

January 8, 2018

TO: Mary Wright

FROM: Dr. Charles Lester *C.L.L.*

RE: **Short-term Rentals and the Big Sur Coast LCP**

This memo considers the question of short-term rentals (STRs) and the local coastal program (LCP) for the Big Sur segment. It focuses on interpretation of the certified LCP (Land Use Plan (LUP) and Implementation Plan (IP)). The memo concludes that the LCP for Big Sur does not specifically address STRs, but that it does have strong land use policies and zoning regulations concerning overnight visitor-serving units. In particular, the LCP establishes a cap on the number of new visitor-serving overnight units other than low-intensity camping, for the purposes of protecting coastal resources and the capacity of Highway 1, especially for recreational purposes. It also does not contemplate certain visitor-serving overnight uses in areas zoned specifically for residential use; and seeks to protect existing affordable housing in Big Sur, particularly for workers in the visitor economy.

The memo does not express a specific opinion on whether STRs should be allowed in Big Sur. However, given the increase in STR activity, the sensitivity of Big Sur's coastal resources, and the significant and historic concern for the limited capacity of Highway 1 in Big Sur, the consideration of an STR ordinance for Big Sur should include an updated evaluation the supply and demand for overnight visitor-serving use in Big Sur; the impacts of such use on coastal resources; and the capacity of Highway 1 to continue providing adequate public access to and along Big Sur, especially as it relates to the highway's importance as a recreational resource of national significance.

Discussion

Monterey County is considering whether to proceed with the development of an ordinance regulating STRs in Big Sur. County staff have properly noted that any such regulation "must be found consistent with adopted policy" and in particular the Big Sur Land Use Plan (BSLUP).¹ The County is considering various options, including postponing indefinitely any discussion of STRs in Big Sur; establishing a moratorium on STRs until regulations are adopted; and developing STR regulations subject to review for consistency with the BSLUP, either as it is currently certified, or as it may be amended through a future update.²

An LCP consists of a Land Use Plan (LUP) and an Implementation Plan (IP). The LUP establishes the kinds, locations and intensities of allowable land uses, and applicable resource protection and

¹ The County states:

As part of the ordinance development process, the regulations must be found consistent with adopted policy. Developing regulations can either begin at the policy level (Land Use Plan) with the regulatory details (ordinance) to follow, or can begin with an ordinance subject to review for consistency with the LUP. In the case of Big Sur, consistency could be achieved by either: 1) Developing regulations consistent with the BSLUP; or 2) Developing regulations that require amending the BSLUP for consistency. However, an option requiring amendment of an Area Plan - especially a coastal one (Land Use Plan) -- will take a long time, so the consistency determination is key in all cases.

Monterey County Planning Commission Staff Report, Agenda Item No. 6, Legistar File Number: PC 18-005, January 10, 2018, p. 6.

² *Id.* pp. 6-7.

development policies, for development in the coastal zone of a specific jurisdiction. The IP includes ordinances, maps and other programs or actions to implement the LUP. This analysis generally assumes that the short-term rental for overnight use of part or all of a residential structure is a land use subject to the requirements of the Coastal Act, and that proposals to regulate such use represent a potential change in the intensity or density of land use qualifying as development, and thus are subject to the review of the Coastal Commission.³ To be legally effective in the coastal zone, any updates to the BSLUP adopted by the County must conform with applicable policies of the California Coastal Act, as determined by the Coastal Commission. The Coastal Commission must also find that any proposed ordinances approved by the County for the coastal zone conform with, and are adequate to carry out, the BSLUP.⁴

The Big Sur LCP

The Monterey County LCP has four geographic segments: North Monterey County, the Del Monte Forest, the Carmel Area and Big Sur. Each LCP segment is governed by a specific LUP (in this case, the Big Sur LUP) and the Coastal Implementation Plan (IP). The IP includes general ordinances for the coastal zone (Title 20) and specific regulations for each area (for example, PART 3: *Regulations for Development in the Big Sur Coast Land Use Plan Area* (Chapter 20.145)).⁵ This memo focuses on the Big Sur LUP, Part 3 of the IP, and Title 20. It is important to note that the BSLUP and Part 3 of the IP are controlling over Title 20 in the event of a conflict.⁶

