

# Exhibit E

This page intentionally left blank.

**From:** [Tamara Bitticks](#)  
**To:** [293-zahearingcomments](#); [Polockowj@countyofmonterey.gov](mailto:Polockowj@countyofmonterey.gov)  
**Subject:** Project File No. PLN260005  
**Date:** Tuesday, May 19, 2026 2:20:47 PM

---

**This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender**

You have not previously corresponded with this sender.

Dear Zoning Administrator and Project Planner Jordan Evans-Polockow:

As a resident of Mesa Court, Mesa Drive, I am respectfully submitting this letter in strong opposition to Project File No. PLN260005, the application by the Leavy-Hoglund Penelope Christine Trust for a Commercial Vacation Rental permit at 25735 Mesa Drive, Carmel.

This is not an abstract concern about short-term rentals generally. It is a specific objection to placing a commercial transient lodging use into this particular residential setting, where the subject property directly adjoins and faces a small cluster of homes. Nine homes are immediately adjacent to or directly affected by the property, and additional nearby neighbors share the same quiet residential environment, emergency-access concerns, and safety concerns.

The proposed use would convert a single-family residence into a commercial visitor accommodation with repeated turnover of unrelated guests staying for periods of 30 calendar days or fewer. That use is incompatible with the location, layout, parking patterns, emergency-access needs, and neighborhood character of this part of Carmel. We respectfully request that the County deny the permit.

**1. The prior County history and residents' experience show that the impacts are not theoretical.**

The County should consider this application in light of the prior land-use history at this same address. County Legistar records show that file PLN171029, involving 25735 Mesa Drive and related APNs at this location, was heard by the Monterey County Planning Commission on August 29, 2018, to consider a Conditional Certificate of Compliance. A subsequent County report for the September 26, 2018 continued hearing states that, after considering evidence and public testimony, the Planning Commission found that the subject parcel did not qualify for a conditional certificate of compliance and directed staff to return with a resolution denying the Coastal Development Permit for issuance of the certificate.

That prior history is important because County decisions at this property have long-term consequences for the immediately adjoining residents.

For several years, residents have experienced the following impacts associated with short-term use of the property: noise, outdoor gatherings, guest turnover, parking and circulation issues, trash concerns, loss of privacy, and disruption of quiet enjoyment.

This is not a theoretical prediction about what might happen someday. Based on residents' experience, the house has been used or rented on a short-term basis for several years. For the homes closest to the property, these impacts have already been part of daily life. Granting the permit would formalize and perpetuate those harms instead of resolving

them.

## **2. The property layout creates direct and unreasonable noise impacts on nearby homes.**

The physical layout of 25735 Mesa Drive makes it especially unsuitable for transient lodging. The house has an open living/kitchen area and outdoor deck/patio areas oriented toward neighboring homes on Mesa Court and Mesa Drive. In addition, the outdoor areas appear to be set up for recreational activities, including a putting green, cornhole, and other outdoor games. Sound from outdoor dining, socializing, music, guests arriving and leaving, and late-evening conversations travels directly toward adjacent residences.

Permanent residents are invested in long-term relationships with their neighbors. Short-term vacation guests are different: they arrive for recreation, often in groups, and have no continuing relationship with the neighborhood. Even well-written house rules are difficult to enforce in real time, especially at night or on weekends, after the noise has already affected nearby families.

For the homes closest to the subject property, the impacts are not occasional or speculative. They recur with each new rental group, creating a repeated loss of privacy, quiet enjoyment, and sleep in a neighborhood that has historically functioned as a residential area.

## **3. Parking, traffic, and emergency-access impacts are serious.**

The concern is that a commercial vacation rental adds extra vehicles, unfamiliar drivers, cleaning crews, deliveries, ride-share drop-offs, and guests searching for the property in a residential setting that was not designed for commercial guest turnover. Vacation rental groups commonly arrive in more than one vehicle. Overflow parking, vehicles stopping temporarily, or guests maneuvering in unfamiliar locations can create blind spots, interfere with pedestrians, and make it harder for residents to enter and leave safely.

Emergency access is a critical issue. Fire trucks, ambulances, and evacuation traffic must be able to move quickly through the neighborhood. Even where the roadway is not unusually narrow, this residential segment is unlaned and must remain unobstructed. Additional parked or stopped vehicles, guest loading and unloading, or unfamiliar drivers can delay access during an emergency. In a coastal California community with wildfire and evacuation concerns, this should not be treated as a minor operational issue or left to after-the-fact complaint enforcement.

## **4. The proposed commercial use is inconsistent with the established residential character of the neighborhood.**

The surrounding area is composed of homes, not hotels. The proposed permit would introduce a rotating commercial lodging use into a stable residential setting. Frequent guest turnover changes the character of the block: unfamiliar vehicles, late arrivals, trash set out by visitors who do not know local practices, outdoor gatherings, and loss of neighbor-to-neighbor accountability.

The County should give substantial weight to the lived experience of the residents who will bear the impacts. This neighborhood is not a commercial corridor. It is a quiet residential community, and the proposed use would shift the burden of a private commercial enterprise onto surrounding households.

**5. Approval would harm community well-being and threaten neighboring property values.**

The impacts described above affect more than convenience. They directly affect the well-being of residents who live next to and around the property: their sleep, privacy, ability to use their homes peacefully, and confidence that emergency access will remain unobstructed.

The permit would also threaten the value and market desirability of neighboring homes. Buyers reasonably consider peace, privacy, safety, and the residential character of the surrounding area when evaluating a property. A permitted commercial vacation rental next to a small cluster of homes, with repeated guest turnover and recurring noise and parking impacts, can make nearby homes less desirable and may reduce property values. The County should not require surrounding homeowners to absorb that potential loss for the benefit of one commercial operation.

**6. CEQA should not be used to avoid site-specific review of these unusual circumstances.**

The public notice states that the County proposes to find the project categorically exempt under CEQA Guidelines section 15301. We object to that conclusion for this site. The unusual circumstances here include the property's close physical relationship to a cluster of immediately affected homes, the orientation of outdoor living areas toward those homes, the project's parking and emergency-access impacts, the long prior history of land-use issues at this property, and the neighbors' actual lived experience with recurring disturbances.

The impacts most concerning to residents - noise, parking, traffic circulation, emergency access, evacuation safety, trash, property values, and neighborhood disruption - are exactly the types of localized impacts that require careful review rather than a blanket finding.

**7. House rules and remote management are not adequate mitigation.**

The applicant may propose occupancy limits, quiet hours, guest instructions, or a property manager contact number. Those measures do not solve the basic problem. Neighbors should not be required to police a commercial lodging operation or repeatedly call a manager after disturbances occur. Enforcement after the fact does not restore lost sleep, privacy, safety, or diminished enjoyment of one's home.

Because the property is physically oriented toward neighboring homes and because the impacts have already been experienced by residents for years, the most effective mitigation is denial of the commercial vacation rental permit.

**Requested Action**

For the reasons above, I respectfully request that the Monterey County Zoning Administrator deny Project File No. PLN260005 for a Commercial Vacation Rental at 25735 Mesa Drive.

If the County is not prepared to deny the application at this time, I request that the hearing be continued and that staff be directed to conduct further site-specific review of noise, parking capacity, emergency access, evacuation safety, road conditions, guest occupancy, outdoor-use areas, property-value impacts, and cumulative impacts on the immediate neighborhood. I also request that this letter and all similar letters be included in the administrative record for the project.

Thank you for your consideration and for protecting the safety, quiet enjoyment, property values, and residential character of my neighborhood.

Respectfully,

Tamara Bitticks

Homeowner

Mesa Terrace Association

**From:** [Kevin Francis](#)  
**To:** [293-zahearingcomments](#); [Evans-Polockow, Jordan](#); [Laura Francis](#)  
**Subject:** Opposition to Project File No. PLN260005  
**Date:** Tuesday, May 19, 2026 2:53:31 PM

---

**This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender**

You have not previously corresponded with this sender.

Dear Zoning Administrator and Project Planner Jordan Evans-Polockow:

As a resident of Mesa Court, Mesa Drive, I am respectfully submitting this letter in strong opposition to Project File No. PLN260005, the application by the Leavy-Hoglund Penelope Christine Trust for a Commercial Vacation Rental permit at 25735 Mesa Drive, Carmel.

This is not an abstract concern about short-term rentals generally. It is a specific objection to placing a commercial transient lodging use into this particular residential setting, where the subject property directly adjoins and faces a small cluster of homes. Nine homes are immediately adjacent to or directly affected by the property, and additional nearby neighbors share the same quiet residential environment, emergency-access concerns, and safety concerns.

The proposed use would convert a single-family residence into a commercial visitor accommodation with repeated turnover of unrelated guests staying for periods of 30 calendar days or fewer. That use is incompatible with the location, layout, parking patterns, emergency-access needs, and neighborhood character of this part of Carmel. I respectfully request that the County deny the permit.

**1. The prior County history and residents' experience show that the impacts are not theoretical.**

The County should consider this application in light of the prior land-use history at this same address. County Legistar records show that file PLN171029, involving 25735 Mesa Drive and related APNs at this location, was heard by the Monterey County Planning Commission on August 29, 2018, to consider a Conditional Certificate of Compliance. A subsequent County report for the September 26, 2018 continued hearing states that, after considering evidence and public testimony, the Planning Commission found that the subject parcel did not qualify for a conditional certificate of compliance and directed staff to return with a resolution denying the Coastal Development Permit for issuance of the certificate. **That prior history is important because County decisions at this property have long-term consequences for the immediately adjoining residents.**

For several years, residents have experienced the following impacts associated with short-term use of the property: noise, outdoor gatherings, guest turnover, parking and circulation issues, trash concerns, loss of privacy, and disruption of quiet enjoyment.

This is not a theoretical prediction about what might happen someday. Based on residents' experience, the house has been used or rented on a short-term basis for several years. For the homes closest to the property, these impacts have already been part of daily life. Granting the permit would formalize and perpetuate those harms instead of resolving them.

**2. The property layout creates direct and unreasonable noise impacts on nearby homes.**

The physical layout of 25735 Mesa Drive makes it especially unsuitable for transient lodging. The house has an open living/kitchen area and outdoor deck/patio areas oriented toward neighboring homes on Mesa Court and Mesa Drive. In addition, the outdoor areas appear to be set up for recreational activities, including a putting green, cornhole, and other outdoor games. Sound from outdoor dining, socializing, music, guests arriving and leaving, and late-evening conversations travels directly toward adjacent residences.

Permanent residents are invested in long-term relationships with their neighbors. Short-term vacation guests are different: they arrive for recreation, often in groups, and have no continuing relationship with the neighborhood. Even well-written house rules are difficult to enforce in real time, especially at night or on weekends, after the noise has already affected nearby families.

For the homes closest to the subject property, the impacts are not occasional or speculative. They recur with each new rental group, creating a repeated loss of privacy, quiet enjoyment, and sleep in a neighborhood that has historically functioned as a residential area.

### **3. Parking, traffic, and emergency-access impacts are serious.**

The concern is that a commercial vacation rental adds extra vehicles, unfamiliar drivers, cleaning crews, deliveries, ride-share drop-offs, and guests searching for the property in a residential setting that was not designed for commercial guest turnover. Vacation rental groups commonly arrive in more than one vehicle. Overflow parking, vehicles stopping temporarily, or guests maneuvering in unfamiliar locations can create blind spots, interfere with pedestrians, and make it harder for residents to enter and leave safely.

Emergency access is a critical issue. Fire trucks, ambulances, and evacuation traffic must be able to move quickly through the neighborhood. Even where the roadway is not unusually narrow, this residential segment is unlaned and must remain unobstructed. Additional parked or stopped vehicles, guest loading and unloading, or unfamiliar drivers can delay access during an emergency. In a coastal California community with wildfire and evacuation concerns, this should not be treated as a minor operational issue or left to after-the-fact complaint enforcement.

### **4. The proposed commercial use is inconsistent with the established residential character of the neighborhood.**

The surrounding area is composed of homes, not hotels. The proposed permit would introduce a rotating commercial lodging use into a stable residential setting. Frequent guest turnover changes the character of the block: unfamiliar vehicles, late arrivals, trash set out by visitors who do not know local practices, outdoor gatherings, and loss of neighbor-to-neighbor accountability.

The County should give substantial weight to the lived experience of the residents who will bear the impacts. This neighborhood is not a commercial corridor. It is a quiet residential community, and the proposed use would shift the burden of a private commercial enterprise onto surrounding households.

### **5. Approval would harm community well-being and threaten neighboring property values.**

The impacts described above affect more than convenience. They directly affect the well-being of residents who live

next to and around the property: their sleep, privacy, ability to use their homes peacefully, and confidence that emergency access will remain unobstructed.

