



Black Point – Green Point Community Plan
Community Workshop #3 – March 5, 2015
Summary of Public Comments

The following is a summary of the input received at the public workshop held on March 5, 2015 on the Draft Black Point – Green Point community plan. Participants were broken up into small groups and were asked a number of questions, led by a facilitator.

1a. What are the differences between the Black Point and Green Point neighborhoods?

- The neighborhoods are separate but equal; they are distinctly different neighborhoods.
- The two areas share more common characteristics compared to other areas in the county.
- When the community plan was written the Green Point area was not as developed and was more sparsely populated. Today it is more developed with many new neighborhoods that have their own homeowner's associations.
- They are zoned differently and have different development standards.
- Lots in Green Point are generally substantially larger, and many feature agricultural uses with horses and goats.
- Most roads in Green Point are County-maintained while most in Black Point are privately owned and not County-maintained.
- Green Point is geographically larger but has the same population as Black Point, which is smaller in area.
- Homes in Green Point are generally larger and newer (post 70's) while those in Black Point are smaller and older (more funky). Home size in Black Point appears to be more varied.
- Green Point has excellent infrastructure (most roads are county-maintained and publicly owned)
- Green Point is "newer."
- Green Point is more sprawled out and is less dense.
- Green Point has better access.
- Green Point has a variety of home sizes without any issues.
- Green Point is not representative of the entire area.
- Home values in Green Point are generally higher and appears to be more affluent.
- Home size more of an issue in Black Point than in Green Point.
- Septic Systems in Green Point are more modern.
- The geology in Black Point is more constrained.
- Black Point has more constraints with septic and fire issues, and limited access
- Black Point is surrounded by water.

- Black Point has more open space areas to hike.
- Both areas seem to have more in common than differences.
- Combining the two into the name of the Draft is a good idea but there do not seem to be significant differences to warrant separation.
- There is a distinction between the community and the rest of Marin.

1b. How should the updated community plan address these neighborhoods?

- Bifurcate the neighborhoods: if it is time, the time is now.
- Combining the two into the name of the Draft is a good idea but there do not seem to be significant differences to warrant separation.
- Within Green Point, the smaller areas should be noted, such as H Lane, Atherton Oaks, and School Road.
- There should be one plan for the entire community.
- The community plan may need to address each neighborhood with neighborhood specific criteria to protect community character.
- There is a distinction between the planning area and the rest of Marin
- Maintain the existing character.
- Provide better documentation of the history and acknowledge that the area was historically one community and keep the character of the current community.
- Provide a clear description of each community in the Draft, including the historical genesis of each to present day and its evolution (i.e. describe how both communities emerged from a common origin).
- The differences between the two areas are a non-factor and it is difficult to understand the need to identify the differences. Most communities have divisions within them.
- A name change should be a community-wide vote and not based on a few outspoken residents.
- The name should remain “Black Point Community Plan.”
- Black Point welcomes Green Point residents.
- There is a concern that limiting home size will reduce property values.
- Consider signage to indicate the two areas in the community.
- The entire area is Black Point with neighborhoods in Green Point, but all part of Black Point.

2. How should the community plan address home size?

- While many support maintaining the existing development process, overall there seems to be a general consensus that the community supports some level of guidance to regulate the size of homes.
- Septic regulations may be a natural limitation on home size.
- Home size more of an issue in Black Point than in Green Point.
- There is a fear of unintended consequences of imposing additional regulations.
- There is interest and support for size limits.
- Keep in mind that the data used to track home size, such as the Assessor’s data, may not be appropriate since the data was collected for assessment and tax related purposes. Consequently, data on home size may not always be accurate. Is there a better way to determine home size?