Key Policies and Ordinances

The consideration of STRs in Big Sur must be understood in the context of the fundamental intent and policies of the Big Sur LUP (BSLUP). The BSLUP recognizes that new development, *of any sort*, in Big Sur should be extremely limited, due to both the sensitivity of Big Sur's scenic and natural resources, and limited capacities to support new development. Key Policy 5.4.1 states:

Future land use development on the Big Sur coast should be extremely limited, in keeping with the larger goal of preserving the coast as a scenic natural area. In all cases, new land uses must

³ Guidance from the Coastal Commission summarizes:

The regulation of short-term/vacation rentals represents a change in the intensity of use and of access to the shoreline, and thus constitutes development to which the Coastal Act and LCPs must apply. We do not believe that regulation outside of that LCP/CDP context (e.g., outright vacation rental bans through other local processes) is legally enforceable in the coastal zone, and we strongly encourage your community to pursue vacation rental regulation through your LCP.

California Coastal Commission, *Memo to Coastal Planning/Community Development Directors regarding Short-Term/Vacation Rentals in the California Coastal Zone Guidance*, December 6, 2016, https://documents.coastal.ca.gov/assets/la/Short_Term_Vacation_Rental_to_Coastal_Planning_&_Devt_Directors_120616.pdf.

⁴ CA PRC sections 30512-14.

⁵ In addition to the four segment-specific IP sections and general Title 20 coastal zone ordinances, the IP has a sixth part that includes other applicable County ordinances, the zoning district maps, and a series of appendices. The Coastal Commission certified the individual LCP LUP segments between 1982 and 1986; the Big Sur LUP segment was certified in 1986. Monterey's complete LCP IP was effectively certified on January 12, 1988, and on February 4, 1988, Monterey County assumed authority for issuing most CDPs in the County.

⁶ Monterey County Zoning Code, 20.02.060 (D), specifies the following hierarchy of controlling regulations in the event of any conflict between the general coastal zone ordinances in Title 20 and other relevant regulations: (1) the Coastal Act; (2) applicable Area LUP; (3) Regulations For Development for the Area (Parts 2 through 6 of the Coastal Implementation Plan); (4) Title 20 (Part 1 of the Coastal Implementation Plan); and (5) any other regulation in the County.

remain subordinate to the character and grandeur of the Big Sur country. All proposed uses, whether public or private, must meet the same exacting environmental standards and must contribute to the preservation of Big Sur's scenery.

The intent of this key policy is also restated in section 20.145.140 of the IP Land Use regulations for Big Sur:

The intent of this Section is to provide standards for land use and development which will allow for the maintenance of the Big Sur Coast as a scenic natural area. As such, future land use development on the Big Sur Coast should be extremely limited. In all cases, new land uses must remain subordinate to the character and grandeur of the Big Sur country. All proposed uses, whether public or private, must meet the 'same exacting environmental standards and must contribute to the preservation of Big Sur's scenery. (Ref. Policy 5.4.1)

In addition to the fundamental goal of preserving the scenic beauty of Big Sur, the limited capacity of Highway 1 to absorb additional traffic was a primary factor driving the conclusion that new development potential in Big Sur was limited. As discussed in the BSLUP:

The limited capacity of Highway 1 to accommodate local and recreation traffic at a level that reserves reasonable service and emergency use and also allows motorists to enjoy the beauty of Big Sur's scenic coast is a major concern. Because traffic volumes along sections of Highway 1 are at capacity during peak recreational use periods and because future demand for recreational access is expected to exceed the capacity of the highway, the capacity of the highway is a major constraint on the long range development of the coast. How the road capacity can be increased without damage to the intrinsic values of Big Sur and how capacity is allocated between visitor and local use is a major challenge.⁷

This concern for Highway 1 capacity dates back to the 1975 Coastal Plan, and was comprehensively studied in 1977 as a precursor to developing the LCP.⁸

Having recognized the limited highway capacity and thus limited development potential in Big Sur, the BSLUP then acknowledges that the Coastal Act requires the reservation of this limited development capacity for Coastal Act priority uses, particularly visitor-serving and recreational land uses. The key transportation policy requires the County to take an active role in maintaining the primary function of Highway One as a *recreational* resource:

4.1.1 Key Policy. *Monterey County will take a strong and active role in guiding the use and improvement of Highway One and land use development dependent on the highway. The County's objective is to maintain and enhance the highway's aesthetic beauty and to protect its primary function as a recreational route. The highway shall remain a two-lane road and shall include walking and bicycle trails wherever feasible. In order to protect and enhance public recreational enjoyment of Big Sur's unique natural and scenic resources, recreational traffic should be regulated during congested peak use periods.*

Accordingly, general BSLUP policy 4.1.2.4 requires that highway capacity be reserved for Coastal Act priority (non-residential) land uses:

⁷ BSLUP, pp. 64-5.

