

**Unit I
Existing and Proposed Policy Comparison
Public Access**

Updated 8/15/2013

Public Access	1
Recreation and Visitor Serving Facilities	10
State and Federal Parklands	12
Stream Protection	16
Lagoon Protection	24
Natural Dune and Sandy Beach Protection	31
Habitat Protection	33
Agriculture	36
Shoreline Protection and Hazard Areas	38
Public Services	43
New Development and Land Use	50
Location and Density of New Development	58

The following chart compares policies from the existing Local Coastal Program Unit I to those in the Land Use Plan of the July 2013 Board of Supervisors-Adopted Local Coastal Program Amendment (LCPA) document. The column on the left shows the existing LCP Unit I policy and its respective status. The column on the right shows the proposed LCPA policy that was adapted from the Unit I policy. The policies are grouped by topic in numerical order as they appear in Unit I.

Unit I Public Access	
Unit I - Existing Policy	LCPA - Proposed Policy
<p><u>Policy 1, pg. 7</u></p> <p>The County's policy is to require provisions for coastal access in all development proposals located between the sea and the first public road. This policy recognizes, however, that in certain locations public access may not be appropriate. Upon specific findings, that public access would be inconsistent with the protection of 1) public safety, 2) fragile coastal resources or 3) agricultural production or, upon specific findings that public use of an accessway would seriously interfere with the privacy of existing homes, provision for coastal access need not be required. In determining whether access is inconsistent with the above, the findings shall specifically consider whether mitigation measures such as setbacks from sensitive habitats, trail or stairway development, or regulation of time, seasons, or types of use could be developed which would adequately mitigate any potential adverse impacts of public access. A finding that an access way can be located 10 feet or more from an existing single family residence or be separated by a landscape buffer or fencing if necessary should be considered to provide adequately for the privacy of existing homes.</p>	<p>C-PA-11 Privacy of Neighbors. In determining appropriate management measures for public coastal accessways, including hours of operation, the Marin County Parks department or other managing entity should take into account the need to respect the privacy of neighboring residents.</p> <p>[BOS app. 12/11/2012] [PC app. 9/19/11, 11/23/09] [Adapted from Unit I Public Access Policy 1, p. 7]</p>

**Unit I
Existing and Proposed Policy Comparison
Public Access**

<p><u>Policy Status</u> The concept of this policy has been adapted and carried forward as LCPA Policy C-PA-11.</p>	
<p><u>Policy 2, pg. 7</u> The provision of coastal access may include any of the following types of easements, either singularly or in a combination:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Vertical easements to the ocean b. Lateral easements along the dry sand adjacent to tidelands c. Bluff top easements along bluffs for public viewing or trail purposes or where no continuous sandy beach exists. <p><u>Policy Status</u> This policy has been carried forward as LCPA Policy C-PA-9, which also draws language from Unit II Public Access Policy 2.b (p. 14).</p>	<p>C-PA-9 Variety of Public Coastal Accessways. When requiring public coastal access, include any of the following types of accessways, either singularly or in combination:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Vertical accessways to the ocean or shoreline; 2. Lateral accessways that extend from the ambulatory mean high tide line landward to a defined line, such as the intersection of the sand with the toe of a revetment, vertical face of a seawall, toe of a bluff, or other feature; 3. Bluff top accessways along bluffs for public viewing or trail purposes or where no continuous sandy beach exists. <p>(PC app. 9/19/11, 11/23/09) <i>[Adapted from Unit I Public Access Policy 2, p. 7, and Unit II Public Access Policy 2.b, p. 14]</i></p>
<p><u>Policy 3, pg. 7</u> Where evidence of prescriptive rights (historic public use) on a project site is determined to exist as a result of permit application review, public easements to protect the types, intensity and areas of historic use shall be established as a condition of project approval. Development may be allowed in an area which has been historically used by the public for vertical access to the beach only when equivalent access which will accommodate the same types and intensity of use has have existed on the subject site, has been assured in the same vicinity.</p> <p><u>Policy Status</u> Language from this policy was used to formulate LCPA Policy C-PA-7. The new policy also draws language from Unit II Public Access Policy 2.a (p. 13) and Coastal Act Section 30211.</p>	<p>C-PA-7 Protection of Prescriptive Rights. Ensure that development does not interfere with the public's right of access to the sea where acquired through use. Where evidence (including historic public use) of prescriptive rights is found in reviewing a coastal permit application, take one or more of the following actions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Consider approval of the coastal permit application, while siting development to avoid the area potentially subject to prescriptive rights and by requiring public easements to protect the types and intensity of use and areas of historic interest as a condition of project approval. 2. If requirement of an access easement to protect areas of historic use would preclude all reasonable private use of the project site, the County or the Coastal Commission and the Attorney General at the request of the County shall, subject to the availability of staff and funds, seek a court determination and confirmation of such public rights. 3. In the absence of a final court determination, the County may proceed to consider approval of development on areas potentially subject to prescriptive rights (except those used for lateral access), provided that all impacts on public access are mitigated in the same vicinity substantially in accordance with the LCP's Access policies. Such mitigation may include securing an accessway on another property in the same vicinity, or providing an in-lieu fee to a public agency or private association approved