The permit would also threaten the value and market desirability of neighboring homes. Buyers reasonably consider peace, privacy, safety, and the residential character of the surrounding area when evaluating a property. A permitted commercial vacation rental next to a small cluster of homes, with repeated guest turnover and recurring noise and parking impacts, can make nearby homes less desirable and may reduce property values. The County should not require surrounding homeowners to absorb that potential loss for the benefit of one commercial operation.

**6. CEQA should not be used to avoid site-specific review of these unusual circumstances.**

The public notice states that the County proposes to find the project categorically exempt under CEQA Guidelines section 15301. We object to that conclusion for this site. The unusual circumstances here include the property's close physical relationship to a cluster of immediately affected homes, the orientation of outdoor living areas toward those homes, the project's parking and emergency-access impacts, the long prior history of land-use issues at this property, and the neighbors' actual lived experience with recurring disturbances.

The impacts most concerning to residents - noise, parking, traffic circulation, emergency access, evacuation safety, trash, property values, and neighborhood disruption - are exactly the types of localized impacts that require careful review rather than a blanket finding.

**7. House rules and remote management are not adequate mitigation.**

The applicant may propose occupancy limits, quiet hours, guest instructions, or a property manager contact number. Those measures do not solve the basic problem. Neighbors should not be required to police a commercial lodging operation or repeatedly call a manager after disturbances occur. Enforcement after the fact does not restore lost sleep, privacy, safety, or diminished enjoyment of one's home.

Because the property is physically oriented toward neighboring homes and because the impacts have already been experienced by residents for years, the most effective mitigation is denial of the commercial vacation rental permit.

**Requested Action**

For the reasons above, I respectfully request that the Monterey County Zoning Administrator deny Project File No. PLN260005 for a Commercial Vacation Rental at 25735 Mesa Drive.

If the County is not prepared to deny the application at this time, I request that the hearing be continued and that staff be directed to conduct further site-specific review of noise, parking capacity, emergency access, evacuation safety, road conditions, guest occupancy, outdoor-use areas, property-value impacts, and cumulative impacts on the immediate neighborhood. I also request that this letter and all similar letters be included in the administrative record for the project.

Thank you for your consideration and for protecting the safety, quiet enjoyment, property values, and residential character of my neighborhood.

Kevin and Laura Francis  
3258 Mesa Court  
Carmel, CA 93923

--

Kevin Francis  
[krfranci@gmail.com](mailto:krfranci@gmail.com)  
650-619-1587

**From:** [mjine7233@comcast.net](mailto:mjine7233@comcast.net)  
**To:** [293-zahearingcomments](mailto:293-zahearingcomments@co.monterey.ca.us); [Polockowj@countyofmonterey.gov](mailto:Polockowj@countyofmonterey.gov)  
**Subject:** PLN260005: Commercial vacation Rental at 25735 Mesa Drive, Carmel, CA93923, APN 009-231-013-000  
**Date:** Tuesday, May 19, 2026 2:00:49 PM

---

**This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender**

You have not previously corresponded with this sender.

Below is the letter I sent just now to the email addresses below. I tweaked the first paragraph to reflect the letter was from the President of the homeowners association. I will send another letter with the first paragraph tweaked again to make the correction that the letter is from me as an individual.

Natasha and others have done a fantastic job on putting this together. Many thanks to her and them.

**THE ACTUAL DATE BY WHICH COMMENTS MUST BE RECEIVED IS THE WEDNESDAY BEFORE THE HEARING BY 5:00 P.M. — TOMORROW WEDNESDAY THE 20TH.**

You do not have to send this letter. You may frame your own comments or decline to comment. Note the address below where the hearing will be held beginning at 9:30. is in Salinas. This is the third item on the agenda, so anyone planning on attending should be there close to 9:30. If you want to carpool, let me know.

May 19, 2026

Via Email: [zahearingcomments@co.monterey.ca.us](mailto:zahearingcomments@co.monterey.ca.us);  
[Polockowj@countyofmonterey.gov](mailto:Polockowj@countyofmonterey.gov)

Monterey County Zoning Administrator  
County of Monterey Housing and Community Development  
1441 Schilling Place, 2nd Floor  
Salinas, CA 93901

**Re: ;** [Polockowj@countyofmonterey.gov](mailto:Polockowj@countyofmonterey.gov)

**PLN260005: Commercial Vacation Rental at 25735 Mesa Drive, Carmel, CA 93923, APN 009-231-013-000**

**Hearing Date: May 28, 2026, 9:30 a.m.**

Dear Zoning Administrator and Project Planner Jordan Evans-Polockow:

As the President of the Mesa Terrace Homeowners' Association, I respectfully submit this letter in strong opposition to Project File No. PLN260005, the application by the Leavy-Hoglund Penelope Christine Trust for a Commercial Vacation Rental permit at 25735 Mesa Drive, Carmel.

This is not an abstract concern about short-term rentals generally. It is a specific objection to placing a commercial transient lodging use into this particular residential setting, where the subject property directly adjoins and faces a small cluster of homes. Nine homes are immediately adjacent to or directly affected by the property, and additional nearby neighbors share the same quiet residential environment, emergency-access concerns, and safety concerns.

The proposed use would convert a single-family residence into a commercial visitor accommodation with repeated turnover of unrelated guests staying for periods of 30 calendar days or fewer. That use is incompatible with the location, layout, parking patterns, emergency-access needs, and neighborhood character of this part of Carmel. We respectfully request that the County deny the permit.

**1. The prior County history and residents' experience show that the impacts are not theoretical.**

The County should consider this application in light of the prior land-use history at this same address. County Legistar records show that file PLN171029, involving 25735 Mesa Drive and related APNs at this location, was heard by the Monterey County Planning Commission on August 29, 2018, to consider a Conditional Certificate of Compliance. A subsequent County report for the September 26, 2018 continued hearing states that, after considering evidence and public testimony, the Planning Commission found that the

subject parcel did not qualify for a conditional certificate of compliance and directed staff to return with a resolution denying the Coastal Development Permit for issuance of the certificate.

That prior history is important because County decisions at this property have long-term consequences for the immediately adjoining residents.

For several years, residents have experienced the following impacts associated with short-term use of the property: noise, outdoor gatherings, guest turnover, parking and circulation issues, trash concerns, loss of privacy, and disruption of quiet enjoyment.

This is not a theoretical prediction about what might happen someday. Based on residents' experience, the house has been used or rented on a short-term basis for several years. For the homes closest to the property, these impacts have already been part of daily life. Granting the permit would formalize and perpetuate those harms instead of resolving them.

## **2. The property layout creates direct and unreasonable noise impacts on nearby homes.**

The physical layout of 25735 Mesa Drive makes it especially unsuitable for transient lodging. The house has an open living/kitchen area and outdoor deck/patio areas oriented toward neighboring homes on Mesa Court and Mesa Drive. In addition, the outdoor areas appear to be set up for recreational activities, including a putting green, cornhole, and other outdoor games. Sound from outdoor dining, socializing, music, guests arriving and leaving, and late-evening conversations travels directly toward adjacent residences.

Permanent residents are invested in long-term relationships with their neighbors. Short-term vacation guests are different: they arrive for recreation, often in groups, and have no continuing relationship with the neighborhood. Even well-written house rules are difficult to enforce in real time,

especially at night or on weekends, after the noise has already affected nearby families.

For the homes closest to the subject property, the impacts are not occasional or speculative. They recur with each new rental group, creating a repeated loss of privacy, quiet enjoyment, and sleep in a neighborhood that has historically functioned as a residential area.

### **3. Parking, traffic, and emergency-access impacts are serious.**

The concern is that a commercial vacation rental adds extra vehicles, unfamiliar drivers, cleaning crews, deliveries, ride-share drop-offs, and guests searching for the property in a residential setting that was not designed for commercial guest turnover. Vacation rental groups commonly arrive in more than one vehicle. Overflow parking, vehicles stopping temporarily, or guests maneuvering in unfamiliar locations can create blind spots, interfere with pedestrians, and make it harder for residents to enter and leave safely.

Emergency access is a critical issue. Fire trucks, ambulances, and evacuation traffic must be able to move quickly through the neighborhood. Even where the roadway is not unusually narrow, this residential segment is unlaned and must remain unobstructed. Additional parked or stopped vehicles, guest loading and unloading, or unfamiliar drivers can delay access during an emergency. In a coastal California community with wildfire and evacuation concerns, this should not be treated as a minor operational issue or left to after-the-fact complaint enforcement.

### **4. The proposed commercial use is inconsistent with the established residential character of the neighborhood.**

The surrounding area is composed of homes, not hotels. The proposed permit would introduce a rotating commercial lodging use into a stable residential setting. Frequent guest turnover changes the character of the block: unfamiliar

vehicles, late arrivals, trash set out by visitors who do not know local practices, outdoor gatherings, and loss of neighbor-to-neighbor accountability.

The County should give substantial weight to the lived experience of the residents who will bear the impacts. This neighborhood is not a commercial corridor. It is a quiet residential community, and the proposed use would shift the burden of a private commercial enterprise onto surrounding households.

#### **5. Approval would harm community well-being and threaten neighboring property values.**

The impacts described above affect more than convenience. They directly affect the well-being of residents who live next to and around the property: their sleep, privacy, ability to use their homes peacefully, and confidence that emergency access will remain unobstructed.

The permit would also threaten the value and market desirability of neighboring homes. Buyers reasonably consider peace, privacy, safety, and the residential character of the surrounding area when evaluating a property. A permitted commercial vacation rental next to a small cluster of homes, with repeated guest turnover and recurring noise and parking impacts, can make nearby homes less desirable and may reduce property values. The County should not require surrounding homeowners to absorb that potential loss for the benefit of one commercial operation.

#### **6. CEQA should not be used to avoid site-specific review of these unusual circumstances.**

The public notice states that the County proposes to find the project categorically exempt under CEQA Guidelines section 15301. We object to that conclusion for this site. The unusual circumstances here include the property's close physical relationship to a cluster of immediately affected homes, the orientation of outdoor living areas toward those homes, the

project's parking and emergency-access impacts, the long prior history of land-use issues at this property, and the neighbors' actual lived experience with recurring disturbances.

The impacts most concerning to residents - noise, parking, traffic circulation, emergency access, evacuation safety, trash, property values, and neighborhood disruption - are exactly the types of localized impacts that require careful review rather than a blanket finding.

### **7. House rules and remote management are not adequate mitigation.**

The applicant may propose occupancy limits, quiet hours, guest instructions, or a property manager contact number. Those measures do not solve the basic problem. Neighbors should not be required to police a commercial lodging operation or repeatedly call a manager after disturbances occur. Enforcement after the fact does not restore lost sleep, privacy, safety, or diminished enjoyment of one's home.

Because the property is physically oriented toward neighboring homes and because the impacts have already been experienced by residents for years, the most effective mitigation is denial of the commercial vacation rental permit.

### **Requested Action**

For the reasons above, we respectfully request that the Monterey County Zoning Administrator deny Project File No. PLN260005 for a Commercial Vacation Rental at 25735 Mesa Drive.

If the County is not prepared to deny the application at this time, we request that the hearing be continued and that staff be directed to conduct further site-specific review of noise, parking capacity, emergency access, evacuation safety, road conditions, guest occupancy, outdoor-use areas, property-value impacts, and cumulative impacts on the immediate neighborhood. We also request that this letter and all signatures be included in the administrative record for the

project.

Thank you for your consideration and for protecting the safety, quiet enjoyment, property values, and residential character of our neighborhood.

Respectfully,

Kathleen V. Ritter, President, Mesa Terrace Homeowners'  
Association

3535 Mesa Court, Carmel, CA 93923

[mine7233@comcast.net](mailto:mine7233@comcast.net)

**From:** [mj7233@comcast.net](mailto:mj7233@comcast.net)  
**To:** [293-zahearingcomments](mailto:293-zahearingcomments)  
**Subject:** Comments re Hearing May 28, 2026 on Application File # PLN260005  
**Date:** Tuesday, May 19, 2026 2:18:16 PM

---

**This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender**

You have not previously corresponded with this sender.

