

**MINUTES**  
**North Coast Big Sur Land Use Advisory Committee**  
**March 10, 2026**

1. Meeting called to order by Trey Kropp at 10:15 am

2. Roll Call

**Members Present:**

Trey Kropp, John Grigsby, John Wilson, Dave Smiley, Christina DiPaci, Connie Mccoy (South Coast LUAC)

**Members Absent:**

Marcus Foster

3. Approval of Minutes:

A. January 17, 2026 and minutes  
February 10, 2026

Motion: Trey Kropp (LUAC Member's Name)

Second: David Smiley (LUAC Member's Name)

Ayes: Unanimous

Noes: \_\_\_\_\_

Absent: \_\_\_\_\_

Abstain: \_\_\_\_\_

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 Item**

PLN240359-DEP – BIG SUR CG OWNER LLC

**6. Other Items:**

A) Preliminary Courtesy Presentations by Applicants Regarding Potential Projects

None

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

B) Announcements

None

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

**7. Meeting Adjourned:** 1:02PM

**Minutes taken by:** Christina DiPaci

# Action by Land Use Advisory Committee

## Project Referral Sheet

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

Advisory Committee: North Coast Big Sur LUAC

1. **Project Name:** BIG SUR CG OWNER LLC AND BIG SUR CG EAST OWNER LLC AND BIG SUR CG SOUTH OWNER LLC
- File Number:** PLN240359-DEP
- Project Location:** 47000 HWY 1, BIG SUR, CA 93920
- Assessor's Parcel Number(s):** 419-211-004-000, 419-211-003-000, 419-201-023-000, 419-201-005-000
- Project Planner:** FIONNA JENSEN
- Area Plan:** BIG SUR COAST LAND USE PLAN, COASTAL ZONE
- Project Description:** COMBINED DEVELOPMENT PERMIT AND GENERAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN CONSISTING OF A:
- 1) COASTAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT AND DESIGN APPROVAL TO ALLOW BIG SUR CAMPGROUND AND CABINS (ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NUMBER 419-201-023-000) IMPROVEMENTS INCLUDING A REPLACEMENT SEPTIC SYSTEM, REPLACEMENT OF 17 PARK MODEL RVs AND FOUR MOBILE HOMES, REDEVELOPMENT OF 71 RV CAMPSITES WITH PARK MODEL RVs, CONVERTING 11 RV SITES TO RUSTIC TENT-ONLY SITES, INTERIOR REMODEL OF THREE EXISTING CABINS, DEMOLITION OF APPROXIMATELY 14,692 SQUARE FEET OF EXISTING CAMPGROUND COMMON SPACES AND CONSTRUCTION OF A 70 SQUARE FOOT GATEHOUSE, 1,020 SQUARE FOOT CAMPGROUND RETAIL STORE, 4,987 SQUARE FOOT CAFE/FOOD PREP/BATHROOM BUILDING, 1,678 SQUARE FOOT GAME ROOM AND HISTORY CENTER, 2,131 SQUARE FOOT LODGE;
  - 2) COASTAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT AND DESIGN APPROVAL TO ALLOW CONSTRUCTION OF THREE APARTMENTS ON ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NUMBER 419-201-005-000 CONTAINING 30 EMPLOYEE HOUSING UNITS (TOTAL OF 19,849 SQUARE FEET) AS A SIMILAR USE TO AGRICULTURE EMPLOYEE HOUSING;
  - 3) COASTAL ADMINISTRATIVE PERMIT AND DESIGN APPROVAL TO ALLOW DEMOLITION OF 26,637 SQUARE FEET OF EXISTING INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT AND CONSTRUCTION OF A 87,000 AND 88,000 GALLON WATER TANKS ON ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NUMBER 419-201-005-000;
  - 4) COASTAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT AND DESIGN APPROVAL TO ALLOW RIVERSIDE CAMPGROUNDS AND CABINS (ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NUMBERS 419-211-003-000 AND 419-211-004-000) IMPROVEMENTS INCLUDING CONSTRUCTION OF A REPLACEMENT DRAIN FIELD, REPLACEMENT OF 10 OF THE 12 CABINS WITH PARK MODEL RVs, DEMOLITION OF 4,734 SQUARE FEET OF EXISTING CAMPGROUND COMMON SPACE AND CONSTRUCTION OF 2,776 SQUARE FEET OF REPLACEMENT FACILITIES (720 SQUARE FOOT CAMP STORE, 1,056 SQUARE FOOT BATHHOUSE, 1,000 SQUARE FOOT PLAYGROUND), CONVERTING 50 CAMPSITES TO RUSTIC TENT-ONLY SITES;
  - 5) COASTAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT TO ALLOW DEVELOPMENT ON SLOPES IN EXCESS OF 30%;
  - 6) COASTAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT TO ALLOW DEVELOPMENT WITHIN 100 FEET OF ENVIRONMENTALLY SENSITIVE HABITAT AREA; AND
  - 7) COASTAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT TO ALLOW DEVELOPMENT WITHIN 750 FEET OF KNOWN ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES.
- RECOMMENDATION FOR THE LUAC TO PROVIDE FEEDBACK ON SITE DESIGN, NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER COMPATIBILITY, AND LOCAL CONSIDERATIONS.