⁸ California Coastal Zone Conservation Commissions, *California Coastal Plan* (1975), p. 233; California Coastal Commission, *Big Sur Coast: A Subregional Analysis*, February 7, 1977.

4.1.2.4. To conform to the Coastal Act, most remaining capacity on Highway 1 shall be reserved for coastal priority uses: recreation and visitor-serving facilities, the military, agriculture and other coastal dependent uses.

The BSLUP then specifically requires the reservation of 85% of Highway 1 capacity for recreational travel, with residential development limited to 15% of the capacity, at buildout.⁹

While prioritizing the recreational function of Highway One, the BSLUP Key policy also recognizes the need to regulate recreational traffic, in part because of the impacts of visitation and recreational use on Big Sur's sensitive environment.¹⁰ Further, new visitor-serving and recreational development must specifically address impacts to Highway 1 service capacity, including potential land use conflicts.¹¹ Rather than maximizing recreational use, the BSLUP identifies the need to "optimize" such use in order to protect coastal resources:

*. . . management of Highway 1 should attempt to optimize rather than maximize visitor use levels on the highway in relation to other user needs and planning objectives for the coast. As an objective, the maintenance of an acceptable minimum level of service and corresponding maximum traffic volume standard for Highway 1 traffic must satisfy several criteria. A reasonable level of traffic volume must be accommodated that reflects current recreational and residential use patterns, future demand for access to Big Sur, property rights of landowners, and resource protection goals aimed at preserving the natural character and beauty of Big Sur.*¹²

⁹ BSLUP Policy 4.1.3C.

¹⁰ The BSLUP observes:

. . . study has shown that the aesthetic qualities of Highway 1 are eroding. This is the result of both private and public development in the scenic viewshed, and visitor overuse within the highway right-of-way itself. Gradually, many informal, unsurfaced and unsightly pullouts have developed along the highway. The level of careless public use is resulting in a serious problem. Non-native and invasive plants are spreading along the highway to the detriment of the scenic beauty.

BSLUP, p. 65.

¹¹ Policy 4.1.3 C states:

Traffic Regulation and Coastal Priority Uses 1. To comply to Coastal Act policies concerning the allocation of limited highway capacity to coastal priority uses, 85 percent of the capacity of Highway 1 under improved road conditions and managed traffic shall be reserved to serve recreational travel, service trips to public and private recreation and visitor-serving facilities, use by military vehicles, and coastal-dependent agriculture. To implement this policy, the land use regulations of this plan limit future residential development to a level that will utilize not more than 15 percent of highway capacity at buildout. 2. Proposed new or expanded public or private recreation and visitor-serving uses shall be required to submit with their application, a traffic component which evaluates the anticipated impact to Highway 1 service capacity and makes recommendations on how conflicts can be overcome or mitigated.

¹² BSLUP, p. 65.

Visitor-serving Unit Cap

The explicit focus of the BSLUP on the limited capacity Highway 1 is reflected in the LUP's specific limitations on both residential development and new visitor-serving overnight units. In particular, the BSLUP establishes a cap of 300 new visitor-serving units in Big Sur, except for low-intensity "rustic" and non-RV campground units, which are not limited.¹³

LUP 5.4.2.9. The following density standards for inn unit development are designed to allow up to 300 new visitor-serving lodge or inn units on the Big Sur Coast, based on protection of the capacity of Highway One to accommodate recreational use, the avoidance of overuse of areas of the coast, and the need for development to respect the rural character of the Big Sur Coast and its many natural resources.