Unit I
Existing and Proposed Policy Comparison
Public Access

	<p>by the County and Coastal Commission for acquisition, improvement, or maintenance of access in the same vicinity. Same vicinity is considered to be within 1,000 feet of the project site (parcel).</p> <p>(PC app. 9/19/11, 2/8/10)</p> <p><i>[Adapted from Unit I Public Access Policy 3, p. 7, Unit II Public Access Policy 2.a, p. 13, and Coastal Act Section 30211]</i></p>
<p><u>Policy 4, pg. 7</u> Construction of shoreline protection measures otherwise permitted by LCP policies shall accommodate previously existing shoreline access.</p> <p><u>Policy Status</u> This policy has been carried forward as LCPA Policy C-PA-21.</p>	<p>C-PA-21 Shoreline Structures on or Near Public Coastal Accessways. Ensure that construction of shoreline protection measures otherwise permitted by LCP policies maintains the same or similar shoreline access as previously existed.</p> <p>(PC app. 9/19/11, 11/23/09)</p> <p><i>[Adapted from Unit I Public Access Policy 4, p. 7]</i></p>
<p><u>Policy 5, pg. 7</u> Where appropriate and feasible, parking areas should be provided in conjunction with access easements. The need for parking areas shall be evaluated based upon the parking and/or public transit opportunities available in the area. As transit service becomes available, parking capacities should be reduced or eliminated since transit opportunities reduce reliance on the private automobile.</p> <p><u>Policy Status</u> This policy has been carried forward to LCPA Policy C-PA-18, which also draws language from Unit I Public Access Policy 9 (p. 8) and Unit II Public Access Policy 2.c (p. 14).</p>	<p>C-PA-18 Parking and Support Facilities at Public Coastal Accessways. Where appropriate and feasible, provide parking areas for automobiles and bicycles and appropriate support facilities in conjunction with public coastal accessways. The location and design of new parking and support facilities shall minimize adverse impacts on adjacent residential areas. The need for parking shall be determined based on existing parking and public transit opportunities in the area, balanced with resource protection policies. Consider opportunities for reducing or eliminating parking capacities if transit service becomes available or increases.</p> <p>(PC app. 9/19/11, 2/8/10)</p> <p><i>[Adapted from Unit I Public Access Policies 5 and 9, pp. 7-8, and Unit II Public Access Policy 2.c, p. 14]</i></p>
<p><u>Policy 6, pg. 8</u> The County will accept, and as resources permit, open access easements in the following situations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) When the offer to dedicate an easement is made pursuant to evidence of prescriptive rights, or (b) Where the offered easement is in a developed area (density of one unit per acre or higher) where a substantial amount of the use could be expected to be made by local residents. <p>In all other situations the County shall attempt to find appropriate agencies, including County agencies, to accept and maintain the public access easements.</p>	<p>C-PA-5 Accept Offers to Dedicate Public Coastal Accessways. Accept offers to dedicate easements or fee title interests in coastal accessways and, as resources permit, place first priority on opening such accessways when the offer to dedicate is made pursuant to evidence of prescriptive rights or where the offer to dedicate is in a developed area. The County shall accept an offer to dedicate within 9 months of recordation. If the County does not accept an easement within this time period, it shall attempt to find an appropriate public or private agency to do so. Notwithstanding the above, the County may at any time accept a valid offer to dedicate an easement that has not been accepted by another entity.</p> <p>(PC app. 9/19/11, 2/8/10)</p> <p><i>[Adapted from Unit I Public Access Policy 6, p. 8, and Unit II Public Access Policy 2.c, p.</i></p>