May 19, 2026

Via Email: [zahearingcomments@co.monterey.ca.us](mailto:zahearingcomments@co.monterey.ca.us);  
[Polockowj@countyofmonterey.gov](mailto:Polockowj@countyofmonterey.gov)

Monterey County Zoning Administrator  
County of Monterey Housing and Community  
Development  
1441 Schilling Place, 2nd Floor  
Salinas, CA 93901

**Re:PLN260005: Commercial Vacation Rental at  
25735 Mesa Drive, Carmel, CA 93923, APN 009-  
231-013-000**

**Hearing Date: May 28, 2026, 9:30 a.m.**

Dear Zoning Administrator and Project Planner Jordan  
Evans-Polockow:

As the owner of a property that is in the neighborhood  
adjacent to 25735 Mesa Drive, Carmel, CA 93923, I  
respectfully submit this letter in strong opposition to  
Project File No. PLN260005, the application by the  
Leavy-Hoglund Penelope Christine Trust for a  
Commercial Vacation Rental permit at 25735 Mesa  
Drive, Carmel.

This is not an abstract concern about short-term rentals  
generally. It is a specific objection to placing a  
commercial transient lodging use into this particular  
residential setting, where the subject property directly  
adjoins and faces a small cluster of homes. Nine  
homes are immediately adjacent to or directly affected  
by the property, and additional nearby neighbors share

the same quiet residential environment, emergency-access concerns, and safety concerns.

The proposed use would convert a single-family residence into a commercial visitor accommodation with repeated turnover of unrelated guests staying for periods of 30 calendar days or fewer. That use is incompatible with the location, layout, parking patterns, emergency-access needs, and neighborhood character of this part of Carmel. We respectfully request that the County deny the permit.

**1. The prior County history and residents' experience show that the impacts are not theoretical.**

The County should consider this application in light of the prior land-use history at this same address. County Legistar records show that file PLN171029, involving 25735 Mesa Drive and related APNs at this location, was heard by the Monterey County Planning Commission on August 29, 2018, to consider a Conditional Certificate of Compliance. A subsequent County report for the September 26, 2018 continued hearing states that, after considering evidence and public testimony, the Planning Commission found that the subject parcel did not qualify for a conditional certificate of compliance and directed staff to return with a resolution denying the Coastal Development Permit for issuance of the certificate.

That prior history is important because County decisions at this property have long-term consequences for the immediately adjoining residents.

For several years, residents have experienced the following impacts associated with short-term use of the property: noise, outdoor gatherings, guest turnover, parking and circulation issues, trash concerns, loss of privacy, and disruption of quiet enjoyment.

This is not a theoretical prediction about what might happen someday. Based on residents' experience, the house has been used or rented on a short-term basis for several years. For the homes closest to the property, these impacts have already been part of daily life. Granting the permit would formalize and perpetuate those harms instead of resolving them.

## **2. The property layout creates direct and unreasonable noise impacts on nearby homes.**

The physical layout of 25735 Mesa Drive makes it especially unsuitable for transient lodging. The house has an open living/kitchen area and outdoor deck/patio areas oriented toward neighboring homes on Mesa Court and Mesa Drive. In addition, the outdoor areas appear to be set up for recreational activities, including a putting green, cornhole, and other outdoor games. Sound from outdoor dining, socializing, music, guests arriving and leaving, and late-evening conversations travels directly toward adjacent residences.

Permanent residents are invested in long-term relationships with their neighbors. Short-term vacation guests are different: they arrive for recreation, often in groups, and have no continuing relationship with the neighborhood. Even well-written house rules are difficult to enforce in real time, especially at night or on weekends, after the noise has already affected nearby families.

For the homes closest to the subject property, the impacts are not occasional or speculative. They recur with each new rental group, creating a repeated loss of privacy, quiet enjoyment, and sleep in a neighborhood that has historically functioned as a residential area.

## **3. Parking, traffic, and emergency-access impacts are**

**serious.**

The concern is that a commercial vacation rental adds extra vehicles, unfamiliar drivers, cleaning crews, deliveries, ride-share drop-offs, and guests searching for the property in a residential setting that was not designed for commercial guest turnover. Vacation rental groups commonly arrive in more than one vehicle. Overflow parking, vehicles stopping temporarily, or guests maneuvering in unfamiliar locations can create blind spots, interfere with pedestrians, and make it harder for residents to enter and leave safely.

Emergency access is a critical issue. Fire trucks, ambulances, and evacuation traffic must be able to move quickly through the neighborhood. Even where the roadway is not unusually narrow, this residential segment is unlaned and must remain unobstructed. Additional parked or stopped vehicles, guest loading and unloading, or unfamiliar drivers can delay access during an emergency. In a coastal California community with wildfire and evacuation concerns, this should not be treated as a minor operational issue or left to after-the-fact complaint enforcement.

**4. The proposed commercial use is inconsistent with the established residential character of the neighborhood.**

The surrounding area is composed of homes, not hotels. The proposed permit would introduce a rotating commercial lodging use into a stable residential setting. Frequent guest turnover changes the character of the block: unfamiliar vehicles, late arrivals, trash set out by visitors who do not know local practices, outdoor gatherings, and loss of neighbor-to-neighbor accountability.

The County should give substantial weight to the lived

experience of the residents who will bear the impacts. This neighborhood is not a commercial corridor. It is a quiet residential community, and the proposed use would shift the burden of a private commercial enterprise onto surrounding households.

### **5. Approval would harm community well-being and threaten neighboring property values.**

The impacts described above affect more than convenience. They directly affect the well-being of residents who live next to and around the property: their sleep, privacy, ability to use their homes peacefully, and confidence that emergency access will remain unobstructed.

The permit would also threaten the value and market desirability of neighboring homes. Buyers reasonably consider peace, privacy, safety, and the residential character of the surrounding area when evaluating a property. A permitted commercial vacation rental next to a small cluster of homes, with repeated guest turnover and recurring noise and parking impacts, can make nearby homes less desirable and may reduce property values. The County should not require surrounding homeowners to absorb that potential loss for the benefit of one commercial operation.

### **6. CEQA should not be used to avoid site-specific review of these unusual circumstances.**

The public notice states that the County proposes to find the project categorically exempt under CEQA Guidelines section 15301. We object to that conclusion for this site. The unusual circumstances here include the property's close physical relationship to a cluster of immediately affected homes, the orientation of outdoor living areas toward those homes, the project's parking and emergency-access impacts, the long prior history of land-use issues at

this property, and the neighbors' actual lived experience with recurring disturbances.

The impacts most concerning to residents - noise, parking, traffic circulation, emergency access, evacuation safety, trash, property values, and neighborhood disruption - are exactly the types of localized impacts that require careful review rather than a blanket finding.

### **7. House rules and remote management are not adequate mitigation.**

The applicant may propose occupancy limits, quiet hours, guest instructions, or a property manager contact number. Those measures do not solve the basic problem. Neighbors should not be required to police a commercial lodging operation or repeatedly call a manager after disturbances occur. Enforcement after the fact does not restore lost sleep, privacy, safety, or diminished enjoyment of one's home.

Because the property is physically oriented toward neighboring homes and because the impacts have already been experienced by residents for years, the most effective mitigation is denial of the commercial vacation rental permit.

### **Requested Action**

For the reasons above, we respectfully request that the Monterey County Zoning Administrator deny Project File No. PLN260005 for a Commercial Vacation Rental at 25735 Mesa Drive.

If the County is not prepared to deny the application at this time, we request that the hearing be continued and that staff be directed to conduct further site-specific review of noise, parking capacity, emergency access, evacuation safety, road conditions, guest occupancy, outdoor-use areas, property-value impacts, and

cumulative impacts on the immediate neighborhood.  
We also request that this letter and all signatures be included in the administrative record for the project.  
Thank you for your consideration and for protecting the safety, quiet enjoyment, property values, and residential character of our neighborhood.

Respectfully,

Kathleen V Ritter 3535 Mesa Court, Carmel, CA  
93923 mine7233@comcast.net

**From:** [Pam Klaumann](#)  
**To:** [293-zahearingcomments](#); [Polockowj@countyofmonterey.gov](mailto:Polockowj@countyofmonterey.gov)  
**Subject:** Community opposition to project file No.PLN260p005  
**Date:** Monday, May 18, 2026 10:08:01 PM  
**Attachments:** [Community Opposition Letter PLN260005 \(1\).docx](#)

---

**This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender**

You have not previously corresponded with this sender.

I oppose this project. Are quiet residential setting does not want a commercial rental. We have already experienced noise and multiple vehicles with this property. Last weekend 7 cars were parked at his rental.

Pamela Klaumann  
3517 Mesa Court  
Carmel, CA. 93923

May 19, 2026

Via Email: [zahearingcomments@co.monterey.ca.us](mailto:zahearingcomments@co.monterey.ca.us);  
[Polockowj@countyofmonterey.gov](mailto:Polockowj@countyofmonterey.gov)

Monterey County Zoning Administrator  
County of Monterey Housing and Community Development  
1441 Schilling Place, 2nd Floor  
Salinas, CA 93901

**Re: Community Opposition to Project File No.  
PLN260005 - Commercial Vacation Rental at 25735  
Mesa Drive, Carmel, CA 93923, APN 009-231-013-  
000**

Hearing Date: May 28, 2026, 9:30 a.m.

Dear Zoning Administrator and Project Planner Jordan Evans-Polockow:

We, the undersigned residents of Mesa Court, Mesa Drive, and neighboring homes in the immediate area, respectfully submit this letter in strong opposition to Project File No. PLN260005, the application by the Leavy-Hoglund Penelope Christine Trust for a Commercial Vacation Rental permit at 25735 Mesa Drive, Carmel.

This is not an abstract concern about short-term rentals generally. It is a very specific objection to placing a commercial transient lodging use into this particular residential setting, where the subject property directly adjoins and faces a small cluster of homes. Nine homes are immediately attached to or directly affected by the property, and additional nearby neighbors share the same quiet residential environment, emergency-access concerns, and safety concerns.

The proposed use would convert a single-family residence into a commercial visitor accommodation with repeated turnover of unrelated guests staying for periods of 30 calendar days or fewer. That use is incompatible with the location, layout, parking patterns, emergency-access needs, and neighborhood character of this part of Carmel. We respectfully request that the County deny the permit.

**1. The prior County history and residents' experience show that the impacts are not theoretical.**

The County should consider this application in light of the prior land-use history at this same address. County Legistar records show that file PLN171029, involving 25735 Mesa Drive, was heard by the Monterey County Planning Commission on August 29, 2018, to consider a Conditional Certificate of Compliance. A subsequent County report for the September 26, 2018 continued

hearing states that the Planning Commission found that the subject parcel did not qualify for a conditional certificate of compliance and directed staff to return with a resolution denying the Coastal Development Permit for issuance of the certificate. The same report also states that the Commission determined APNs 009-231-013-000 and 009-231-023-000 should be considered one combined legal lot of record eligible for one unconditional certificate of compliance, rather than two separate conditional certificates of compliance. (County of Monterey Legistar, File PC 18-099 / PLN171029, Aug. 29, 2018; File PC 18-108 / PLN171029, Sept. 26, 2018.)

That prior history is important because County decisions at this property have long-term consequences for the immediately adjoining residents. The neighbors respectfully believe that past review did not adequately involve or protect the surrounding homes. The current application should therefore receive careful site-specific scrutiny, with full consideration of actual neighborhood experience.

For several years, residents have experienced the kinds of impacts now being discussed: noise, outdoor gatherings, guest turnover, parking and circulation issues, trash concerns, loss of privacy, and disruption of quiet enjoyment. This is not a theoretical prediction about what might happen someday. For the homes closest to the property, these impacts have already

been part of daily life. Granting the permit would formalize and perpetuate those harms instead of resolving them.

## **2. The property layout creates direct and unreasonable noise impacts on nearby homes.**

The physical layout of 25735 Mesa Drive makes it especially unsuitable for transient lodging. The house has an open living/kitchen area and outdoor deck/patio areas oriented toward the neighboring homes on Mesa Court and Mesa Drive. Sound from outdoor dining, socializing, music, guests arriving and leaving, hot tub or pool use, and late-evening conversations travels directly toward adjacent residences.

Permanent residents are invested in long-term relationships with their neighbors. Short-term vacation guests are different: they arrive for recreation, often in groups, and have no continuing relationship with the neighborhood. Even well-written house rules are difficult to enforce in real time, especially at night or on weekends, after the noise has already affected nearby families.

For the homes closest to the subject property, the impacts are not occasional or speculative. They recur with each new rental group, creating a repeated loss of privacy, quiet enjoyment, and sleep in a neighborhood that has historically functioned as a residential area.

### **3. Parking, traffic, and emergency-access impacts are serious even though the roads are not narrow.**

The concern is that a commercial vacation rental adds extra vehicles, unfamiliar drivers, cleaning crews, deliveries, ride-share drop-offs, and guests searching for the property in a residential setting that was not designed for commercial guest turnover. Vacation rental groups commonly arrive in more than one vehicle. Overflow parking, vehicles stopping temporarily, or guests maneuvering in unfamiliar locations can create blind spots, interfere with pedestrians, and make it harder for residents to enter and leave safely.

