present:
Donna Kostigen (Chair)
Stuart Poulter (Interim Secretary)
Clyde Freedman
Sri Shankar

Members Absent:
Suzanne Kushner

Public Attendance: A sign-in sheet was circulated. Thirty (30) entries were recorded; see the attached Carmel Highlands LUAC Sign-in Sheet dated August 3, 2026.

3. Approval of Minutes:

A. **July 6, 2026** minutes

Motion: Clyde Freedman (LUAC Member's Name)

Second: Stuart Poulter (LUAC Member's Name)

Ayes: 2 (Clyde, Stuart)

Noes:

Absent: Suzanne Kushner

Abstain: Donna Kostigen, Sri Shankar (absent at last meeting)

4. Public Comments: The Committee will receive public comment on non-agenda items that are within the purview of the Committee at this time. The length of individual presentations may be limited by the Chair.

None.

5. Scheduled Items
PLN180431 – STATE OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF PARKS & RECREATION

PLN240362 – KSHIRE PROPERTY INVESTMENTS LLC
PLN260051 – WYNNE STEPHEN & VICKI M TRS

6. Other Items:

A) Preliminary Courtesy Presentations by Applicants Regarding Potential Projects

None.

B) Announcements

None.

7. Meeting Adjourned: 5:35 pm

Minutes taken by: Stuart Poulter

Action by Land Use Advisory Committee
Project Referral Sheet

Monterey County Housing & Community Development
1441 Schilling Place 2nd Floor
Salinas CA 93901
(831) 755-5025

Advisory Committee: Carmel Unincorporated/Highlands

1.

Project Name: STATE OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF PARKS & RECREATION
File Number: PLN180431
Project Location: THE PROPERTY IS LOCATED NEAR THE INTERSECTION OF HIGHWAY 1 AND RIO ROAD, CARMEL (NO ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NUMBER), BETWEEN THE CROSSROADS SHOPPING CENTER AND HIGHWAY 1.
Assessor's Parcel Number(s): N/A
Project Planner: TAYLOR PRICE
Area Plan: Carmel Area Land Use Plan & Carmel Valley Master Plan
Project Description: Coastal Development Permit to allow construction of a shuttle parking lot at Marathon Flats, and shuttle system serving Marathon Flats, Rancho Canada, and Point Lobos State Natural Reserve, and implementation of a reservation system for Point Lobos State Natural Reserve.

Was the Owner/Applicant/Representative present at meeting? YES X NO ____

(Please include the names of those present)

John Hiles, California State Parks (applicant)
Tyler Potter, Denise Duffy & Associates (County/State Parks consultant)

Was a County Staff/Representative present at meeting? Fionna Jensen, Taylor Price, Jade Mason **(Name)**

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Name	Site Neighbor?		Issues / Concerns (suggested changes)
	YES	NO	
Member of the public			Asked how "capacity" is defined. State Parks responded that capacity would be established by range and by condition of approval, based on the number of parking spaces and the approximate number of people per vehicle.

Member of the public			Raised drive-by issues; messaging and communication identified as key. Muir Woods cited as an example, where roughly three years were required to convey the message to the public.
Scott Ahrendt			Cited Sedona, Arizona (Dry Creek Road) as a comparable example; discussed the use of barriers, the need for constant enforcement, and evacuation concerns.
Member of the public			Expressed support for the reservation system and the parking lot.
Member of the public (Malpaso HOA)	X		Addressed the east-side parking lot; considers this the best available short-term solution; enforcement is key.
Steve Novak	X		Resident of Carmel Highlands. Opposed the project and questioned the premise of overuse and resource degradation, stating the Reserve is in its best condition in a long time. State Parks responded that damage is documented through CSUMB student work and the visitor use survey, including impacts to coastal terraces, off-trail use, and damage to cultural sites, and that current walking distances before entering reserve are not ideal for the visitor experience.
Member of the public			Addressed the west-side parking lot; stated the $28 parking fine is not a sufficient deterrent and that enforcement is needed; asked whether a tow zone could be established; suggested the matter be raised with the Board of Supervisors.
Collin Gallagher			Former local planner. Stated the Park does not manage existing parking well, citing 40-50% vacancy and visitors not being admitted, and asked State Parks to explain. Noted 10 conditions of approval had been submitted to the County. State Parks responded regarding the west-side parking lot (Hudson Meadow), visual impacts along State Scenic Highway (SR 1), and that the lot fills within 15-20 minutes of the gate opening. All submitted public comments are to be included in the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors packet.
Member of the public			Identified conflicting objectives and goals, and major health and safety issues are as important as any other project objective.