**Unit I
Existing and Proposed Policy Comparison
Public Access**

<p>Whenever the County agrees to accept an access easement, the County will be responsible for maintenance and signing of the accessway. If no agency or association is immediately available to accept the grant of an easement, a 20-year irrevocable offer to dedicate the easement shall be recorded by the applicant prior to the commencement of project construction. The County shall immediately notify the California Coastal Conservancy of the existence of such offers to dedicate.</p> <p><u>Policy Status</u></p> <p>This policy was carried forward to LCPA Policy C-PA-5, which also draws language from Unit II Public Access Policy 2.c (p. 14) and Coastal Act Section 30212(a)(3).</p>	<p>14]</p>
<p><u>Policy 7, pg. 8</u></p> <p>The County shall post all County owned shoreline accessways which are open and available to the public.</p> <p><u>Policy Status</u></p> <p>The concept of this policy was carried forward to LCPA Policy C-PA-19, which also draws language from Unit I Public Access Policy 8 (p. 8) and Unit II Public Access Policy 2.c (p. 14).</p>	<p>C-PA-19 Explanatory Signs at Public Coastal Accessways. Sign existing and new public coastal accessways, trails, and parking facilities where necessary, and use signs to minimize conflicts between public and private land uses. Signs posted along the shoreline shall indicate appropriate restrictions, such as that no fires or overnight camping are permitted, and that the privacy of homeowners shall be respected. Where public access trails are located adjacent to agricultural lands, signs shall indicate appropriate restrictions against trespassing, fires, camping, and hunting. Where only limited public access or use of an area can be permitted in order to protect resource areas from overuse, such signing should identify the appropriate type and levels of use which are consistent with resource protection. The County and CALTRANS shall as resources permit, post informational signs at appropriate intersections and turning points along visitor routes, in order to direct coastal visitors to public recreation and nature study areas in the Coastal Zone.</p> <p>(PC app. 9/19/11, 11/23/09)</p> <p><i>[Adapted from Unit I Public Access Policies 7 and 8, p. 8, and Unit II Public Access Policy 2.c, p. 14]</i></p>
<p><u>Policy 8, pg. 8</u></p> <p>The County and CALTRANS shall, as resources permit, post informational signs at appropriate intersections and turning points on Highway 1, the Bolinas-Olema Road, and Mesa Road, in order to direct coastal visitors to public recreation and nature study areas in the Unit I coastal zone. Where only limited public access or use of an area can be permitted in order to protect resource areas from overuse, such signing should identify the appropriate type and levels of use which is consistent with resource protection.</p>	<p>C-PA-19 Explanatory Signs at Public Coastal Accessways. Sign existing and new public coastal accessways, trails, and parking facilities where necessary, and use signs to minimize conflicts between public and private land uses. Signs posted along the shoreline shall indicate appropriate restrictions, such as that no fires or overnight camping are permitted, and that the privacy of homeowners shall be respected. Where public access trails are located adjacent to agricultural lands, signs shall indicate appropriate restrictions against trespassing, fires, camping, and hunting. Where only limited public access or use of an area can be permitted to protect resource areas from overuse, such signing should identify the</p>