Emergency access is a critical issue. Fire trucks, ambulances, and evacuation traffic must be able to move quickly through the neighborhood. Even on roads that are not narrow, additional parked or stopped vehicles can delay access during an emergency. In a coastal California community with wildfire and evacuation concerns, this should not be treated as a minor operational issue or left to after-the-fact complaint enforcement.

### **4. The proposed commercial use is inconsistent with the established residential character of the neighborhood.**

The surrounding area is composed of homes, not hotels. The proposed permit would introduce a rotating commercial lodging use into a stable residential setting.

Frequent guest turnover changes the character of the block: unfamiliar vehicles, late arrivals, trash set out by visitors who do not know local practices, outdoor gatherings, and loss of neighbor-to-neighbor accountability.

The County should give substantial weight to the lived experience of the residents who will bear the impacts. This neighborhood is not a commercial corridor. It is a quiet residential community, and the proposed use would shift the burden of a private commercial enterprise onto surrounding households.

### **5. Approval would harm community well-being and threaten neighboring property values.**

The impacts described above affect more than convenience. They directly affect the well-being of residents who live next to and around the property: their sleep, privacy, ability to use their homes peacefully, and confidence that emergency access will remain unobstructed.

The permit would also threaten the value and market desirability of neighboring homes. Buyers reasonably consider peace, privacy, safety, and the residential character of the surrounding area when evaluating a property. A permitted commercial vacation rental next to a small cluster of homes, with repeated guest turnover and recurring noise and parking impacts, can make nearby homes less desirable and reduce property

value. The County should not require surrounding homeowners to absorb that loss for the benefit of one commercial operation.

## **6. CEQA should not be used to avoid site-specific review of these unusual circumstances.**

The public notice states that the County proposes to find the project categorically exempt under CEQA Guidelines section 15301. We object to that conclusion for this site. The unusual circumstances here include the property's close physical relationship to a cluster of immediately affected homes, the orientation of outdoor living areas toward those homes, the project's parking and emergency-access impacts, the long prior history of land-use issues at this property, and the neighbors' actual lived experience with recurring disturbances.

The impacts most concerning to residents - noise, parking, traffic circulation, emergency access, evacuation safety, trash, property values, and neighborhood disruption - are exactly the types of localized impacts that require careful review rather than a blanket finding.

## **7. House rules and remote management are not adequate mitigation.**

The applicant may propose occupancy limits, quiet hours, guest instructions, or a property manager contact number. Those measures do not solve the basic problem. Neighbors should not be required to police a

commercial lodging operation or repeatedly call a manager after disturbances occur. Enforcement after the fact does not restore lost sleep, privacy, safety, or diminished enjoyment of one's home.

Because the property is physically oriented toward neighboring homes and because the impacts have already been experienced by residents for years, the most effective mitigation is denial of the commercial vacation rental permit.

### **Requested Action**

For the reasons above, we respectfully request that the Monterey County Zoning Administrator deny Project File No. PLN260005 for a Commercial Vacation Rental at 25735 Mesa Drive.

If the County is not prepared to deny the application at this time, we request that the hearing be continued and that staff be directed to conduct further site-specific review of noise, parking capacity, emergency access, evacuation safety, road conditions, guest occupancy, outdoor-use areas, property-value impacts, and cumulative impacts on the immediate neighborhood. We also request that this letter and all signatures be included in the administrative record for the project.

Thank you for your consideration and for protecting the safety, quiet enjoyment, property values, and residential character of our neighborhood.



**From:** [Dana Richards](#)  
**To:** [Evans-Polockow, Jordan](#)  
**Cc:** [293-zahearingcomments](#)  
**Subject:** PLN260005: LEAVY-HOGLUND PENELOPE CHRISTINE TRUST  
**Date:** Tuesday, May 19, 2026 4:00:12 PM

---

**This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender**

You have not previously corresponded with this sender.

Dear Zoning Administrator and Project Planner Jordan Evans-Polockow:

I live next door to 25735 Mesa Drive. As a resident of Mesa Court, Mesa Drive, I am respectfully submitting this letter in strong opposition to Project File No. PLN260005, the application by the Leavy-Hoglund Penelope Christine Trust for a Commercial Vacation Rental permit at 25735 Mesa Drive, Carmel.

This is not an abstract concern about short-term rentals generally. It is a specific objection to placing a commercial transient lodging use into this particular residential setting, where the subject property directly adjoins and faces a small cluster of homes. Nine homes are immediately adjacent to or directly affected by the property, and additional nearby neighbors share the same quiet residential environment, emergency-access concerns, and safety concerns.

The proposed use would convert a single-family residence into a commercial visitor accommodation with repeated turnover of unrelated guests staying for periods of 30 calendar days or fewer. That use is incompatible with the location, layout, parking patterns, emergency-access needs, and neighborhood character of this part of Carmel. I respectfully request that the County deny the permit.

**1. The prior County history and residents' experience show that the impacts are not theoretical.**

The County should consider this application in light of the prior land-use history at this same address. County Legistar records show that file PLN171029, involving 25735 Mesa Drive and related APNs at this location, was heard by the Monterey County Planning Commission on August 29, 2018, to consider a Conditional Certificate of Compliance. A subsequent County report for the September 26, 2018 continued hearing states that, after considering evidence and public testimony, the Planning Commission found that the subject parcel did not qualify for a conditional certificate of compliance and directed staff to return with a resolution denying the Coastal Development Permit for issuance of the certificate. That prior history is important because County decisions at this property have long-term consequences for the immediately adjoining residents.

For several years, residents have experienced the following impacts associated with short-term use of the property: noise, outdoor gatherings, guest turnover, parking and circulation issues, trash concerns, loss of privacy, and disruption of quiet enjoyment.

This is not a theoretical prediction about what might happen someday. Based on residents' experience, the house has been used or rented on a short-term basis for several years. For the homes closest to the property, these impacts have already been part of daily life. Granting the permit would formalize and perpetuate those harms instead of resolving them.

**2. The property layout creates direct and unreasonable noise impacts on nearby homes.**

The physical layout of 25735 Mesa Drive makes it especially unsuitable for transient lodging. The house has an open living/kitchen area and outdoor deck/patio areas oriented toward neighboring homes on Mesa Court and Mesa Drive. In addition, the outdoor areas appear to be set up for recreational activities, including a putting green, cornhole, and other outdoor games. Sound from outdoor dining, socializing, music, guests arriving and leaving, and late-evening conversations travels directly toward adjacent residences.

Permanent residents are invested in long-term relationships with their neighbors. Short-term vacation guests are different: they arrive for recreation, often in groups, and have no continuing relationship with the neighborhood. Even well-written house rules are difficult to enforce in real time, especially at night or on weekends, after the noise has already affected nearby families.

For the homes closest to the subject property, the impacts are not occasional or speculative. They recur with each new rental group, creating a repeated loss of privacy, quiet enjoyment, and sleep in a neighborhood that has historically functioned as a residential area.

**3. Parking, traffic, and emergency-access impacts are serious.**

The concern is that a commercial vacation rental adds extra vehicles, unfamiliar drivers, cleaning crews, deliveries, ride-share drop-offs, and guests searching for the property in a residential setting that was not designed for commercial guest turnover. Vacation rental groups commonly arrive in more than one vehicle. Overflow parking, vehicles stopping temporarily, or guests maneuvering in unfamiliar locations can create blind spots, interfere with pedestrians, and make it harder for residents to enter and leave safely.

Emergency access is a critical issue. Fire trucks, ambulances, and evacuation traffic must be able to move quickly through the neighborhood. Even where the roadway is not unusually narrow, this residential segment is unlaned and must remain unobstructed. Additional parked or stopped vehicles, guest loading and unloading, or unfamiliar drivers can delay access during an emergency. In a coastal California community with wildfire and evacuation concerns, this should not be treated as a minor operational issue or left to after-the-fact complaint enforcement.

**4. The proposed commercial use is inconsistent with the established residential character of the neighborhood.**

The surrounding area is composed of homes, not hotels. The proposed permit would introduce a rotating commercial lodging use into a stable residential setting. Frequent guest turnover changes the character of the block: unfamiliar vehicles, late arrivals, trash set out by visitors who do not know local practices, outdoor gatherings, and loss of neighbor-to-neighbor accountability.

The County should give substantial weight to the lived experience of the residents who will bear the impacts. This neighborhood is not a commercial corridor. It is a quiet residential community, and the proposed use would shift the burden of a private commercial enterprise onto surrounding households.

**5. Approval would harm community well-being and threaten neighboring property values.**

The impacts described above affect more than convenience. They directly affect the well-being of residents who live next to and around the property: their sleep, privacy, ability to use their homes peacefully, and confidence that emergency access will remain unobstructed.

The permit would also threaten the value and market desirability of neighboring homes. Buyers reasonably consider peace, privacy, safety, and the residential character of the surrounding area when evaluating a property. A permitted commercial vacation rental next to a small cluster of homes, with repeated guest turnover and recurring noise and parking impacts, can make nearby homes less desirable and may reduce property values. The County should not require surrounding homeowners to absorb that potential loss for the benefit of one commercial operation.

**6. CEQA should not be used to avoid site-specific review of these unusual circumstances.**

The public notice states that the County proposes to find the project categorically exempt under CEQA Guidelines section 15301. We object to that conclusion for this site. The unusual circumstances here include the property's close physical relationship to a cluster of immediately affected homes, the orientation of outdoor living areas toward those homes, the project's parking and emergency-access impacts, the long prior history of land-use issues at this property, and the neighbors' actual lived experience with recurring disturbances.

The impacts most concerning to residents - noise, parking, traffic circulation, emergency access, evacuation safety, trash, property values, and neighborhood disruption - are exactly the types of localized impacts that require careful review rather than a blanket finding.

**7. House rules and remote management are not adequate mitigation.**

The applicant may propose occupancy limits, quiet hours, guest instructions, or a property manager contact number. Those measures do not solve the basic problem. Neighbors should not be required to police a commercial lodging operation or repeatedly call a manager after disturbances occur. Enforcement after the fact does not restore lost sleep, privacy, safety, or diminished enjoyment of one's home.

Because the property is physically oriented toward neighboring homes and because the impacts have already been experienced by residents for years, the most effective mitigation is denial of the commercial vacation rental permit.

**Requested Action**

For the reasons above, I respectfully request that the Monterey County Zoning Administrator deny Project File No. PLN260005 for a Commercial Vacation Rental at 25735 Mesa Drive.

If the County is not prepared to deny the application at this time, I request that the hearing be continued and that staff be directed to conduct further site-specific review of noise, parking capacity, emergency access, evacuation safety, road conditions, guest occupancy, outdoor-use areas, property-value impacts, and cumulative impacts on the immediate neighborhood. I also request that this letter and all similar letters be included in the administrative record for the project.

Thank you for your consideration and for protecting the safety, quiet enjoyment, property values, and residential

character of my neighborhood.

Respectfully,

Dana Merry Richards, PhD

Homeowner

Mesa Terrace Association

3511 Mesa Ct, Carmel, CA

**From:** [John Richards](#)  
**To:** [293-zahearingcomments](#); [Polockowj@countyofmonterey.gov](mailto:Polockowj@countyofmonterey.gov)  
**Cc:** [Dana Richards](#); [Kathie Ritter](#); [Natasha Lipkina](#)  
**Subject:** Project File No PLN2260005: LEAVY-HOGLUND PENELOPE CHRISTINE TR  
**Date:** Tuesday, May 19, 2026 5:25:32 PM  
**Attachments:** [Short-Term Rental Opposition.pdf](#)  
[Kathie Ritter Letter.pdf](#)

---

**This Message Is From an External Sender**

[CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the County. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.]

Attached please find documents opposing the LEAVY-HOGLUND PENELOPE CHRISTINE TR, application for Commercial Vacation Rental (Project File No. PLN 2260005) for the property located at 25735 Mesa Dr, Carmel, CA 93923 (APN 009-231-013-000)

1                                   BEFORE THE ZONING ADMINISTRATOR  
2                                   FOR THE COUNTY OF MONTEREY  
3  
4  
5

6 In the Matter of the Application of  
7 LEAVY-HOGLUND PENELOPE  
8 CHRISTINE TR,  
9 For A  
10 COMMERCIAL VACATION RENTAL  
11 (30 days or Less)  
12  
13

Project File No. PLN2260005  
  
25735 Mesa Dr., Carmel, CA  
93923  
  
A.P.N. 009-231-013-000

14  
15           John W. and Dana M. Richards oppose any proposal to authorize  
16 short-term vacation rentals (less than 30 days) for residential properties in  
17 this neighborhood.  
18

19           John W. and Dana M. Richards own property at 3511 Mesa Ct,  
20 Carmel, CA 93923 (Assessor's Parcel No. 009-231-032-000). The  
21 proposed project parcel (25735 Mesa Dr, Carmel, CA 93923, Assessor's  
22 Parcel No. 009-231-013-000) is contiguous to 3511 Mesa Ct and extends  
23 along the entire western boundary of our property. (A separate parcel,  
24 Assessor's Parcel No. 009-231-023-000, owned in common with the project  
25 parcel covers about half of our northern boundary.)