The cap is recognized in Table 1 of the LUP (attached). The visitor-serving unit cap is also found in IP section 20.145.140 (B)(1)(c)(5).¹⁴ The fact that low-intensity camping was not limited perhaps reflects the BSLUP emphasis on prioritizing and providing for recreation while minimizing the potential land use impacts of new visitor-serving development.¹⁵

It appears that the visitor-serving unit cap was primarily focused on significant physical development of new visitor-serving structures or developed areas, such as a lodge, inn or RV campground, as opposed to lower-intensity "rustic" camping, and that the short-term visitor-serving rental of residential structures was not specifically contemplated as part of the visitor-serving unit mix at the time of LUP and IP certification. There was explicit concern, though, for the *combined* level of both new visitor-serving overnight units and new residential units in relation to appropriate densities for new development in Big Sur. This is well-illustrated in the discussion of how to apply the LCP's density formula for determining the allowable number of new residential or visitor-serving units on a parcel:

The policies that follow establish a slope density formula as the determinant of potential residential development. A conversion factor is available in the Watershed and Scenic Conservation land use designation that permits potential residential units to be developed as inn units at the rate of two inn units per residence (up to a maximum of 8 per parcel), thereby establishing potential buildout for this major land use category. Consequently, long range development of the coast will depend upon the choices made by landowners over time. A strong response to demand for visitor facilities will result in a reduction in residential construction potential. For example, if 100 additional residential units are ultimately approved for development in the Watershed and Scenic Conservation area, this could result in 100 residences. It could also result in 50 residences and 100 inn units, or no residences and 200 inn units, etc. While this is only illustrative, it shows the relationship of visitor-serving facilities and residential

¹³ "No limitation is established in the plan for the number of campsites that could be developed." BSLUP, 82.

¹⁴ The IP states: "A maximum total of 300 inn/r.v. campground units may be approved after certification of the Big Sur Land Use Plan." The BSLUP (Table 1) and the IP also contemplate a maximum of 50 new hostel beds.

¹⁵ BSLUP policy 5.4.3.C states: 1. Development of recreation and visitor-serving facilities at locations suitable for such use is preferred over other types of development in Big Sur because of Big Sur's national significance as a recreation area. 2. Maintenance of the rustic, outdoor recreational character of Big Sur is emphasized. The expansion and development of recreation and visitor-serving facilities in Big Sur shall be of a scale and nature that is compatible with the natural and cultural character of the area while offering opportunities for visitors to experience and enjoy the beauty and inspiration that the Big Sur environment presents. Intensive recreational uses or facilities are not appropriate and shall not be permitted. Compatible scale and character shall include limiting the number of visitor accommodation units as specified in 5.4.2.9 and shall limit such structures to two stories in height, subject to site constraints. ...

*development based on the conversion factor. An important condition of the plan is that property can be devoted to either residential or visitor-serving overnight accommodations, or a combination of both, but that density credit cannot be applied for both uses from the same acreage.*¹⁶

This policy underscores the BSLUP concern for the finite carrying capacity of both Highway 1 and the Big Sur coast broadly.

Since LCP certification, the Coastal Commission has considered the overnight visitor-serving question on at least one occasion – an appeal of the Treebones Campground in southern Big Sur.¹⁷ The Commission’s primary concern was the proper site density and related impacts for the project.¹⁸ After redesign of the project, the Commission found that the project was akin to a “rustic” campground, and could be approved consistent with the BSLUP visitor-serving unit cap and density requirements.

Locations for New Visitor-serving Development and Land Uses

The BSLUP identifies inns, lodges, hostels, RV sites, rustic campsites and walk-in/environmental camping as allowable new visitor-serving overnight units. STRs are not specifically identified in the BSLUP or IP as a visitor-serving or residential use.¹⁹ Regardless, the BSLUP contemplates potential new visitor-serving overnight uses in most land use designations, ranging from inns and lodges in the visitor-serving commercial (VSC) and watershed and scenic conservation (WSC) zones, to less intensive camping in the outdoor recreation (OR) and resource conservation (RC) zones. For example, in the WSC, 2 visitor-serving units per residential unit retired are allowed (BSLUP Table 1; IP Attachment 3 (attached)):

*The Watershed and Scenic Conservation category permits a number of land uses including ranches, rural residences, low intensity recreation, rustic visitor accommodations, and under careful controls, forestry, mining, and aquaculture [emphasis added].*²⁰

However, the LUP and IP also specifically limit visitor-serving uses in certain residential areas (RDR zoning):

General Policy 5.4.2.2

Development of any area of Big Sur will be limited to uses for that area illustrated on the plan map and to the use intensities described in the text. Uses not shown on the plan map or described in the text will not be permitted [emphasis added].