**Unit I
Existing and Proposed Policy Comparison
Public Access**

<p><u>Policy Status</u></p> <p>The concept of this policy was carried forward to LCPA Policy C-PA-19, which also draws language from Unit I Public Access Policy 7 (p. 8) and Unit II Public Access Policy 2.c (p. 14).</p>	<p>appropriate type and levels of use consistent with resource protection. The County and CALTRANS shall, as resources permit, post informational signs at appropriate intersections and turning points along visitor routes, in order to direct coastal visitors to public recreation and nature study areas in the Coastal Zone.</p> <p>(PC app. 9/19/11, 11/23/09)</p> <p><i>[Adapted from Unit I Public Access Policies 7 and 8, p. 8, and Unit II Public Access Policy 2.c, p. 14]</i></p>
<p><u>Policy 9, pg. 8</u></p> <p>Adequate public access to Stinson Beach currently exists across Federal park lands, County land at Calle Del Sierra and private land at the Calles and Walla Vista. To encourage the continuance of access availability in these areas the County shall post the existing pedestrian access easements along Calle Del Arroyo. However, should the current levels of usage be jeopardized in the future, the County shall open and maintain at least two additional pedestrian access easements on Calle Del Arroyo. One of these will be at Walla Vista; the other would be situated where appropriate in the Calles. On street parking along the northerly side of Calle Del Arroyo shall continue to be available for day-use beach access.</p> <p><u>Policy Status</u></p> <p>This policy was carried forward to LCPA Policy C-PA-18, which also draws language from Unit I Public Access Policy 5 (p. 7) and Unit II Public Access Policy 2.c (p. 14). The concept of this policy was also carried forward to LCPA Policy C-PA-6.</p>	<p>C-PA-6 Acquisition and Location of New Public Coastal Accessways through Suitable Means. Acquire additional public coastal accessways in order to enhance opportunities to reach public tidelands, to link publicly accessible beaches via lateral trails, and to avoid impacts of overuse of any single area. Acquisition shall be pursued through available means including, public purchase, tax default acquisitions, agreements with nonprofit management entities, voluntary donation, or, when permissible, dedication as a condition of a coastal project permit. When available funds or other acquisition opportunities are limited, accessways listed in the Appendix shall receive first priority. Acquisition and location of accessways shall take into account the need to protect public safety, military security, fragile coastal resources, and agriculture.</p> <p>[BOS app. 12/11/2012]</p> <p>(PC app. 9/19/11, 11/23/09)</p> <p><i>[Adapted from Unit I Public Access Policies 9, 11, 12, and 13, pp. 8-9, and Unit II Public Access Policies 3, 4, and 5, pp. 15-22]</i></p> <p>C-PA-18 Parking and Support Facilities at Public Coastal Accessways. Where appropriate and feasible, provide parking areas for automobiles and bicycles and appropriate support facilities in conjunction with public coastal accessways. The location and design of new parking and support facilities shall minimize adverse impacts on adjacent residential areas. The need for parking shall be determined based on existing parking and public transit opportunities in the area, balanced with resource protection policies. Consider opportunities for reducing or eliminating parking capacities if transit service becomes available or increases.</p> <p>(PC app. 9/19/11, 2/8/10)</p> <p><i>[Adapted from Unit I Public Access Policies 5 and 9, pp. 7-8, and Unit II Public Access Policy 2.c, p. 14]</i></p>
<p><u>Policy 10, pg. 8</u></p>	

Unit I
Existing and Proposed Policy Comparison
Public Access

<p>Public access to Duxbury Reef shall continue to be protected consistent with current State laws prohibiting the collecting of most intertidal animals.</p> <p><u>Policy Status</u></p> <p>The policy is out of date and has not been carried forward to the LCPA. Duxbury Reef is included in the Duxbury Reef State Marine Conservation Area, which prohibits the take of all living marine resources, except the recreational take of finfish from shore only and the recreational take of abalone. However, California's marine protected areas encourage recreational and educational uses of the ocean. Activities such as kayaking, diving, snorkeling, and swimming are allowed unless otherwise restricted. The Duxbury Reef SMCA is one of 21 marine protected areas adopted by the California Fish and Game Commission in August 2009, during the second phase of the Marine Life Protection Act Initiative.</p>	<p>n/a</p>
<p><u>Policy 11, p. 9</u></p> <p>Historic public use of the two access trails across Bolinas Mesa to the RCA beach and of the beach area itself shall be protected in accordance with the access program approved by the North Central Coast regional Commission in its action on Permit No. 31-78 (Commonweal). As provided by the conditions of the Commonwealth permit approval, use of the access trails and beach areas shall be limited to the level and character of the historic use of the property (including but not limited to use for beach access, hiking, swimming, and horseback riding) in order to protect the natural resources of Duxbury Reef. Upon acceptance by a public agency of easements over the access trails, trailheads, and beach areas which are to be offered as a condition of the Commonwealth permit approval, limited signing shall be provided to identify the access trails and caution trail users of the fragile coastal resources of the area.</p> <p><u>Policy Status</u></p> <p>This policy has been carried forward to LCPA Policy C-PA-8. The concept of this policy has also been carried forward to LCPA Policy C-PA-6.</p>	<p>C-PA-6 Acquisition of New Public Coastal Accessways through Suitable Means. Acquire additional public coastal accessways in order to enhance opportunities to reach public tidelands, to link publicly accessible beaches via lateral trails, and to avoid impacts of overuse of any single area. Acquisition shall be pursued through available means including, public purchase, tax default acquisitions, agreements with nonprofit management entities, voluntary donation, or, when permissible, dedication as a condition of a coastal project permit. When available funds or other acquisition opportunities are limited, accessways listed in the Appendix shall receive first priority. Acquisition of accessways shall take into account the need to protect public safety, military security, fragile coastal resources, and agriculture.</p> <p>(PC app. 9/19/11, 11/23/09)</p> <p><i>[Adapted from Unit I Public Access Policies 9, 11, 12, and 13, pp. 8-9, and Unit II Public Access Policies 3, 4, and 5, pp. 15-22]</i></p> <p>C-PA-8 Bolinas Mesa. Public use of the two access trails across Bolinas Mesa to the RCA beach and the beach area itself shall be protected and shall be limited to the level and character of the historic use of the property (including use for beach access, hiking, swimming, and horseback riding) to protect the natural resources of Duxbury Reef. Limited signing shall be provided to identify the access trails and caution trail users of the fragile coastal resources of the area.</p> <p>(PC app. 11/7/11, 11/23/09)</p> <p><i>[Adapted from Unit I Public Access Policy 11, p. 9]</i></p>
<p><u>Policy 12, p. 9</u></p>	<p>C-PA-6 Acquisition and Location of New Public Coastal Accessways</p>