Member of the public			Suggested designing a parking lot within the existing park footprint; referenced a prior car accident for which the County paid $18 million.
Member of the public			Noted the same health and safety issues were discussed over a decade ago.
Member of the public			Observed that the State Parks mission starts/stops at the gates; small issues build up over time into major issues; the project is not perfect but moves toward a better the situation outside of the gates, and alternatives are infeasible due to their complexity.
Member of the public			Asked about the timeline. Response: Coastal Development Permit to the Planning Commission, then to the Board of Supervisors, anticipated completion next summer (2027).

PUBLIC COMMENT (CONTINUED):

Name	**Site Neighbor?**		**Issues / Concerns (suggested changes)**
	YES	**NO**	
Member of the public			Stated that enforcement representatives need to be present, and that towing could be a potential solution.
Augie Lewis			Referenced State of California Public Resources Code section 5019.5 regarding carrying capacity, which is not part of the Park General Plan; raised degradation of the park; noted 1979 was the last time carrying capacity was calculated; asserted State Parks does not have the "right"; cited the obligation to both protect and provide access; stated the park is over capacity, per a letter submitted to the LUAC, and that assessing capacity at a later date is not viable or appropriate.
Member of the public			Stated the "trail" along the highway creates access issues.
Member of the public			Stated there is no sense of how much the reservation system would actually reduce use. State Parks responded that it will reduce current over-capacity conditions.

Member of the public			Addressed the Marathon Flats parking lot concept; raised increased demand at the Crossroads Shopping Center, impacts to restrooms, and concerns regarding access on Rio Road and the Bank of America parking lot.
Member of the public			Stated that parking at the park itself needs to be addressed first.
Member of the public			Stated that State agencies are not communicating with one another, resulting in delayed response.
Member of the public			Raised the safety of people and children walking along Highway 1; asked that a ban on parking along Highway 1, at least in segments, be considered.
Member of the public			Referenced the Carmel Land Use Plan 1,500-person limit in connection with the reservation system.
Member of the public			Stated that over the last three years capacity has become out of hand and something needs to be done; noted the difficulty of getting government agencies to work together; described ParkIT as an imperfect but temporary solution.
Member of the public			Raised wildfire and evacuation concerns.
Member of the public			Asked whether walk-in visitors would need a reservation. State Parks responded yes - the same access point applies, and a reservation would be required; significant messaging is planned, with no signage planned along the highway.
Member of the public			Asked about reservation conflicts. State Parks responded that no parking would be removed along the highway and that fencing is planned along the highway.

LUAC AREAS OF CONCERN

Concerns / Issues (e.g. site layout, neighborhood compatibility; visual impact, etc)	**Policy/Ordinance Reference (If Known)**	**Suggested Changes - to address concerns (e.g. relocate; reduce height; move road access, etc)**

Committee member Clyde Freedman asked about the area across from Point Lobos (west-side / east-side parking).	Carmel Area State Parks General Plan; Carmel Area Land Use Plan	State Parks responded that a feasibility study has not yet started, that the area is governed by the Carmel Area State Parks General Plan and is not part of this project, and that it would require complex federal, State, and local permitting with a 7-10 year lead time. The Committee asked that planning for the west-side and east-side areas begin.
Committee member Srividya Shankar - no comments.		
Committee member Stuart Poulter mentioned his letter submitted prior to the meeting to County staff (included in Additional Correspondence attachment distributed prior to the meeting). Noted his comments were generally intended to assist County staff with drawing connections with past planning efforts for Point Lobos and consistency with past and current long-range plans like State Parks General Plan (1979 and 2021), Carmel LUP, etc.	Carmel Area State Parks General Plan; Carmel Area Land Use Plan	
Committee member Donna Kostigen asked whether the project was part of a master plan, at which stage of the master plan this project relates, and at what stage of implementation of the Master Plan are we currently. Donna also asked if there were any learnings or insights from Bixby Bridge Public Safety Crisis that should be considered for this project that aims to improve the Public Safety Crisis at Pt. Lobos.		State Parks described the Master Plan at initial stages and that a feasibility study had not been conducted. The project before the LUAC was described as a short-term, interim project and the start of a program to address the issues, and stated that he was not aware of any change to current enforcement. County staff responded to the Bixby Bridge example and the urgency ordinance, and asked the Committee to focus on the project before it.
Signage and notification of violations.		Signage should clearly notify visitors that reservations are required and identify permissible parking, illegal parking, and whether the vehicle is subject to citation or removal.