1 John W. and Dana M. Richards are concerned that short-term  
2 vacation rentals will have an adverse impact on the residential character of  
3 the neighborhood, the quiet enjoyment of our property adjacent to the  
4 project parcel, and will have a detrimental impact on property value. The  
5 project parcel has been rented many times since the owners completed an  
6 extensive remodeling effort.

7  
8 Short-term vacation renters have been more conspicuous than would  
9 be expected from residents or long-term tenants:

- 10 An outdoor party gathering extended well after dark with light  
11 and noise later than normal;
- 12 A group of men in town for an event who were more exuberant  
13 than other occupants;
- 14 An afternoon gathering involving numerous cars parked on the  
15 street, including in front of our property on Mesa Ct, a private  
16 drive despite adequate off-street parking for renters at the  
17 project parcel; and
- 18 Waste bins have been placed on Mesa Dr for collection  
19 immediately after weekend occupancies and have languished  
20 on the street until collected on Friday. (This occurs routinely at  
21 weekend homes or other vacation rentals or in the  
22 neighborhood.)

23 ///  
24 ///  
25 ///

1           Parking on Mesa Ct at the corner of Mesa Dr by invited guests at the  
2 project parcel obstructs the ability of residents exiting Mesa Ct to see traffic  
3 southbound on Mesa Dr.

4  
5           Short-term vacation rentals are inherently a potential source of  
6 nuisance conditions, such as excessive noise and traffic as compared to  
7 longer term vacation rentals (30 days or more). While not all short-term  
8 vacation renters create nuisance problems, groups of vacationers attracted  
9 to a particular event who stay for just a weekend, or a few days, are more  
10 likely to be in “party” mode associated with their attendance at particular  
11 transient entertainments (such as golf tournaments, motorsports events,  
12 cycling competitions, music festivals, etc., etc.) than family vacationers who  
13 plan to reside for longer periods to take advantage of a variety of  
14 experiences over the course of weeks and to the appreciate the  
15 atmosphere of living in the community .

16  
17           The project property has numerous bedrooms to suitable for groups  
18 and could involve excessive traffic in the neighborhood due to the  
19 additional vehicles and frequent excursions to event, dining, and  
20 recreational venues. Increased traffic on the narrow, winding streets of this  
21 neighborhood, which are already subject to overflow traffic from Hwy 1,  
22 would detract further from the residential character of the neighborhood.

23           ///

24           ///

25           ///

1 CONCLUSION

2 We oppose approval of the proposal for Commercial Vacation Rental  
3 to allow use of the subject residential property for transient lodging for a  
4 period of 30 calendar days or fewer. We endorse the concerns expressed  
5 in the attached letter prepared by members of the Mesa Terrace  
6 Homeowners Association (the nine parcels on Mesa Ct).

7  
8 RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 19th day of May, 2026.

9  
10  
11 JOHN W. RICHARDS  
12 3511 Mesa Ct, Carmel, CA 93923  
13 (530) 400-0994  
[john.w.richards@me.com](mailto:john.w.richards@me.com)

14 DANA M. RICHARDS  
15 3511 Mesa Ct, Carmel, CA 93923  
16 (530) 400-1002  
[danemrichards@gmail.com](mailto:danemrichards@gmail.com)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25



May 19, 2026

Via Email: [zahearingcomments@co.monterey.ca.us](mailto:zahearingcomments@co.monterey.ca.us);

[Polockowj@countyofmonterey.gov](mailto:Polockowj@countyofmonterey.gov)

Monterey County Zoning Administrator

County of Monterey Housing and Community

Development

1441 Schilling Place, 2nd Floor

Salinas, CA 93901

Re: ; [Polockowj@countyofmonterey.gov](mailto:Polockowj@countyofmonterey.gov)

PLN260005: Commercial Vacation Rental at 25735 Mesa Drive, Carmel, CA 93923, APN 009-231-013-000

Hearing Date: May 28, 2026, 9:30 a.m.

Dear Zoning Administrator and Project Planner Jordan Evans-Polockow:

As the President of the Mesa Terrace Homeowners' Association, I respectfully submit this letter in strong opposition to Project File No. PLN260005, the application by the Leavy-Hoglund Penelope Christine Trust for a Commercial Vacation Rental permit at 25735 Mesa Drive, Carmel.

This is not an abstract concern about short-term rentals generally. It is a specific objection to placing a commercial transient lodging use into this particular residential setting, where the subject property directly adjoins and faces a small cluster of homes. Nine homes are immediately adjacent to or directly affected by the property, and additional nearby neighbors share the same quiet residential environment, emergency-access concerns, and safety concerns.

The proposed use would convert a single-family residence into a commercial visitor accommodation with repeated turnover of unrelated guests staying for periods of 30 calendar days or fewer. That use is incompatible with the location, layout, parking patterns, emergency-access needs, and neighborhood character of this part of Carmel. We respectfully request that the County deny the permit.

1. The prior County history and residents' experience show that the impacts are not theoretical.

The County should consider this application in light of the prior land-use history at this same address. County Legistar records show that file PLN171029, involving 25735 Mesa Drive and related APNs at this location, was heard by the Monterey County Planning Commission on August 29, 2018, to consider a Conditional Certificate of Compliance. A subsequent County report for the September 26, 2018 continued hearing states that, after considering evidence and public testimony, the Planning Commission found that the subject parcel did not qualify for a conditional certificate of compliance and directed staff to return with a resolution denying the Coastal Development Permit for issuance of the certificate.

That prior history is important because County decisions at this property have long-term consequences for the immediately adjoining residents.

For several years, residents have experienced the following impacts associated with short-term use of the property: noise, outdoor gatherings, guest turnover, parking and circulation issues, trash concerns, loss of privacy, and disruption of quiet enjoyment.

This is not a theoretical prediction about what might happen someday. Based on residents' experience, the house has been used or rented on a short-term basis for several years. For the homes closest to the property, these impacts have already been part of daily life. Granting the permit would formalize and perpetuate those harms instead of resolving them.

2. The property layout creates direct and unreasonable noise impacts on nearby homes.

The physical layout of 25735 Mesa Drive makes it especially unsuitable for transient lodging. The house has an open living/kitchen area and outdoor deck/patio areas oriented toward neighboring homes on Mesa Court and Mesa Drive. In addition, the outdoor areas appear to be set up for recreational activities, including a putting green, cornhole, and other outdoor games. Sound from outdoor dining, socializing, music, guests arriving and leaving, and late-evening conversations travels directly toward adjacent residences.

Permanent residents are invested in long-term relationships with their neighbors. Short-term vacation guests are different: they arrive for recreation, often in groups, and have no continuing relationship with the neighborhood. Even well-written house rules are difficult to enforce in real time, especially at night or on weekends, after the noise has already affected nearby families.

For the homes closest to the subject property, the impacts are not occasional or speculative. They recur with each new rental group, creating a repeated loss of privacy, quiet

enjoyment, and sleep in a neighborhood that has historically functioned as a residential area.

3. Parking, traffic, and emergency-access impacts are serious.

The concern is that a commercial vacation rental adds extra vehicles, unfamiliar drivers, cleaning crews, deliveries, ride-share drop-offs, and guests searching for the property in a residential setting that was not designed for commercial guest turnover. Vacation rental groups commonly arrive in more than one vehicle. Overflow parking, vehicles stopping temporarily, or guests maneuvering in unfamiliar locations can create blind spots, interfere with pedestrians, and make it harder for residents to enter and leave safely.

Emergency access is a critical issue. Fire trucks, ambulances, and evacuation traffic must be able to move quickly through the neighborhood. Even where the roadway is not unusually narrow, this residential segment is unlaned and must remain unobstructed. Additional parked or stopped vehicles, guest loading and unloading, or unfamiliar drivers can delay access during an emergency. In a coastal California community with wildfire and evacuation concerns, this should not be treated as a minor operational issue or left to after-the-fact complaint enforcement.

4. The proposed commercial use is inconsistent with the established residential character of the neighborhood. The surrounding area is composed of homes, not hotels. The proposed permit would introduce a rotating commercial lodging use into a stable residential setting.

Frequent guest turnover changes the character of the block: unfamiliar vehicles, late arrivals, trash set out by visitors who do not know local practices, outdoor gatherings, and loss of neighbor-to-neighbor accountability.

The County should give substantial weight to the lived experience of the residents who will bear the impacts. This neighborhood is not a commercial corridor. It is a quiet residential community, and the proposed use would shift the burden of a private commercial enterprise onto surrounding households.

5. Approval would harm community well-being and threaten neighboring property values.

The impacts described above affect more than convenience. They directly affect the well-being of residents who live next to and around the property: their sleep, privacy, ability to use their homes peacefully, and confidence that emergency access will remain unobstructed.

The permit would also threaten the value and market desirability of neighboring homes. Buyers reasonably consider peace, privacy, safety, and the residential character of the surrounding area when evaluating a property. A permitted commercial vacation rental next to a small cluster of homes, with repeated guest turnover and recurring noise and parking impacts, can make nearby homes less desirable and may reduce property values. The County should not require surrounding homeowners to absorb that potential loss for the benefit of one commercial operation.

6. CEQA should not be used to avoid site-specific review of these unusual circumstances.

The public notice states that the County proposes to find the project categorically exempt under CEQA Guidelines section 15301. We object to that conclusion for this site.

The unusual circumstances here include the property's close physical relationship to a cluster of immediately affected homes, the orientation of outdoor living areas toward those homes, the project's parking and emergency-access impacts, the long prior history of land-use issues at this property, and the neighbors' actual lived experience with recurring disturbances.

The impacts most concerning to residents - noise, parking, traffic circulation, emergency access, evacuation safety, trash, property values, and neighborhood disruption - are exactly the types of localized impacts that require careful review rather than a blanket finding.

7. House rules and remote management are not adequate mitigation.

The applicant may propose occupancy limits, quiet hours, guest instructions, or a property manager contact number. Those measures do not solve the basic problem.

Neighbors should not be required to police a commercial lodging operation or repeatedly call a manager after disturbances occur. Enforcement after the fact does not restore lost sleep, privacy, safety, or diminished enjoyment of one's home.

Because the property is physically oriented toward neighboring homes and because the impacts have already been experienced by residents for years, the most

effective mitigation is denial of the commercial vacation rental permit.

#### Requested Action

For the reasons above, we respectfully request that the Monterey County Zoning Administrator deny Project File No. PLN260005 for a Commercial Vacation Rental at 25735 Mesa Drive.

If the County is not prepared to deny the application at this time, we request that the hearing be continued and that staff be directed to conduct further site-specific review of noise, parking capacity, emergency access, evacuation safety, road conditions, guest occupancy, outdoor-use areas, property-value impacts, and cumulative impacts on the immediate neighborhood. We also request that this letter and all signatures be included in the administrative record for the project.

Thank you for your consideration and for protecting the safety, quiet enjoyment, property values, and residential character of our neighborhood.

Respectfully,

Kathleen V. Ritter, President, Mesa Terrace Homeowners' Association

3535 Mesa Court, Carmel, CA 93923

[mine7233@comcast.net](mailto:mine7233@comcast.net)

**From:** [Natasha Lipkina](#)  
**To:** [293-zahearingcomments](#); [Evans-Polockow, Jordan](#)  
**Subject:** Opposition letter PLN260005 See 2 attachments  
**Date:** Tuesday, May 19, 2026 10:53:37 PM  
**Attachments:** [Opposition letter re PLN260005.pdf](#)  
[Picture.pdf](#)

---

**This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender**

You have not previously corresponded with this sender.

May 19, 2026

Dear Zoning Administrator and Project Planner Jordan Evans-Polockow:

As a resident of Mesa Court, I am respectfully submitting this letter in strong opposition to Project File No. PLN260005, the application by the Leavy-Hoglund Penelope Christine Trust for a Commercial Vacation Rental permit at 25735 Mesa Drive, Carmel.