Unit I
Existing and Proposed Policy Comparison
Public Access

<p>A determination of the necessity to provide additional access trails across other large agricultural holdings on the Bolinas Mesa should be deferred pending a review of the adequacy of public access opportunities to be provided in the vicinity as part of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area General Management Plan. The necessity for additional access will be reconsidered during the Unit II planning process when appropriate land use designations for the large agricultural holdings in the Bolinas Mesa area will be developed as part of a Countywide approach to the protection of large agricultural holdings.</p> <p><u>Policy Status</u></p> <p>The policy is no longer relevant and has not been carried forward. LCPA Policy C-PA-6 (p. 121) recommends that acquisitions for public accessways shall take into account the needs to protect public safety, military security, fragile coastal resources, and agriculture.</p>	<p>through Suitable Means. (See policy language above)</p>
<p><u>Policy 13, p. 9</u></p> <p>The provision of public access to and use of the Seadrift Beach for low-intensity recreational uses shall be assured (1) by requiring, as part of the coastal development permit process for new development projects on ocean front parcels in Subarea I, dedications of public access consistent with the standards of the suggested settlement agreement as set forth below, and (2) by establishing an overall solution to obtaining access at Seadrift Beach through either (a) an access agreement with the property owners, (b) litigation to establish the public's prescriptive rights gained by historic use, or (3) public purchase. In order to minimize the public costs involved in acquisition or in litigation of the prescriptive rights issue, in addition to requiring dedications, obtaining an access agreement presents the preferred approach to achieving access to the Seadrift Beach.</p> <p>In order to facilitate an agreement between the County of Marin, the Coastal Commission, and beachfront property owners, the County or Coastal Commission shall offer a settlement- agreement incorporating the following provisions to the above parties for a period of 18 months from the final certification of the Unit I LCP. These provisions establish the minimum standards necessary to assure public access to Seadrift, but are not intended to represent all of the proposed terms of the agreement in its final form. Minimum standards shall be interpreted to mean that the offered agreement may provide additional access along the beach and additional amenities within the Easement area but may not in any way diminish the public rights which would be established as a result of an agreement incorporating the following provisions.</p> <p>a. A grant to the County of Marin on behalf of the public by the agreeing property owners of a non-exclusive easement for access to and use of the</p>	<p>C-PA-6 Acquisition and Location of New Public Coastal Accessways through Suitable Means. (See policy language above)</p>

Unit I
Existing and Proposed Policy Comparison
Public Access

beach. This easement shall include the beach area between the ocean and a line 25 feet seaward of the toe of the Seadrift sand dunes, provided, however, that the easement shall not extend any closer than 100 feet to the rear building setback line on each ocean front lot. In addition to the above easement, the grant shall also include provision for a floating five-foot wide lateral access easement to be located landward for any wave run-up where such run-up extends further inland than the above easement. In no case, however, shall the five-foot floating easement extend inland beyond the rear building setback line or the toe of the dunes, whichever point is the farthest seaward.

In return for the grant, the agreement shall include an assurance by the state that the existence of public prescriptive rights over any portion of the property affected by the agreement will not be litigated further while the agreement is in effect.