Capacity analysis.	Carmel Area Land Use Plan (1,500-person limit); carrying capacity last calculated in 1979	A more intensive capacity analysis is needed.
Current Public Safety Crisis created by off Highway parking.		Hwy 1 Pt. Lobos parking enforcement is currently inadequate, and the LUAC, as well as community members, respectfully request an agenda item be added to a LUAC meeting to better understand the County Pt. Lobos parking enforcement plans and strategies to address the Public Safety Crisis created by the defacto parking area on Highway 1 shoulders for Pt. Lobos access.

ADDITIONAL LUAC COMMENTS

Presentation: John Hiles of California State Parks presented to the Committee and the audience, joined by Tyler Potter of Denise Duffy & Associates (County/State Parks Consultant)

The presentation covered the history of the process from 1979 onward, including the Park General Plan, the 2022 Mitigated Negative Declaration, and the 2024 Parking/Traffic Plan; visitation history, with 2026 year-to-date already approaching the 2025 total; and an overview of how the project complies with local and State parking planning policies.

Two objectives were described: a reservation system for Point Lobos State Natural Reserve, and a parking lot and shuttle system at Marathon Flats. Attendance spikes between 10:00 AM and 2:00 PM, and the project is intended to flatten that spike. One hundred (100) parking spaces are proposed at Marathon Flats, with shuttle service operated by a concessionaire. On-site parking spaces currently sell out within 15 minutes of opening. The project would not eliminate parking along the highway but is intended to alleviate it.

Effort made to limit public comments to three minutes per person while ensuring each person had an opportunity to speak at least one time. County planners had a hard stop at 5:30 PM. (County planners needing to attend Carmel Valley LUAC hearing for same item)

Following the close of the question and answer session, LUAC member Clyde Freedman reminded those present that the Public Safety Crisis created as a result of Pt. Lobos walk-in entry parking on SR Hwy 1 has grown over a long period of time and that public service departments across Federal, State and Local Agencies are aware of the Public Safety concerns. Although this project is intended to alleviate parking on SR Hwy 1, it does not address minimizing, managing, or enforcing parking on SR Hwy 1. Therefore, LUAC Committee Member Clyde Freedman made a motion to support the project with changes. The changes to the project are defined as the plan to create permanent on/near site parking, which addresses the Parks maximum capacity plan. Land already owned by the state on the east side of SR Hwy1 seems ideal. With the knowledge that mid-year 2026 attendance has already exceeded the entire 2025 year's attendance, there does not appear to be a clear capacity maximum; a project change to update capacity planning to identify a maximum number of visitors and develop on/near site parking spaces to that capacity was requested as a change to the project. Additionally, a project change to add signage on SR Highway 1 around Pt. Lobos to clearly notify visitors that reservations are required, signage to identify permissible SR Highway 1 parking spots, signage for areas where parking is not permitted, and whether the vehicle is subject to citation or removal.

Recommendation to Support Project with the following Changes; 1) Update the capacity plan and identify a maximum visitation capacity; 2) Develop permanent on/near site parking lot designed to meet updated maximum capacity, and 3) Add SR Highway 1 signage that clearly notifies visitors that reservations are required, signage that identifies permissible SR Highway 1 parking slots, identifies where parking is not permitted and whether the vehicle is subject to citation or removal.