This is not an abstract concern about short-term rentals generally. It is a specific objection to placing a commercial transient lodging use into this particular residential setting, where the subject property directly adjoins and faces a small cluster of homes. Nine homes are immediately adjacent to or directly affected by the property, and additional nearby neighbors share the same quiet residential environment, emergency-access concerns, and safety concerns.

The proposed use would convert a single-family residence into a commercial visitor accommodation with repeated turnover of unrelated guests staying for periods of 30 calendar days or fewer. That use is incompatible with the location, layout, parking patterns, emergency-access needs, and neighborhood character of this part of Carmel. I respectfully request that the County deny the permit.

**1. The prior County history and residents' experience show that the impacts are not theoretical.**

The County should consider this application in light of the prior land-use history at this same address. County Legistar records show that file PLN171029, involving 25735 Mesa Drive and related APNs at this location, was heard by the Monterey County Planning Commission on August 29, 2018, to consider a Conditional Certificate of Compliance. A subsequent County report for the September 26, 2018 continued hearing states that, after considering evidence and public testimony, the Planning Commission found that the subject parcel did not qualify for a conditional certificate of compliance and directed staff to return with a resolution denying the Coastal Development Permit for issuance of the certificate. That prior history is important because County decisions at this property have long-term consequences for the immediately adjoining residents.

For several years, residents have experienced the following impacts associated with short-term use of the property: noise, outdoor gatherings, guest turnover, parking and circulation issues, trash concerns, loss of privacy, and disruption of quiet enjoyment.

This is not a theoretical prediction about what might happen someday. Based on residents' experience, the house has been used or rented on a short-term basis for several years. For the homes closest to the property, these impacts have already been part of daily life. Granting the permit would formalize and perpetuate those harms instead of resolving them.

**2. The property layout creates direct and unreasonable noise impacts on nearby homes.**

The physical layout of 25735 Mesa Drive makes it especially unsuitable for

transient lodging. The house has an open living/kitchen area and outdoor deck/patio areas oriented toward neighboring homes on Mesa Court and Mesa Drive. In addition, the outdoor areas appear to be set up for recreational activities, including a putting green, cornhole, and other outdoor games. Sound from outdoor dining, socializing, music, guests arriving and leaving, and late-evening conversations travels directly toward adjacent residences.

Permanent residents are invested in long-term relationships with their neighbors. Short-term vacation guests are different: they arrive for recreation, often in groups, and have no continuing relationship with the neighborhood. Even well-written house rules are difficult to enforce in real time, especially at night or on weekends, after the noise has already affected nearby families.

For the homes closest to the subject property, the impacts are not occasional or speculative. They recur with each new rental group, creating a repeated loss of privacy, quiet enjoyment, and sleep in a neighborhood that has historically functioned as a residential area.

### **3. Parking, traffic, and emergency-access impacts are serious.**

The concern is that a commercial vacation rental adds extra vehicles, unfamiliar drivers, cleaning crews, deliveries, ride-share drop-offs, and guests searching for the property in a residential setting that was not designed for commercial guest turnover. Vacation rental groups commonly arrive in more than one vehicle. Overflow parking, vehicles stopping temporarily, or guests maneuvering in unfamiliar locations can create blind spots, interfere with pedestrians, and make it harder for residents to enter and leave safely.

Emergency access is a critical issue. Fire trucks, ambulances, and evacuation traffic must be able to move quickly through the neighborhood. Even where the roadway is not unusually narrow, this residential segment is unlaned and must remain unobstructed. Additional parked or stopped vehicles, guest loading and unloading, or unfamiliar drivers can delay access during an emergency. In a coastal California community with wildfire and evacuation concerns, this should not be treated as a minor operational issue or left to after-the-fact complaint enforcement.

### **4. The proposed commercial use is inconsistent with the established residential character of the neighborhood.**

The surrounding area is composed of homes, not hotels. The proposed permit would introduce a rotating commercial lodging use into a stable residential setting. Frequent guest turnover changes the character of the block: unfamiliar vehicles, late arrivals, trash set out by visitors who do not know local practices, outdoor gatherings, and loss of neighbor-to-neighbor accountability.

The County should give substantial weight to the lived experience of the residents who will bear the impacts. This neighborhood is not a commercial corridor. It is a quiet residential community, and the proposed use would shift the burden of a private commercial enterprise onto surrounding households.

### **5. Approval would harm community well-being and threaten neighboring property values.**

The impacts described above affect more than convenience. They directly affect the well-being of residents who live next to and around the property: their sleep, privacy, ability to use their homes peacefully, and confidence that emergency access will remain unobstructed.

The permit would also threaten the value and market desirability of neighboring homes. Buyers reasonably consider peace, privacy, safety, and the residential character of the surrounding area when evaluating a property. A permitted commercial vacation rental next to a small cluster of homes, with repeated guest turnover and recurring noise and parking impacts, can make nearby homes less desirable and may reduce property values. The County should not require surrounding homeowners to absorb that potential loss for the benefit of one commercial operation.

**6. CEQA should not be used to avoid site-specific review of these unusual circumstances.**

The public notice states that the County proposes to find the project categorically exempt under CEQA Guidelines section 15301. We object to that conclusion for this site. The unusual circumstances here include the property's close physical relationship to a cluster of immediately affected homes, the orientation of outdoor living areas toward those homes, the project's parking and emergency-access impacts, the long prior history of land-use issues at this property, and the neighbors' actual lived experience with recurring disturbances.

The impacts most concerning to residents - noise, parking, traffic circulation, emergency access, evacuation safety, trash, property values, and neighborhood disruption - are exactly the types of localized impacts that require careful review rather than a blanket finding.

**7. House rules and remote management are not adequate mitigation.**

The applicant may propose occupancy limits, quiet hours, guest instructions, or a property manager contact number. Those measures do not solve the basic problem. Neighbors should not be required to police a commercial lodging operation or repeatedly call a manager after disturbances occur. Enforcement after the fact does not restore lost sleep, privacy, safety, or diminished enjoyment of one's home.

Because the property is physically oriented toward neighboring homes and because the impacts have already been experienced by residents for years, the most effective mitigation is denial of the commercial vacation rental permit.

**Requested Action**

For the reasons above, I respectfully request that the Monterey County Zoning Administrator deny Project File No. PLN260005 for a Commercial Vacation Rental at 25735 Mesa Drive.

If the County is not prepared to deny the application at this time, I request that the hearing be continued and that staff be directed to conduct further site-specific review of noise, parking capacity, emergency access, evacuation safety, road conditions, guest occupancy, outdoor-use areas, property-value impacts, and cumulative impacts on the immediate neighborhood. I also request that this letter and all similar letters be included in the administrative record for the project.

Thank you for your consideration and for protecting the safety, quiet enjoyment, property values, and residential character of my neighborhood.

See attachments:

1. Opposition letter
2. View of the house

Respectfully,

*Natalia Lipkina*

*Homeowner*

*Mesa Terrace Association*

*3523 Mesa Ct, Carmel*

May 19,2026

Dear Zoning Administrator and Project Planner Jordan Evans-Polockow:

As a resident of Mesa Court, I am respectfully submitting this letter in strong opposition to Project File No. PLN260005, the application by the Leavy-Hoglund Penelope Christine Trust for a Commercial Vacation Rental permit at 25735 Mesa Drive, Carmel.

This is not an abstract concern about short-term rentals generally. It is a specific objection to placing a commercial transient lodging use into this particular residential setting, where the subject property directly adjoins and faces a small cluster of homes. Nine homes are immediately adjacent to or directly affected by the property, and additional nearby neighbors share the same quiet residential environment, emergency-access concerns, and safety concerns.

The proposed use would convert a single-family residence into a commercial visitor accommodation with repeated turnover of unrelated guests staying for periods of 30 calendar days or fewer. That use is incompatible with the location, layout, parking patterns, emergency-access needs, and neighborhood character of this part of Carmel. I respectfully request that the County deny the permit.

**1. The prior County history and residents' experience show that the impacts are not theoretical.**

The County should consider this application in light of the prior land-use history at this same address. County Register records show that file PLN171029, involving 25735 Mesa Drive and related APNs at this location, was heard by the Monterey County Planning Commission on August 29, 2018, to consider a Conditional Certificate of Compliance. A subsequent County report for the September 26, 2018 continued hearing states that, after considering evidence and public testimony, the Planning Commission found that the subject parcel did not qualify for a conditional certificate of compliance and directed staff to return with a resolution denying the Coastal Development Permit for issuance of the certificate. That prior history is important because County decisions at

this property have long-term consequences for the immediately adjoining residents.

For several years, residents have experienced the following impacts associated with short-term use of the property: noise, outdoor gatherings, guest turnover, parking and circulation issues, trash concerns, loss of privacy, and disruption of quiet enjoyment.

This is not a theoretical prediction about what might happen someday. Based on residents' experience, the house has been used or rented on a short-term basis for several years. For the homes closest to the property, these impacts have already been part of daily life. Granting the permit would formalize and perpetuate those harms instead of resolving them.

## **2. The property layout creates direct and unreasonable noise impacts on nearby homes.**

The physical layout of 25735 Mesa Drive makes it especially unsuitable for transient lodging. The house has an open living/kitchen area and outdoor deck/patio areas oriented toward neighboring homes on Mesa Court and Mesa Drive. In addition, the outdoor areas appear to be set up for recreational activities, including a putting green, cornhole, and other outdoor games. Sound from outdoor dining, socializing, music, guests arriving and leaving, and late-evening conversations travels directly toward adjacent residences.

Permanent residents are invested in long-term relationships with their neighbors. Short-term vacation guests are different: they arrive for recreation, often in groups, and have no continuing relationship with the neighborhood. Even well-written house rules are difficult to enforce in real time, especially at night or on weekends, after the noise has already affected nearby families.

For the homes closest to the subject property, the impacts are not occasional or speculative. They recur with each new rental group, creating a repeated loss of privacy, quiet enjoyment, and sleep in a neighborhood that has historically functioned as a residential area.

## **3. Parking, traffic, and emergency-access impacts are serious.**

The concern is that a commercial vacation rental adds extra vehicles, unfamiliar drivers, cleaning crews, deliveries, ride-share drop-offs, and guests searching for the property in a residential setting that was not designed for commercial guest turnover. Vacation rental groups commonly arrive in more than one vehicle. Overflow parking, vehicles stopping temporarily, or guests maneuvering in unfamiliar locations can create blind spots, interfere with pedestrians, and make it harder for residents to enter and leave safely.

Emergency access is a critical issue. Fire trucks, ambulances, and evacuation traffic must be able to move quickly through the neighborhood. Even where the roadway is not unusually narrow, this residential segment is “unlaned” and must remain unobstructed. Additional parked or stopped vehicles, guest loading and unloading, or unfamiliar drivers can delay access during an emergency. In a coastal California community with wildfire and evacuation concerns, this should not be treated as a minor operational issue or left to after-the-fact complaint enforcement.

#### **4. The proposed commercial use is inconsistent with the established residential character of the neighborhood.**

The surrounding area is composed of homes, not hotels. The proposed permit would introduce a rotating commercial lodging use into a stable residential setting. Frequent guest turnover changes the character of the block: unfamiliar vehicles, late arrivals, trash set out by visitors who do not know local practices, outdoor gatherings, and loss of neighbor-to-neighbor accountability.

The County should give substantial weight to the lived experience of the residents who will bear the impacts. This neighborhood is not a commercial corridor. It is a quiet residential community, and the proposed use would shift the burden of a private commercial enterprise onto surrounding households.

#### **5. Approval would harm community well-being and threaten neighboring property values.**

The impacts described above affect more than convenience. They directly affect the well-being of residents who live next to and around the property: their sleep, privacy, ability to use their homes peacefully, and confidence that emergency access will remain unobstructed.

The permit would also threaten the value and market desirability of neighboring homes. Buyers reasonably consider peace, privacy, safety, and the residential character of the surrounding area when evaluating a property. A permitted commercial vacation rental next to a small cluster of homes, with repeated guest turnover and recurring noise and parking impacts, can make nearby homes less desirable and may reduce property values. The County should not require surrounding homeowners to absorb that potential loss for the benefit of one commercial operation.

#### **6. CEQA should not be used to avoid site-specific review of these unusual circumstances.**

The public notice states that the County proposes to find the project categorically exempt under CEQA Guidelines section 15301. We object to that conclusion for this site. The unusual circumstances here include the property's close physical relationship to a cluster of immediately affected homes, the orientation of outdoor living areas toward those homes, the project's parking and emergency-access impacts, the long prior history of land-use issues at this property, and the neighbors' actual lived experience with recurring disturbances.

The impacts most concerning to residents - noise, parking, traffic circulation, emergency access, evacuation safety, trash, property values, and neighborhood disruption - are exactly the types of localized impacts that require careful review rather than a blanket finding.