5.4.3. G. Rural Residential

2. Development in designated rural residential areas shall continue to be limited to residential uses in order to protect residents from unwanted intrusion by other incompatible activities and because neither available vacant land, water, nor roads are adequate to support more intensive uses.

¹⁶ BSLUP, p. 81.

¹⁷ California Coastal Commission, A-3-MC0-99-097 (Treebones Campground), Approved, May 11, 2000, <https://documents.coastal.ca.gov/reports/2000/5/Th10c-5-2000.pdf>.

¹⁸ The Commission was also concerned with the potential adverse precedent for the visitor-serving unit cap.

¹⁹ The fact that STRs are not enumerated is not necessarily evidence that STRs are not allowed. “Hotels” are not specifically identified, either, though clearly they fit within the Big Sur rubric of “inns” and “lodges”.

²⁰ BSLUP, p. 79.

*Otter Cove, Palo Colorado Canyon, Bixby Canyon, Sycamore Canyon, Pfeiffer Ridge, Coastlands, and Partington Ridge areas are designated principally for Rural Residential use because they contain numerous comparatively small parcels, generally unsuitable for other kinds of development.*²¹

Thus, new visitor-serving overnight units (and other non-residential uses) were not anticipated in the RDR zone but would be acceptable in the WSC zone.²²

In addition to the avoidance of conflicts between incompatible uses, the limitation of the RDR zone to residential uses derived from a desire to protect and maintain the unique community and natural character of Big Sur. As summarized in the BSLUP discussion of its underlying philosophy:

The scenic beauty of the Big Sur Coast, and the opportunity to escape urban patterns, are prime attractions for residents and visitors alike. . . .

Quality should have precedence over quantity of any permitted uses, whether residential, recreational, or commercial. Any new development should remain within the small-scale, traditional and rural values of the area, rather than to introduce new or conflicting uses.

...

*The special cultural characteristics of the Big Sur Coast should also be recognized as a primary resource. Man's presence along this coast continues to reflect a pioneering attitude of independence and resourcefulness; the environment has been a special nurturing ground for individual and creative fulfillment. The community itself and its traditional way of life are resources that can help to protect the environment and enhance the visitor experience.*²³

The question of the consistency of STRs in the coastal zone often focuses on whether STRs are a “residential” or “commercial” use, precisely because of the potential conflicts between traditional residential uses and visitor activities. But whether STRs are treated more akin to a visitor-serving use (and thus potentially not allowable in the RDR zone in Big Sur) or as residential use (and thus potentially allowable, albeit tacitly), the primary concern of the BSLUP -- to manage the impacts of visitor-serving overnight use on resources, highway capacity and other land uses -- remains.²⁴ The critical questions in considering an STR ordinance for Big Sur concern: the impacts of STRs on coastal resources; whether Highway 1 has adequate capacity to serve STRs and other allowable uses; the compatibility of STRs with existing land uses; and, given the answers to these questions, the consistency of STRs with the Coastal Act. As originally recognized in the development of the LCP for Big Sur, these questions are especially

²¹ BSLUP, p. 80.

²² Paralleling BSLUP Table 1, IP 20.145.140 A5, states: “Development of a parcel, shall be limited to density, land use, and site development standards specific to that parcel's land use designation, as shown in Attachment 3.” Attachment 3 does not identify the RDR zone as an appropriate district for “visitor accommodations”.

²³ BSLUP, p. 9.

²⁴ Title 20 does allow “bed and breakfast facilities” in any zone that allows residential use, but only if the facility is “consistent with the Monterey County Local Coastal Program.” Monterey County Zoning, 20.64.100C and D(5). This provision would thus potentially be overridden by the specific BSLUP and IP provisions governing the RDR if such provisions were interpreted to not allow visitor-serving overnight use in the RDR zone.

important for the relatively “closed” recreational system of Big Sur, and the fact that residential and visitor-serving land uses may generate very different patterns of Highway use.²⁵

Protection of Employee and other Housing

A third important concern of the BSLUP related to the STR land use is the potential impact on housing. At the time of LUP certification, there was significant concern for the lack of affordable employee housing in Big Sur:

*A serious housing shortage exists for employees in Big Sur, particularly in the visitor industry. Because there is little housing available, employees have at times been forced to camp-out, live in cars, or move in with friends. The shortage of affordable housing has also made recruitment of skilled employees difficult. Several factors affect solutions to the housing problems: the costs of land and housing precludes the use of traditional housing assistance programs; and year-round employment is not at a high enough level to support traditional single and multiple family housing projects. Employee housing provided by an employer must be a primary source of affordable housing in the area. Caretaker housing, which has traditionally provided shelter for many long-time residents and employees, will also continue to be an important element of the affordable housing supply.*²⁶