Planning Commissioners:

Your constituents are passionate about their community and provided feedback regarding this project; their feedback centered around concerns for Public Safety on SR Hwy 1 near the Pt. Lobos entrance. Community members cited examples of severe pedestrian, traffic, and emergency access safety concerns driven by a massive surge in tourism. Tourists often make U-turns, walk in active traffic lanes, cross roads, and open car doors into oncoming highway traffic. This Public Safety situation is the direct result of an unmanaged, unenforced "defacto" highway parking lot on SR Hwy 1 used to facilitate Pt. Lobos walk-in entry. As noted in the project background, Pt. Lobos Park management actively manages the reserves available on-site parking and routinely closes the entry gate when the park is "deemed" full. However, Park management continues to allow walk-in visitation from parked cars on SR Hwy 1, and creates the Public Safety crisis we are currently experiencing on SR Hwy 1.

The project before the LUAC does not address the Public Safety Crisis caused by using SR Hwy1 as a "defacto parking lot" for Pt. Lobos walk-in entry. It is difficult to ignore what the community believes is a Public Safety Crisis on SR Hwy1 while reviewing this project. The LUAC appreciates incremental improvements but is compelled to support the project with changes to address the Public Safety Crisis on SR Hwy1 resulting from the lack of on-site parking. Recommended Change 1 – Update the capacity plan and identify the maximum allowed visitation capacity. Recommended Change 2 - Develop a permanent on/near site parking lot designed to meet such maximum capacity, and Recommended Change 3 - Add SR Highway 1 signage that clearly notifies visitors that reservations are required, add signage that identifies permissible SR Highway 1 parking slots, add signage that clearly identifies where parking is not permissible and that violators will be subject to citation or removal. The LUAC appreciates incremental improvements but implores commissioners to take urgent steps to eliminate the Public Safety Crisis on SR Hwy 1 near Pt. Lobos.

RECOMMENDATION:

Motion by: Clyde (LUAC Member's Name)

Second by: Sri (LUAC Member's Name)

___ Support Project as proposed

X Support Project with changes

___ Continue the Item

Reason for Continuance: _____

Continue to what date: _____

Ayes: 4 (Donna, Stuart, Clyde, Sri)

Noes: 0

Absent: Suzanne

Abstain: None

Action by Land Use Advisory Committee
Project Referral Sheet

Monterey County Housing & Community Development
1441 Schilling Place 2nd Floor
Salinas CA 93901
(831) 755-5025

Advisory Committee: Carmel Unincorporated/Highlands

2.

Project Name: KSHIRE PROPERTY INVESTMENTS LLC
File Number: PLN240362
Project Location: 2755 15TH AVE, CARMEL, CA 93923
Assessor's Parcel Number(s): 009-383-012-000
Project Planner: IMANI HARRIGAN
Area Plan: Carmel Land Use Plan, Coastal Zone
Project Description: Combined Development Permit consisting of: 1) Coastal Administrative Permit and Design Approval to allow the demolition of a one-story 646 square foot single family dwelling and construction of a 2,531 square foot single family dwelling with a 263 square foot attached garage, an 800 square foot attached accessory dwelling unit, and 677 square foot associated site improvements; 2) Coastal Administrative Permit to allow development within 750 feet of known archaeological resources; and 3) Coastal Development Permit to allow removal of 3 Oak Trees.

Was the Owner/Applicant/Representative present at meeting? YES X NO ____

(Please include the names of those present)

Eric Miller, Architect

Was a County Staff/Representative present at meeting? Jade Mason (LUAC Liaison) **(Name)**

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Name	Site Neighbor?		Issues / Concerns (suggested changes)
	YES	NO	
None			

PUBLIC COMMENT (CONTINUED):

Name	Site Neighbor?		Issues / Concerns (suggested changes)
	YES	NO	

LUAC AREAS OF CONCERN

Concerns / Issues (e.g. site layout, neighborhood compatibility; visual impact, etc)	Policy/Ordinance Reference (If Known)	Suggested Changes - to address concerns (e.g. relocate; reduce height; move road access, etc)
Staking and flagging - the concern that caused this item to be continued from the July 6, 2026 meeting.	LUAC continuance, July 6, 2026	Staking and flagging were confirmed to be in place, verified both by the County and by Committee members. The July 6, 2026 concern is resolved.
Responses to Committee questions from the prior meeting.		Interim Secretary Stuart Poulter read into the record the responses received from the County planner to his previously submitted questions. Copy of responses attached to meeting minutes.

