

Melanie Beretti: Special Programs Manager
Monterey County Resource Management Agency-Planning
168 West Alisal Street 2nd Floor
Salinas, Ca 93901-2438

Project File Number REF 130043
Project File Number REF 100042

Dear Manager Beretti:

First allow me to state this letter is written in support of continuing the current Law: namely that STR activity is illegal and should remain so, on the Big Sur Coast.

I raise the legal point of the "clean hands doctrine" which excludes those individuals from being heard, if they are currently breaking the law. The STR representatives before you request that you now legalize their continuing criminal activity. To say they have no respect for the Rule of Law, is an understatement.

One can predict there will be many STR folks at the meeting on 7/13. To get a true read on the gathering, we ask for a head count/vote, of those people who live/own on Coastal Big Sur. I believe you will find most of the STR people volume will be from other places and that should demonstrate the unique nature of our problem in sparsely populated private gated communities; underrepresented by number but most in need of continuing the illegality of STR activity. This is reflected, not in the noise and by the STR activists present on the 13th, but by the Clear Ridge vote recently conducted. Please note greater than 70% of the vote total was against STR activity in our neighborhood.

i view this STR question in simple terms: greed and monetization of a residential property turned into a commercial enterprise, in some cases with multiple units for rent on a single residential property, by many owners who no longer, if at any time, live here in Big Sur, opposed by property owners who purchased a private residence in Big Sur for its quiet, unique, less crowded environment at the single residential level wishing to enjoy nature and the magnificent unspoiled, at least to this point, rugged coast. My position does not exclude or prevent visitors and tourists from local experience and complies with the California Coastal Act of 1976: section 30001 (c) protect private property, (d) promote the wellbeing of people of this State especially to working persons employed within the coastal zone. Allowing STR activity removes from the market considerable longterm low/moderate income housing for local workers. Furthermore it leaves intact Section 30530 which directs us to maximize public access to and along the coastline. Recall expanding and preserving viewsheds is considered public access. Changing the Law and allowing STR in Big Sur will produce the opposite result in each case of section 30001. As to section 30213, the realistic way to expand the overnight accommodation resource and lower charges," where feasible", is to enlarge current permitted campgrounds which are considerably less expensive than other cabin/room rentals, have less of an environmental impact and by continuing the Law stating STR is illegal, serves to preserve our local gated communities. That approach is fair, equitable and moral.

How do we protect our low and moderate income local workers who are being shut out of long term rentals so that STR activity may increase? Is that not directly against the Coastal Commission's mandate? We, the owners and the local workers, are the victims of these law breaking STR owners. The pro-STR group, by using 1960 buzzwords such as discrimination, unfair treatment, are merely employing a ruse to get the attention of Board members. If anything, those words apply to us, the non-STR owners and their longterm local working tenants! The Coastal rules really favor access, not overnight accommodations.

Access consists of view sheds and corridors to get to the beaches and coastline. In Clear Ridge, for example, we are surrounded by 2 large public parks with outstanding view and beach access. We presently have more than enough access limited by the traffic volume which a one lane highway in each direction, can properly, safely handle. The absolutely false claim that lower house STR rental prices will allow low/moderate income visitors to stay in Big Sur is absurd. All of these current STR people (not

owners) are quite well to do, can afford to choose from multiple legal offerings with many young folks preferring the the camping grounds anyway. Our local coastal plan specifies the number of overnight rooms available and that should remain the standard. Many of those motel/hotel rooms are far less expensive than the average price for an STR stay. Practically speaking any person or family on a budget would find an overnight stay in Carmel/ Monterey and a 35 minute trip south on route 1 far more practical and enjoyable than paying twice to 6 times the price in Big Sur, whether thru an illegal STR rental or hotel/motel. It is a disingenuous argument to state that STR locations are dedicated to lowering the costs of Big Sur accommodations. This meeting would not be taking place if an average daily STR rental was 100 dollars. We are speaking of 50k to 150k per year of STR income per owner...does that sound like low/moderate cost overnight charges? From my personal observations, the house STR renters are usually 1 to 2 adults sometimes with, at most, 1 to 2 children. Section 30213 of the CCA discusses overnight ROOM rentals but emphasizes solutions and expansion of public recreational opportunities are preferred over low cost accommodations. Let us turn our energy and attention to making a day visit to Big Sur the best of experiences.

The CCA of 1976 is quite clear in its stated priorities. The first two major concerns are public access and protecting private property rights. The third priority is low/moderate income HOUSING FOR LOCAL WORKERS (emphasis added). Your continued restriction of STR activity along the coast in Big Sur satisfies the 3 major priorities of the CCA of 1976. The CCA addresses lower cost overnight ROOM rentals much later in the Act in section 30213, "lower cost visitor and recreational facilities shall be protected, encouraged and WHERE FEASIBLE, provided" (emphasis added). The use of the word ROOM instead of the word HOUSE or HOME clearly states the intent of those who wrote the CCA . Approving HOUSE/HOME rentals under the STR banner is not a feasible solution and runs against the spirit of the Act.

i see the properties which are part of a private gated road system, such as Clear Ridge, as needing the Board's absolute support to continue to make STRs illegal. Unlike a residence with a driveway directly on route 1, we, here in Clear Ridge, have real existential issues. For example, safety on miles of private roads, personal safety and quiet enjoyment of owning here, (that is protecting private property rights). Living here involves knowing everyone in the community. It involves a sense of community caring and helping each other (the true Big Sur , Rural Western experience) as seen with the Big Sur fire of 2 years ago.. STR produces a greater fire threat.(we had STR folks dig a fire pit and start a blaze...they were also drunk) There is a higher accident threat since STR folks have no idea how to navigate the multiple switchbacks and narrow private road areas. The noise level has increased, especially true in the evenings where before we had stark silence, apart from the ocean breaking upon the shore, heard in the distance. Chattering people on holiday appears to be the standard (they are not to blame for paying large dollars for a place to party not knowing the rental is illegal) and can be seen walking up and down our private road system (not a locals habit) accompanied by dogs not on leashes. Music playing late into the night, lights on till all hours now frequently occurs, none of which ever happened but for maybe once per year, on a birthday, by the locals who first asked their neighbors for permission to do so.. Those STR uses for the roads were never envisioned when mutual easements for ingress and egress were exchanged among the property owners decades ago. We have found former STR occupants, who then know the road system and sometime the gate code, returning to the ridge months after they rented a private single family residence for 2 nights, to wander over our properties, stating to me upon questioning why they were here?, "we are just enjoying ourselves, whats the problem?". In truth, they were trespassers, creating more lawlessness, a consequence of an earlier illegal STR experience. STR two day stay folks don't realize many of us are off the grid, have limited water and septic resources. They believe this is party time LA with more trees! They leave and we sustain and deal with the environmental damage.

We ask the Board to affirm and enforce the Law as it presently stands: STR activity is illegal in Big Sur. Please do not undo, by approving STR in Big Sur, the atmosphere and Nature which local residents have nurtured and preserved over the past 40 years.

Respectfully submitted,

george braff 47826 middle road big sur ca 93920