In conjunction with the overarching concern for limiting cumulative residential development, the IP specifically requires that that caretaker housing not be rented, leased, or let but rather, provide caretaker or employee housing.²⁷ The BSLUP also contains a general policy to prevent the conversion of affordable housing to other uses.²⁸ These restrictions evince an intent to protect housing opportunities that may already exist. Consideration of an STR ordinance should evaluate whether STRs are displacing affordable housing opportunities, including because such housing may be critical to supporting the visitor-serving economy of Big Sur that is prioritized by the Coastal Act. Any ordinance should also reconcile potential inconsistencies with existing provisions of the BSLUP and IP, such as the prohibition on renting guest houses.

Conclusion

The BSLUP and IP strictly limit new development, including instituting a cap of 300 new visitor-serving units (inns, lodges, RV spaces), excluding low-intensity camping. In conjunction with many other environmental regulations, the cap supports the primary goal of the LCP to protect the world-class aesthetic, environmental and recreational values of Big Sur. Maintaining the capacity of Highway 1 for its primary visitor-serving, *recreational* function was a critical factor in the development of the LCP. The goal of the LCP is thus to maximize visitor-serving and recreational land uses *within the limits* of the environment and carrying capacity of Highway 1.

STRs are not specifically referenced as a visitor-serving land use in the BSLUP or IP. In addition, the LCP limits development in residential zones to residential land uses, to “protect residents from unwanted intrusion by other incompatible activities and because neither available vacant land, water, nor roads are

²⁵ See fn 8, California Coastal Commission, *Id.* (1977).

²⁶ BSLUP, p. 73.

²⁷ IP 20.145.140 (B)(4). This section also requires that “guest houses” not be equipped for independent residential living, nor rented, leased or otherwise let.

²⁸ BSLUP Policy 5.4.3(I)(1) states: “[t]he County shall protect existing affordable housing in the Big Sur coastal area from loss due to deterioration, conversion or any other reason.”

adequate to support more intensive uses.” Finally, the LCP contains policies and ordinances to both limit new residential development, and protect affordable housing, particularly for those working in the Big Sur visitor-serving economy.

Considering the certified LCP and the high sensitivity and importance of Big Sur’s coastal resources, any consideration of STRs in Big Sur should ideally occur through a comprehensive update of the LCP for Big Sur, but should at least include an updated review of STR development trends, potential resource impacts and use conflicts, and service capacity limitations, especially the capacity of Highway 1 to support expanded visitor-serving use. This review should include an evaluation of both the supply and demand for overnight visitor-serving uses and their impacts on coastal resources; and the current and projected capacity of Highway 1, including updated traffic counts and origin-destination analyses. This recommendation is consistent with recent Coastal Commission guidance that acknowledges the need to address the potential impacts of STRs taking into account local context:

. . . we also recognize and understand legitimate community concerns associated with the potential adverse impacts associated with vacation rentals, including with respect to community character and noise and traffic impacts. We also recognize concerns regarding the impact of vacation rentals on local housing stock and affordability. Thus, in our view it is not an ‘all or none’ proposition. Rather, the Commission’s obligation is to work with local governments to accommodate vacation rentals in a way that respects local context.²⁹

²⁹ *Id.* fn 3.