ADDITIONAL LUAC COMMENTS

This item was continued from the July 6, 2026 meeting to a date uncertain because the stakes and flagging had not been placed, leaving the Committee unable to assess the scale of the project.

Staking and flagging have since been installed and were confirmed by both the County and Committee members, allowing the Committee to make an informed recommendation. The project was approved as presented.

RECOMMENDATION:

Motion by: Clyde (LUAC Member's Name)

Second by: Donna (LUAC Member's Name)

X Support Project as proposed

____ Support Project with changes

____ Continue the Item

Reason for Continuance: _____

Continue to what date: _____

Ayes: 4 (Donna, Stuart, Clyde, Sri)

Noes: 0 (None)

Absent: Suzanne

Abstain: None

Action by Land Use Advisory Committee
Project Referral Sheet

Monterey County Housing & Community Development
1441 Schilling Place 2nd Floor
Salinas CA 93901
(831) 755-5025

Advisory Committee: Carmel Unincorporated/Highlands

3.

Project Name: WYNNE STEPHEN A & VICKI M TRS
File Number: PLN260051
Project Location: 212 CREST RD, CARMEL, CA 93923
Assessor's Parcel Number(s): 241-271-019-000
Project Planner: Kayla Nelson
Area Plan: Carmel Land Use Plan, Coastal Zone
Project Description: After-the-fact Combined Development Permit to partial clear Code Enforcement violation (25CE00206) consisting of a: 1) Coastal Development Permit to allow construction of a 658 square foot non-habitable accessory structure (workshop) with a 110 square foot patio prior to establishment of main use or structure (ZA); and 2) Coastal Development Permit to allow development on slopes in excess of 30%.

Was the Owner/Applicant/Representative present at meeting? YES X NO ____

(Please include the names of those present)

Stephen Wynne, Owner/Applicant

Brittney Schloss, Agent

Neighbor to applicant/owner

Was a County Staff/Representative present at meeting? Jade Mason (LUAC Liaison) **(Name)**

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Name	Site Neighbor?		Issues / Concerns (suggested changes)
	YES	NO	
None			

PUBLIC COMMENT (CONTINUED):

Name	Site Neighbor?		Issues / Concerns (suggested changes)
	YES	NO	

LUAC AREAS OF CONCERN

Concerns / Issues (e.g. site layout, neighborhood compatibility; visual impact, etc)	Policy/Ordinance Reference (If Known)	Suggested Changes - to address concerns (e.g. relocate; reduce height; move road access, etc)
A concrete pad was poured without permit and a citation was issued.	Code Enforcement violation 25CE00206	An after-the-fact permit is sought for the workshop.
The property comprises two lots; the proposed 658 square foot workshop is accessory to the main house.	Coastal Land Use Plan, Coastal Zone - accessory structure prior to establishment of main use or structure	The structure is proposed as accessory to the main residence.
Tree removal and replanting.	Arborist report	The arborist report recommends planting three (3) coastal live oaks.
Design and site treatment.		The proposal includes a living roof. The owner is an engineer.

ADDITIONAL LUAC COMMENTS

The Committee reviewed the after-the-fact Combined Development Permit for the 658 square foot non-habitable accessory structure (workshop) and 110 square foot patio, including development on slopes in excess of 30%.

Multiple letters of support was provided as an addendum to the agenda. Committee commended owner/applicant for working with neighbors and gaining their support for his project.

RECOMMENDATION:

Motion by: Sri (LUAC Member's Name)

Second by: Stuart (LUAC Member's Name)

X Support Project as proposed

___ Support Project with changes

___ Continue the Item

Reason for Continuance: _____

Continue to what date: _____

Ayes: 4 (Donna, Stuart, Clyde, Sri)

Noes: 0 (None)

Absent: Suzanne

Abstain: None

This page intentionally left blank