#### **7. House rules and remote management are not adequate mitigation.**

The applicant may propose occupancy limits, quiet hours, guest instructions, or a property manager contact number. Those measures do not solve the basic problem. Neighbors should not be required to police a commercial lodging operation or repeatedly call a manager after disturbances occur. Enforcement after the fact does not restore lost sleep, privacy, safety, or diminished enjoyment of one's home.

Because the property is physically oriented toward neighboring homes and because the impacts have already been experienced by residents for years, the most effective mitigation is denial of the commercial vacation rental permit.

**Requested Action**

For the reasons above, I respectfully request that the Monterey County Zoning Administrator deny Project File No. PLN260005 for a Commercial Vacation Rental at 25735 Mesa Drive.

If the County is not prepared to deny the application at this time, I request that the hearing be continued and that staff be directed to conduct further site-specific review of noise, parking capacity, emergency access, evacuation safety, road conditions, guest occupancy, outdoor-use areas, property-value impacts, and cumulative impacts on the immediate neighborhood. I also request that this letter and all similar letters be included in the administrative record for the project.

Thank you for your consideration and for protecting the safety, quiet enjoyment, property values, and residential character of my neighborhood.

Respectfully,

Natalia Lipkina  
Homeowner  
Mesa Terrace Association  
3523 Mesa Ct, Carmel

See all properties

Share

Save



Overview Amenities Location Policies

Bring home

## Santa Lucia Range Views from the Patio, Putting Green, Near Downtown!

9.8 Exceptional

See all 21 reviews

4 bedrooms

3+ bathrooms

Sleeps 8

### Highlights

- Loved by group travelers**  
This property received multiple 10/10 ratings from group travelers.
- Games**  
A rare find - enjoy a variety of games available on-site.
- Great location**  
Guests value the location for making travel plans effortless.

Add dates for total pricing

Start date

End date

Travelers  
5 travelers

\$3,137

All fees included  
May 20 - May 21

Check availability

Contact host

**From:** [Edward Drapkin](#)  
**To:** [293-zahearingcomments](#); [Evans-Polockow, Jordan](#)  
**Subject:** Opposition letter PLN260005 See 2 attachments  
**Date:** Tuesday, May 19, 2026 11:09:25 PM  
**Attachments:** [Opposition letter re PLN260005\\_ED.pdf](#)  
[Picture.pdf](#)

---

**This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender**

You have not previously corresponded with this sender.

May 19, 2026

Dear Zoning Administrator and Project Planner Jordan Evans-Polockow:

As a resident of Mesa Court, I am respectfully submitting this letter in strong opposition to Project File No. PLN260005, the application by the Leavy-Hoglund Penelope Christine Trust for a Commercial Vacation Rental permit at 25735 Mesa Drive, Carmel.

This is not an abstract concern about short-term rentals generally. It is a specific objection to placing a commercial transient lodging use into this particular residential setting, where the subject property directly adjoins and faces a small cluster of homes. Nine homes are immediately adjacent to or directly affected by the property, and additional nearby neighbors share the same quiet residential environment, emergency-access concerns, and safety concerns.

The proposed use would convert a single-family residence into a commercial visitor accommodation with repeated turnover of unrelated guests staying for periods of 30 calendar days or fewer. That use is incompatible with the location, layout, parking patterns, emergency-access needs, and neighborhood character of this part of Carmel. I respectfully request that the County deny the permit.

**1. The prior County history and residents' experience show that the impacts are not theoretical.**

The County should consider this application in light of the prior land-use history at this same address. County Legistar records show that file PLN171029, involving 25735 Mesa Drive and related APNs at this location, was heard by the Monterey County Planning Commission on August 29, 2018, to consider a Conditional Certificate of Compliance. A subsequent County report for the September 26, 2018 continued hearing states that, after considering evidence and public testimony, the Planning Commission found that the subject parcel did not qualify for a conditional certificate of compliance and directed staff to return with a resolution denying the Coastal Development Permit for issuance of the certificate. That prior history is important because County decisions at this property have long-term consequences for the immediately adjoining residents.

For several years, residents have experienced the following impacts associated with short-term use of the property: noise, outdoor gatherings, guest turnover, parking and circulation issues, trash concerns, loss of privacy, and disruption of quiet enjoyment.

This is not a theoretical prediction about what might happen someday. Based on residents' experience, the house has been used or rented on a

short-term basis for several years. For the homes closest to the property, these impacts have already been part of daily life. Granting the permit would formalize and perpetuate those harms instead of resolving them.

## **2. The property layout creates direct and unreasonable noise impacts on nearby homes.**

The physical layout of 25735 Mesa Drive makes it especially unsuitable for transient lodging. The house has an open living/kitchen area and outdoor deck/patio areas oriented toward neighboring homes on Mesa Court and Mesa Drive. In addition, the outdoor areas appear to be set up for recreational activities, including a putting green, cornhole, and other outdoor games. Sound from outdoor dining, socializing, music, guests arriving and leaving, and late-evening conversations travels directly toward adjacent residences.

Permanent residents are invested in long-term relationships with their neighbors. Short-term vacation guests are different: they arrive for recreation, often in groups, and have no continuing relationship with the neighborhood. Even well-written house rules are difficult to enforce in real time, especially at night or on weekends, after the noise has already affected nearby families.

For the homes closest to the subject property, the impacts are not occasional or speculative. They recur with each new rental group, creating a repeated loss of privacy, quiet enjoyment, and sleep in a neighborhood that has historically functioned as a residential area.

## **3. Parking, traffic, and emergency-access impacts are serious.**

The concern is that a commercial vacation rental adds extra vehicles, unfamiliar drivers, cleaning crews, deliveries, ride-share drop-offs, and guests searching for the property in a residential setting that was not designed for commercial guest turnover. Vacation rental groups commonly arrive in more than one vehicle. Overflow parking, vehicles stopping temporarily, or guests maneuvering in unfamiliar locations can create blind spots, interfere with pedestrians, and make it harder for residents to enter and leave safely.

Emergency access is a critical issue. Fire trucks, ambulances, and evacuation traffic must be able to move quickly through the neighborhood. Even where the roadway is not unusually narrow, this residential segment is unlaned and must remain unobstructed. Additional parked or stopped vehicles, guest loading and unloading, or unfamiliar drivers can delay access during an emergency. In a coastal California community with wildfire and evacuation concerns, this should not be treated as a minor operational issue or left to after-the-fact complaint enforcement.

## **4. The proposed commercial use is inconsistent with the established residential character of the neighborhood.**

The surrounding area is composed of homes, not hotels. The proposed permit would introduce a rotating commercial lodging use into a stable residential setting. Frequent guest turnover changes the character of the block: unfamiliar vehicles, late arrivals, trash set out by visitors who do not know local practices, outdoor gatherings, and loss of neighbor-to-neighbor accountability.

The County should give substantial weight to the lived experience of the residents who will bear the impacts. This neighborhood is not a commercial corridor. It is a quiet residential community, and the proposed use would shift the burden of a private commercial enterprise onto surrounding households.

## **5. Approval would harm community well-being and threaten**

### **neighboring property values.**

The impacts described above affect more than convenience. They directly affect the well-being of residents who live next to and around the property: their sleep, privacy, ability to use their homes peacefully, and confidence that emergency access will remain unobstructed.

The permit would also threaten the value and market desirability of neighboring homes. Buyers reasonably consider peace, privacy, safety, and the residential character of the surrounding area when evaluating a property. A permitted commercial vacation rental next to a small cluster of homes, with repeated guest turnover and recurring noise and parking impacts, can make nearby homes less desirable and may reduce property values. The County should not require surrounding homeowners to absorb that potential loss for the benefit of one commercial operation.

### **6. CEQA should not be used to avoid site-specific review of these unusual circumstances.**

The public notice states that the County proposes to find the project categorically exempt under CEQA Guidelines section 15301. We object to that conclusion for this site. The unusual circumstances here include the property's close physical relationship to a cluster of immediately affected homes, the orientation of outdoor living areas toward those homes, the project's parking and emergency-access impacts, the long prior history of land-use issues at this property, and the neighbors' actual lived experience with recurring disturbances.

The impacts most concerning to residents - noise, parking, traffic circulation, emergency access, evacuation safety, trash, property values, and neighborhood disruption - are exactly the types of localized impacts that require careful review rather than a blanket finding.

### **7. House rules and remote management are not adequate mitigation.**

The applicant may propose occupancy limits, quiet hours, guest instructions, or a property manager contact number. Those measures do not solve the basic problem. Neighbors should not be required to police a commercial lodging operation or repeatedly call a manager after disturbances occur. Enforcement after the fact does not restore lost sleep, privacy, safety, or diminished enjoyment of one's home.

Because the property is physically oriented toward neighboring homes and because the impacts have already been experienced by residents for years, the most effective mitigation is denial of the commercial vacation rental permit.

### **Requested Action**

For the reasons above, I respectfully request that the Monterey County Zoning Administrator deny Project File No. PLN260005 for a Commercial Vacation Rental at 25735 Mesa Drive.

If the County is not prepared to deny the application at this time, I request that the hearing be continued and that staff be directed to conduct further site-specific review of noise, parking capacity, emergency access, evacuation safety, road conditions, guest occupancy, outdoor-use areas, property-value impacts, and cumulative impacts on the immediate neighborhood. I also request that this letter and all similar letters be included in the administrative record for the project.

Thank you for your consideration and for protecting the safety, quiet enjoyment, property values, and residential character of my neighborhood.

See attachments:

1. Opposition letter
2. View of the house

Respectfully,

*Edward Drapkin*

*Homeowner*

*Mesa Terrace Association*

*3523 Mesa Ct, Carmel*

May 19,2026

Dear Zoning Administrator and Project Planner Jordan Evans-Polockow:

As a resident of Mesa Court, I am respectfully submitting this letter in strong opposition to Project File No. PLN260005, the application by the Leavy-Hoglund Penelope Christine Trust for a Commercial Vacation Rental permit at 25735 Mesa Drive, Carmel.

This is not an abstract concern about short-term rentals generally. It is a specific objection to placing a commercial transient lodging use into this particular residential setting, where the subject property directly adjoins and faces a small cluster of homes. Nine homes are immediately adjacent to or directly affected by the property, and additional nearby neighbors share the same quiet residential environment, emergency-access concerns, and safety concerns.

The proposed use would convert a single-family residence into a commercial visitor accommodation with repeated turnover of unrelated guests staying for periods of 30 calendar days or fewer. That use is incompatible with the location, layout, parking patterns, emergency-access needs, and neighborhood character of this part of Carmel. I respectfully request that the County deny the permit.

**1. The prior County history and residents' experience show that the impacts are not theoretical.**

The County should consider this application in light of the prior land-use history at this same address. County Register records show that file PLN171029, involving 25735 Mesa Drive and related APNs at this location, was heard by the Monterey County Planning Commission on August 29, 2018, to consider a Conditional Certificate of Compliance. A subsequent County report for the September 26, 2018 continued hearing states that, after considering evidence and public testimony, the Planning Commission found that the subject parcel did not qualify for a conditional certificate of compliance and directed staff to return with a resolution denying the Coastal Development Permit for issuance of the certificate. That prior history is important because County decisions at

this property have long-term consequences for the immediately adjoining residents.

For several years, residents have experienced the following impacts associated with short-term use of the property: noise, outdoor gatherings, guest turnover, parking and circulation issues, trash concerns, loss of privacy, and disruption of quiet enjoyment.

This is not a theoretical prediction about what might happen someday. Based on residents' experience, the house has been used or rented on a short-term basis for several years. For the homes closest to the property, these impacts have already been part of daily life. Granting the permit would formalize and perpetuate those harms instead of resolving them.

## **2. The property layout creates direct and unreasonable noise impacts on nearby homes.**

The physical layout of 25735 Mesa Drive makes it especially unsuitable for transient lodging. The house has an open living/kitchen area and outdoor deck/patio areas oriented toward neighboring homes on Mesa Court and Mesa Drive. In addition, the outdoor areas appear to be set up for recreational activities, including a putting green, cornhole, and other outdoor games. Sound from outdoor dining, socializing, music, guests arriving and leaving, and late-evening conversations travels directly toward adjacent residences.

Permanent residents are invested in long-term relationships with their neighbors. Short-term vacation guests are different: they arrive for recreation, often in groups, and have no continuing relationship with the neighborhood. Even well-written house rules are difficult to enforce in real time, especially at night or on weekends, after the noise has already affected nearby families.

For the homes closest to the subject property, the impacts are not occasional or speculative. They recur with each new rental group, creating a repeated loss of privacy, quiet enjoyment, and sleep in a neighborhood that has historically functioned as a residential area.