TABLE 1: LAND USE AND DEVELOPMENT INTENSITY AND BUILDOUT

USES	LOCATION ON LAND USE MAP	OVERALL DENSITY STANDARD #	SITE DEVELOPMENT STANDARD #	ESTIMATED ADDITIONAL UNITS IN BIG SUR
1. Residential				
a. Principal Residences	Watershed & Scenic Cons. Rural Residential Areas Big Sur Valley RCC	Maximum of 100 Units: 1 per 40 acres W. of Hwy 1 1 per 40-320 ac. per slope-density formula E. of Hwy 1 1 per existing parcel.**	1 acre minimum parcel (clustering)	TOTAL: 845 (est.) (656 on existing parcels; 189 on new sites)
b. Additional Residences		2 X the above (except RCC areas)	Same as above	50 per TOD program
c. Employee Housing (1) Caretaker units	Watershed & Scenic Cons.	1 per parcel	N/A	50 maximum
(2) Commercial-employee housing	Rural Community Centers Watershed & Scenic Cons. Outdoor Recreation	Specified in housing plan required for each commercial project	N/A	300 (range 0 - 650+)
(3) Ranch hands - Dormitories/bunk-houses	Watershed & Scenic Cons.	1 per ranch (640 ac.)	N/A	12
2. Visitor Accommodations				
a. Inns, RV Campgrounds ***	Watershed & Scenic Cons. o Westmere	Maximum of 300 units: 2 units for each residential unit credit retired; maximum 8 per parcel 24 units (special allowance)	10 acre minimum parcel 30 units per cluster max. 24 units max.	130 (range 0 - 260) 24
b. Hostels	Rural Community Centers Watershed & Scenic Cons. National Forest Outdoor Recreation Rural Community Centers	1 unit per net undeveloped ac. 1 bed unit per acre; 50 maximum in Big Sur 1 bed per unit acre; 50 maximum in Big Sur	10 ac. minimum parcel; 30 units per cluster, max. 10 acre minimum parcel 5 acre minimum parcel	240 50 maximum
3. Campgrounds				
a. Rustic Campgrounds ***	Outdoor Recreation National Forest Watershed & Scenic Cons. Rural Community Centers	1 space per 20 acres 2 spaces per acre	5 spaces per acre (Clustering) 10 acre minimum parcel; 10 spaces per acre (Clustering) 5 spaces per acre (Clustering)	Undetermined Undetermined Undetermined
b. Hike-in & Environmental Campsites	Outdoor Recreation National Forest Watershed & Scenic Cons. Rural Community Center Resource Conservation	1 space per 20 acres	Development of visitor accommodation use is permitted on a parcel designated RCC and containing an existing residence so long as the existing residence is considered an ancillary use to the visitor-serving facility. ** RV Campgrounds are distinguished from Rustic Campgrounds by utility connections, paved surfaces, etc., at each site.	Undetermined

* These represent maximum intensities. Natural resource limitations or constraints may further reduce these densities for any individual parcel.

** Development of visitor accommodation use is permitted on a parcel designated RCC and containing an existing residence so long as the existing residence is considered an ancillary use to the visitor-serving facility.

*** RV Campgrounds are distinguished from Rustic Campgrounds by utility connections, paved surfaces, etc., at each site.

ATTACHMENT 3

<u>PROPOSED LAND USE</u>	<u>ZONING DISTRICT</u>	<u>MAXIMUM ALLOWABLE DENSITY</u>	<u>SITE DEVELOPMENT STANDARD</u>
<u>Residential</u>			
1. Principal Residence	WSC & RDR	East of Hwy. 1, 1 unit/40-320 ac. as per slope density formula West of Hwy. 1, 1 unit/40 ac.	1 acre minimum, w/cluster.
	VSC	Allowed in Big Sur Valley "CGC" only, 1 unit/parcel	same as above
2. Additional Res. allowable thru TDC program	n/a	Twice the allowable density shown above	same as above
3. Employee Housing for:			
a. Caretaker	WSC	1 unit/parcel	2 acres
b. Commercial Employees	VSC, WSC, & OR	As specified in the required Employee Housing Plan	n/a
c. Ranch Hands	WSC	1 dormitory or bunkhouse/ranch or per 640 acres	n/a

Visitor Accomodations

1. Inns & Campgrounds	WSC	2 units for each residential unit allowed under "Principal Res." above, with those units then unable to be developed; to a maximum 8 units per parcel. (See special provisions for Westmere parcel in the Big Sur Ordinance.)	10 ac. min parcel & maximum of 30 units per cluster
	VSC	1 inn unit or 1 RV site /net undeveloped acre	same as above
2. Hostels	WSC, OR, & VSC	1 bed/acre	10 acre minimum parcel

Campgrounds

1. Rustic Campgrounds	WSC & OR	1 campsite/20 acres	5 sites per acre w/cluster.
	VSC	2 campsites/acre	10 ac. min parcel; 10 sites per acre w/cluster.
2. Make-in & Environmental Campsites	WSC, GC, OR & RC	1 campsite/20 acres	5 sites per acre w/cluster.

Note: RV Campgrounds are distinguished from Rustic Campgrounds by utility connections, paved surfaces, etc. at each site.