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

**(Please include the names of those present)**

Mike Linder (Land Use Attorney) Robin Bot-Miller (COO of EOS)

Public : Heidi Hopkins, Sharon Petrosino- Wilson, Rob Thompson, Kvoni Wooten, Adam Slawter, J.R. Carmichael, Max Jerome, Ellis Battrell, Tara Evans, Kodiak Greenwood, Pearl Bryan, Gordon Clemens, Patrick Orosco, Todd Stornetta, Lygia Chappellet, Rylee Reedes, Katie Rodriguez, Drew Carlson, Diana Ballantyne, Carol Shadwell, Helen Handshy, Dana Carnazzo, Paul Smith, Jane Hardisty, Suzanne Terryson, Melissa Morris, Micah Curtis, Bruce Merchant, Brook & Emilio (KSBW8) Ray Sanborn, Carolyn Sheanr

**Was a County Staff/Representative present at meeting?** Fiona Jensen (Planner) Mckenna (Name)  
Bowling (County) Imani Harrigan  
(County)

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

LUAC’s chair intentionally allowed a more open discussion format during public comment so members of LUAC and members of the public could ask questions and receive responses from the applicant and County staff rather than using a strict three-minute comment limit. The following are comments and concerns that were discussed:

Name	Site Neighbor?		Issues / Concerns (suggested changes)
	YES	NO	
Bruce Merchant			Requested clarification on the definition of a "Park Model," specifically whether it constitutes a permanent structure mounted on wheels and whether Park Models are legally classified as recreational vehicles (RVs).
Pearl Bryan, Sharon Petrosino			Requested clarification regarding the intended uses of the campsite properties, particularly the distinction between traditional camping and RV use. They inquired whether the proposed changes would result in a reduction of available campsites, and sought clarification on the difference between incidental uses and full entitlements.
Lygia Chappellet			Requested clarification on how the proposed project would impact the total number of Visitor-Serving Units (VSUs) in the area.
Dana Carnazzo			Requested clarification on the design specifications of the proposed Park Model units, including occupancy capacity and whether the units would include kitchen facilities or other amenities.
Sharon Petrosino			Raised concerns regarding how the introduction of Park Model units and the potential reduction in traditional campsites would affect the availability of affordable camping options in Big Sur.

Micah Curtis	YES		(1) He inquired about the current number of staff residing on-site and the projected number under the new proposal, expressing concerns about density. (2) He asked how employee activity would be managed to prevent encroachment onto neighboring properties, including unauthorized hiking on adjacent parcels.
Helen Handshy			Raised concerns about the broader community impacts of expanded employee housing, including effects on food accessibility in greater Big Sur and potential impacts on the Big Sur Health Center.
Micah Curtis	YES		Noted that the previous property owner had created environmental damage and deferred necessary maintenance on the property. This clean up is needed and a good idea.
			Pedestrian safety and traffic impacts related to employees walking across the highway to reach the worksite.
			Traffic impacts associated with machinery and equipment transport across the highway during construction and operations. (
			Raised concerns on effects on water usage and potential water contamination resulting from the proposed development.
Carol Shadwell	YES		Concerned about other uses. Specifically whether the project would enable the property to host larger-scale events such as weddings or concerts, which she stated he would not support.
Carol Shadwell	YES		The concentration of campsites and how it may affect the demographic profile of visitors, specifically whether older visitors would face difficulty transporting belongings to rustic tent sites, and whether a shift toward a younger demographic could lead to increased nighttime noise and disturbances. She inquired whether site managers would be located in close proximity to campsites to regulate activity, and expressed concern about the close proximity to other campground facilities such as Ripplewood.
			Concerned about protection of the Redwood ecosystem and what restoration efforts would entail.
			Concerned about the nature and scale of the proposed café and game room, and their potential impact on how visitors interact with the river, the surrounding landscape, and the broader community.
			Additional concerns about traffic impacts on local areas, including whether the project would increase visitor traffic to nearby destinations such as Sycamore Canyon.