## **3. Parking, traffic, and emergency-access impacts are serious.**

The concern is that a commercial vacation rental adds extra vehicles, unfamiliar drivers, cleaning crews, deliveries, ride-share drop-offs, and guests searching for the property in a residential setting that was not designed for commercial guest turnover. Vacation rental groups commonly arrive in more than one vehicle. Overflow parking, vehicles stopping temporarily, or guests maneuvering in unfamiliar locations can create blind spots, interfere with pedestrians, and make it harder for residents to enter and leave safely.

Emergency access is a critical issue. Fire trucks, ambulances, and evacuation traffic must be able to move quickly through the neighborhood. Even where the roadway is not unusually narrow, this residential segment is “unlaned” and must remain unobstructed. Additional parked or stopped vehicles, guest loading and unloading, or unfamiliar drivers can delay access during an emergency. In a coastal California community with wildfire and evacuation concerns, this should not be treated as a minor operational issue or left to after-the-fact complaint enforcement.

#### **4. The proposed commercial use is inconsistent with the established residential character of the neighborhood.**

The surrounding area is composed of homes, not hotels. The proposed permit would introduce a rotating commercial lodging use into a stable residential setting. Frequent guest turnover changes the character of the block: unfamiliar vehicles, late arrivals, trash set out by visitors who do not know local practices, outdoor gatherings, and loss of neighbor-to-neighbor accountability.

The County should give substantial weight to the lived experience of the residents who will bear the impacts. This neighborhood is not a commercial corridor. It is a quiet residential community, and the proposed use would shift the burden of a private commercial enterprise onto surrounding households.

#### **5. Approval would harm community well-being and threaten neighboring property values.**

The impacts described above affect more than convenience. They directly affect the well-being of residents who live next to and around the property: their sleep, privacy, ability to use their homes peacefully, and confidence that emergency access will remain unobstructed.

The permit would also threaten the value and market desirability of neighboring homes. Buyers reasonably consider peace, privacy, safety, and the residential character of the surrounding area when evaluating a property. A permitted commercial vacation rental next to a small cluster of homes, with repeated guest turnover and recurring noise and parking impacts, can make nearby homes less desirable and may reduce property values. The County should not require surrounding homeowners to absorb that potential loss for the benefit of one commercial operation.

#### **6. CEQA should not be used to avoid site-specific review of these unusual circumstances.**

The public notice states that the County proposes to find the project categorically exempt under CEQA Guidelines section 15301. We object to that conclusion for this site. The unusual circumstances here include the property's close physical relationship to a cluster of immediately affected homes, the orientation of outdoor living areas toward those homes, the project's parking and emergency-access impacts, the long prior history of land-use issues at this property, and the neighbors' actual lived experience with recurring disturbances.

The impacts most concerning to residents - noise, parking, traffic circulation, emergency access, evacuation safety, trash, property values, and neighborhood disruption - are exactly the types of localized impacts that require careful review rather than a blanket finding.

#### **7. House rules and remote management are not adequate mitigation.**

The applicant may propose occupancy limits, quiet hours, guest instructions, or a property manager contact number. Those measures do not solve the basic problem. Neighbors should not be required to police a commercial lodging operation or repeatedly call a manager after disturbances occur. Enforcement after the fact does not restore lost sleep, privacy, safety, or diminished enjoyment of one's home.

Because the property is physically oriented toward neighboring homes and because the impacts have already been experienced by residents for years, the most effective mitigation is denial of the commercial vacation rental permit.

### **Requested Action**

For the reasons above, I respectfully request that the Monterey County Zoning Administrator deny Project File No. PLN260005 for a Commercial Vacation Rental at 25735 Mesa Drive.

If the County is not prepared to deny the application at this time, I request that the hearing be continued and that staff be directed to conduct further site-specific review of noise, parking capacity, emergency access, evacuation safety, road conditions, guest occupancy, outdoor-use areas, property-value impacts, and cumulative impacts on the immediate neighborhood. I also request that this letter and all similar letters be included in the administrative record for the project.

Thank you for your consideration and for protecting the safety, quiet enjoyment, property values, and residential character of my neighborhood.

Respectfully,

Edward Drapkin  
Homeowner  
Mesa Terrace Association  
3523 Mesa Ct, Carmel

See all properties

Share

Save



Overview Amenities Location Policies

Bring home

## Santa Lucia Range Views from the Patio, Putting Green, Near Downtown!

9.8 Exceptional

See all 21 reviews

4 bedrooms

3+ bathrooms

Sleeps 8

### Highlights

- Loved by group travelers**  
This property received multiple 10/10 ratings from group travelers.
- Games**  
A rare find - enjoy a variety of games available on-site.
- Great location**  
Guests value the location for making travel plans effortless.

Add dates for total pricing

Start date

End date

Travelers  
5 travelers

\$3,137

All fees included  
May 20 - May 21

Check availability

Contact host

## Estrada, Armida

---

**From:** Evans-Polockow, Jordan  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 19, 2026 4:17 PM  
**To:** 194-HCD-Secretary; Estrada, Armida  
**Cc:** Nickerson, Jacquelyn  
**Subject:** Fw: Project File no. PLN26005- Commercial Vacation rental

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

---

**From:** Sandra H <sandyhamlen@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 19, 2026 4:10 PM  
**To:** Evans-Polockow, Jordan <Evans-PolockowJ@countyofmonterey.gov>  
**Subject:** Project File no. PLN26005- Commercial Vacation rental

**This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender**  
You have not previously corresponded with this sender.

Dear Zoning Administrator and Project Planner Jordan Evans-Polockow:  
We, the undersigned residents of Mesa Court, Mesa Drive, and neighboring homes in the immediate area, respectfully submit this letter in strong opposition to Project File No. PLN260005, the application by the Leavy-Hoglund Penelope Christine Trust for a Commercial Vacation Rental permit at 25735 Mesa Drive, Carmel.

This is not an abstract concern about short-term rentals generally. It is a specific objection to placing a commercial transient lodging use into this particular residential setting, where the subject property directly adjoins and faces a small cluster of homes. Nine homes are immediately adjacent to or directly affected by the property, and additional nearby neighbors share the same quiet residential environment, emergency-access concerns, and safety concerns.

The proposed use would convert a single-family residence into a commercial visitor accommodation with repeated turnover of unrelated guests staying for periods of 30 calendar days or fewer. That use is incompatible with the location, layout, parking patterns, emergency-access

needs, and neighborhood character of this part of Carmel. We respectfully request that the County deny the permit.

**1. The prior County history and residents' experience show that the impacts are not theoretical.**

The County should consider this application in light of the prior land-use history at this same address. County Legistar records show that file PLN171029, involving 25735 Mesa Drive and related APNs at this location, was heard by the Monterey County Planning Commission on August 29, 2018, to consider a Conditional Certificate of Compliance. A subsequent County report for the September 26, 2018 continued hearing states that, after considering evidence and public testimony, the Planning Commission found that the subject parcel did not qualify for a conditional certificate of compliance and directed staff to return with a resolution denying the Coastal Development Permit for issuance of the certificate.

That prior history is important because County decisions at this property have long-term consequences for the immediately adjoining residents.

For several years, residents have experienced the following impacts associated with short-term use of the property: noise, outdoor gatherings, guest turnover, parking and circulation issues, trash concerns, loss of privacy, and disruption of quiet enjoyment.

This is not a theoretical prediction about what might happen someday. Based on residents' experience, the house has been used or rented on a short-term basis for several years. For the homes closest to the property, these impacts have already been part of daily life. Granting the permit would formalize and perpetuate those harms instead of resolving them.

**2. The property layout creates direct and unreasonable noise impacts on nearby homes.**

The physical layout of 25735 Mesa Drive makes it especially unsuitable for transient lodging. The house has an open living/kitchen area and outdoor deck/patio areas oriented toward neighboring homes on Mesa Court and Mesa Drive. In addition, the outdoor areas appear to be set up for recreational activities, including a putting green, cornhole, and other

outdoor games. Sound from outdoor dining, socializing, music, guests arriving and leaving, and late-evening conversations travels directly toward adjacent residences.

Permanent residents are invested in long-term relationships with their neighbors. Short-term vacation guests are different: they arrive for recreation, often in groups, and have no continuing relationship with the neighborhood. Even well-written house rules are difficult to enforce in real time, especially at night or on weekends, after the noise has already affected nearby families.

For the homes closest to the subject property, the impacts are not occasional or speculative. They recur with each new rental group, creating a repeated loss of privacy, quiet enjoyment, and sleep in a neighborhood that has historically functioned as a residential area.

### **3. Parking, traffic, and emergency-access impacts are serious.**

The concern is that a commercial vacation rental adds extra vehicles, unfamiliar drivers, cleaning crews, deliveries, ride-share drop-offs, and guests searching for the property in a residential setting that was not designed for commercial guest turnover. Vacation rental groups commonly arrive in more than one vehicle. Overflow parking, vehicles stopping temporarily, or guests maneuvering in unfamiliar locations can create blind spots, interfere with pedestrians, and make it harder for residents to enter and leave safely.

Emergency access is a critical issue. Fire trucks, ambulances, and evacuation traffic must be able to move quickly through the neighborhood. Even where the roadway is not unusually narrow, this residential segment is unlaned and must remain unobstructed. Additional parked or stopped vehicles, guest loading and unloading, or unfamiliar drivers can delay access during an emergency. In a coastal California community with wildfire and evacuation concerns, this should not be treated as a minor operational issue or left to after-the-fact complaint enforcement.

### **4. The proposed commercial use is inconsistent with the established residential character of the neighborhood.**

The surrounding area is composed of homes, not hotels. The proposed permit would introduce a rotating commercial lodging use into a stable residential setting. Frequent guest turnover changes the character of the block: unfamiliar vehicles, late arrivals, trash set out by visitors who do not know local practices, outdoor gatherings, and loss of neighbor-to-neighbor accountability.

The County should give substantial weight to the lived experience of the residents who will bear the impacts. This neighborhood is not a commercial corridor. It is a quiet residential community, and the proposed use would shift the burden of a private commercial enterprise onto surrounding households.

#### **5. Approval would harm community well-being and threaten neighboring property values.**

The impacts described above affect more than convenience. They directly affect the well-being of residents who live next to and around the property: their sleep, privacy, ability to use their homes peacefully, and confidence that emergency access will remain unobstructed.

The permit would also threaten the value and market desirability of neighboring homes. Buyers reasonably consider peace, privacy, safety, and the residential character of the surrounding area when evaluating a property. A permitted commercial vacation rental next to a small cluster of homes, with repeated guest turnover and recurring noise and parking impacts, can make nearby homes less desirable and may reduce property values. The County should not require surrounding homeowners to absorb that potential loss for the benefit of one commercial operation.

#### **6. CEQA should not be used to avoid site-specific review of these unusual circumstances.**

The public notice states that the County proposes to find the project categorically exempt under CEQA Guidelines section 15301. We object to that conclusion for this site. The unusual circumstances here include the property's close physical relationship to a cluster of immediately affected homes, the orientation of outdoor living areas toward those homes, the

project's parking and emergency-access impacts, the long prior history of land-use issues at this property, and the neighbors' actual lived experience with recurring disturbances.

The impacts most concerning to residents - noise, parking, traffic circulation, emergency access, evacuation safety, trash, property values, and neighborhood disruption - are exactly the types of localized impacts that require careful review rather than a blanket finding.

### **7. House rules and remote management are not adequate mitigation.**

The applicant may propose occupancy limits, quiet hours, guest instructions, or a property manager contact number. Those measures do not solve the basic problem. Neighbors should not be required to police a commercial lodging operation or repeatedly call a manager after disturbances occur. Enforcement after the fact does not restore lost sleep, privacy, safety, or diminished enjoyment of one's home.

Because the property is physically oriented toward neighboring homes and because the impacts have already been experienced by residents for years, the most effective mitigation is denial of the commercial vacation rental permit.

### **Requested Action**

For the reasons above, we respectfully request that the Monterey County Zoning Administrator deny Project File No. PLN260005 for a Commercial Vacation Rental at 25735 Mesa Drive.

If the County is not prepared to deny the application at this time, we request that the hearing be continued and that staff be directed to conduct further site-specific review of noise, parking capacity, emergency access, evacuation safety, road conditions, guest occupancy, outdoor-use areas, property-value impacts, and cumulative impacts on the immediate neighborhood. We also request that this letter and all signatures be included in the administrative record for the project.

Thank you for your consideration and for protecting the safety, quiet enjoyment, property values, and residential character of our neighborhood.

Respectfully,

*Sandra Hamlen*

---

---