- Need clear, defined standards since the Design Review process allows flexibility to review projects on a case-by-case basis.
- It is important to maintain community character.
- Look at how the City of Novato addresses home size. It is not tied to median FAR. Larkspur and Mill Valley are more flexible towards footprint and size, which does not limit additional construction.
- Ensure the Single-family Residential Design Guidelines are applied consistently.
- Keep things the way they are: don't fix what isn't broken.
- The design of a home is a key factor, not the size.
- Like the idea of preventing large homes from being developed on small lots, similar to Option 2. However, the specific details in this Option need to be reconsidered to achieve the same objective to allow for some flexibility. An area surrounded by small homes should not be a limiting factor. There should be allowances for large lots.
- A FAR of 0.3 is significant.
- The home recently approved on Grandview Avenue is an example of a situation where a property needs to be large enough to accommodate both a home and its respective septic system. The size of the home may need to be reduced and the home relocated to accommodate an on-site septic system.
- Support the County's efforts to limit home size but encourage development in compliance with community character

3. How should the community plan address the issue of setbacks?

- Overall there appears to be community support for additional setback regulations.
- The addition of setback standards to the community plan is a substantial change from the current plan.
- Require setbacks for Black Point, not Green Point.
- Setback standards in the ARP-2 zoning district in Green Point should not be the same as the A2 zoning district setback standards in Black Point.
- Setbacks are more of a concern on smaller lots than larger ones.
- There should be setback minimums in ARP-2 (25-foot front setback, which is the same required in the A2 zoning district).
- Need to clarify why the Draft will require consistent setbacks when there already is much variability. Having variable setbacks allows for flexibility in addressing specific site constraints, such as topography. Preference is for variable setbacks; flexibility is important.
- Support the County's efforts to limit setbacks but encourage development in compliance with community character.

4. What types of land uses would you like to see the community plan encourage in the Village Center Area? Please explain why you think this use (or uses) should be encouraged.

Overall there appears to be community support for a policy that spells out preferred land uses in the Village Center area. A number of potential uses were suggested, including:

- Gas station.
- Auto repair.
- Child day care center.

- Coffee shop/bakery.
 - Small neighborhood grocery (not a Safeway or Lucky's style market).
 - Dog park.
 - Community hall (or a place where the community can come together and gather).
 - Community garden.
 - Restaurant (Taqueria).
 - Park (perhaps use Measure A funds?).
 - Playground.
 - Farmer's market.
 - Community serving businesses.
 - Medical marijuana dispensary.
 - Holistic medicine center, including massage and meditation.
 - Art and multi-use studios.
- Other suggestions including restoring the older commercial buildings as a little village area, while some preferred no change and to maintain the area as-is since there is a concern about additional traffic.
 - It was noted that many of the "preferred uses" in the proposed policy may not practical given the area's constraints. However, the community plan should provide guidance on future uses should things may change.
 - Regardless of what uses are preferred, signage and lighting should be limited.
 - Encourage the community center, theatre, etcetera in the VCR zoning. Is there anything to stop those uses now? Are these uses economically feasible?

5. Do you have any other comments or questions?

- Protect paper streets for pedestrian access and as wildlife corridors (multiple).
- Property owners should be able to clear road of overgrowth for sightlines.
- Enforcement of junkyards and speeding.
- Drinking outside of Rossi's Deli is an issue (as well as inside the gazebo).
- Day Island is peaceful and quiet. Keep managing it this way to maintain this.
- Discourage commuters from freeway jumping through the community.
- Work to open the gate on Bay Canyon as an emergency evacuation route.
- Encourage fencing that does not block wildlife.
- Maximize recreational opportunities.
- Better communication with residents (need to improve how residents are notified about meetings).
- Limit landscape lights (ensure they shut off at night, but allow minimal lighting for safety purposes). Encourage motion sensors, low wattage, and timers to reduce cumulative impacts on the night sky.
- Need better signage for hiking trails.
- A connector trail between the community and both Bahia and Bel Marin Keys.
- How will the proposed regulations address existing development? Will it be grandfathered? If a house burns down, can you replace what you had?
- Retain paper streets and wildlife corridors.
- Keep paper streets as a buffer.