Micah Curtis			Concerns whether recreational activities such as renting tubs and floating down the river to the River Inn would remain available
Tara Evans			Expressed general concern regarding the lack of affordable housing in the Big Sur area.
Patrick Orosco			Expressed concern regarding the potential impact of the project on visitor patronage of other local establishments, such as the Village and the River Inn
<b>*** The Following are LUAC Comments***</b>			<b>*** The Following are LUAC Comments***</b>
			The LUAC expressed concern regarding the precedents that this project may establish, particularly with respect to density and change of use at visitor-serving campground properties.
LUAC member John Wilson			raised concerns about whether the project would displace lower-income individuals from the ability to experience and camp in Big Sur, given the potential shift from traditional campsites to Park Model units.
			LUAC questioned the legal basis for the Park Model classification and how the proposed changes would affect historical assessments of use on the property.
LUAC member John Wilson			Inquired how the project would impact the total number of Visitor-Serving Units (VSUs) in the Big Sur area.
			LUAC expressed concerns about whether the project would increase or decrease the overall number of visitors, and what the resulting impacts would be on river use, water consumption, and related environmental resources.
LUAC Member John Wilson			Questioned the feasibility of relocating Park Model units if future circumstances required removal from the site.
LUAC member Christina DiPaci			Noted the creative application of the WSC/40 zoning designation to propose employee housing and discussed the precedents this approach may set for other similarly zoned properties. Other members / public acknowledged the potential for this model to expand opportunities for affordable housing for both local residents and employees in the Big Sur area.

LUAC Member Dave Smiley			Noted that traffic issues in the area are longstanding and would not be resolved by this project alone.
			LUAC members recognized that this is one of the largest development plans to come before the LUAC for review and emphasized that it requires careful and thorough deliberation.
			The LUAC acknowledged several positive aspects of the proposal, including improvements to environmental preservation and restoration in the area, the creation of much-needed employee housing, and the overall thoroughness of the plan. LUAC Member Dave Smiley noted this project was designed and informed clear consideration of the Big Sur Coast Land Use Plan.
LUAC chair Trey Kropp			Commented that Big Sur is a fragile area that requires discretionary review for all major projects. It is important for the public to understand that once the Combined Development Permit is complete, any language that is not crystal clear in the permit could allow for future changes with only an administrative permit.

## LUAC AREAS OF CONCERN

<b>Concerns / Issues (e.g. site layout, neighborhood compatibility; visual impact, etc)</b>	<b>Policy/Ordinance Reference (If Known)</b>	<b>Suggested Changes - to address concerns (e.g. relocate; reduce height; move road access, etc)</b>
Event language in the permit should be revised to explicitly prohibit events on the property, rather than requiring a separate permit application for events.		Amend event-related conditions to include an express prohibition on events, removing any provision for future event permitting.
The 10% non-discretionary expansion allowance should be eliminated from the General Development Plan. All future expansions should remain subject to full discretionary review by the community, LUAC, County, and other regulatory agencies.		Remove the 10% non-discretionary expansion provision from the General Development Plan to ensure all modifications require discretionary approval.

## ADDITIONAL LUAC COMMENTS

1. After approximately three hours of public comment and applicant responses, County staff communicated to the Chair and at least one LUAC member that the meeting needed to conclude due to staff availability. Public comment was then closed. A motion was made and seconded shortly thereafter. With limited committee

discussion following the close of public comment, the Committee proceeded to a vote.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Motion by: Dave Smiley (LUAC Member's Name)

Second by: Christina DiPaci (LUAC Member's Name)

       Support Project as proposed

  X   Support Project with changes

       Continue the Item

Reason for Continuance: \_\_\_\_\_

Continue to what date: \_\_\_\_\_

Ayes: Unanimous

Noes: \_\_\_\_\_

Absent: \_\_\_\_\_

Abstain: \_\_\_\_\_