- b. Use of the easement area shall be limited to low-intensity recreational activities, such as strolling, sunbathing, birding, picnicking, fishing, and general viewing. Structures, camping, group sports, fire, private recreational vehicles, and horses shall be prohibited in the easement areas. Use of the five-foot lateral access easement as described above shall be limited to strolling and viewing purposes only.
- c. The agreement shall become effective upon its signing by representatives of the Coastal Commission, the State Lands Commission, and the Attorney General on behalf of the State of California, and by no less than seventy-five (75) percent of the beachfront property owners.
- d. The Attorney General or District Attorney may pursue litigation to establish the existence of public prescriptive rights over the beach, should the agreement not become effective within 18 months from the final certification of the Unit I LCP. Should the agreement become effective, the Attorney General may pursue such litigation on lots which have not been made a party to the agreement.
- e. Nothing in this policy or the agreements or easements described shall be interpreted as affecting the right of the public to use any portion of the beach subject to the public trust.
- f. In the absence of an overall agreement providing access and use along the Seadrift beach, the County, as part of coastal permit review, shall require dedications of such access per the standards of the suggested agreement.

Policy Status

This policy as well as Unit I Location and Density of New Development Policy 33

Unit I
Existing and Proposed Policy Comparison
Public Access

<p>(p. 80), have been superseded by the Seadrift settlement agreement adopted after the LCP was certified [see <i>LCPA Appendix 9</i>], and thus have not been carried forward to the LCPA. The acquisition of new public coastal accessways is addressed by LCPA Policy C-PA-6.</p>	
---	--

**Unit I
Existing and Proposed Policy Comparison
Recreation and Visitor-Serving Facilities**

Unit I Recreation and Visitor-Serving Facilities	
Unit I - Existing Policy	LCPA - Proposed Policy
<p><u>Policy 14, pg. 13</u></p> <p>Commercial facilities shall be channeled into the existing properties in Bolinas and Stinson Beach zoned for VCR and commercial uses. In order to maintain the established character of the village commercial areas-, a mixture of residential and commercial uses shall be permitted within the VCR zone. The principal permitted use of the VCR zone in the two village centers shall include commercial and residential uses, provided that new residential uses shall be permitted only if they are incidental to the commercial use. Exclusive residential uses shall also be permitted as a conditional use be a permitted use subject to coastal permit review; however, in no case shall such use be permitted on more than 25 percent of the lots that are now vacant in each community as of the certification date of LCP I (4-1-80). Replacement of any existing residential use destroyed by natural disaster shall be exempt from the above provision and shall be permitted. The development of motels and hotels in the VCR zone shall require a conditional use permit and is therefore not identified as a principal permitted use in that District.</p> <p><u>Policy Status</u></p> <p>This policy has been carried forward to LCPA Policy C-PK-3. Language specific to the <i>25% of the vacant lots in Bolinas and Stinson Beach</i> has been deleted. The policy language has been modified to require a Use Permit for residential uses on the ground floor of a new or existing structure on the road-facing side of the property.</p>	<p>C-PK-3 Mixed Uses in the Coastal Village Commercial/Residential Zone. Continue to permit a mixture of residential and commercial uses in the C-VCR zoning district to maintain the established character of village commercial areas. Principal permitted use of the C-VCR zone shall include commercial and residential uses. Require a Use Permit for residential uses proposed on the ground floor of a new or existing structure on the road-facing side of the property. Replacement, maintenance and repair of any legal existing residential use shall be exempt from the above provision and shall be permitted.</p> <p>(PC app. 9/19/11, 7/29/10)</p> <p><i>[Adapted from Unit I Recreation and Visitor-Serving Facilities Policy 14, p. 13.]</i></p>
<p><u>Policy 15, pg. 14</u></p> <p>The current Bed and Breakfast program Bolinas shall be continued, and the program shall be encouraged in the following manner:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The County shall encourage the National Park Service and State Parks and Recreation Department to make available advertising space to those homeowners who wish to participate in the Bed and Breakfast program. b. The County shall encourage the Marin Coast Chamber of Commerce to make available advertising space to those homeowners who wish to participate in the Bed and Breakfast program. 	<p>C-PK-6 Bed and Breakfast Inns. Support bed and breakfast facilities in the Coastal Zone as a means of providing visitor accommodations, while minimizing their impacts on surrounding communities. Restrict the conversion of second units and affordable housing to bed and breakfast inns. In addition, support the location of bed and breakfast inns in areas that are easily and directly accessible from usual tourist travel routes and where there is adequate off-street parking for guests and where the problem of nearby residents being inconvenienced by noise and increased transient traffic is minimized. Bed and breakfast inns shall be permitted to host or provide facilities for gatherings, such as weddings, receptions, private parties, or retreats if located in the C-APZ, C-ARP or C-R-A. Each bed and breakfast inn must be operated by a householder who is the sole proprietor</p>

Unit I
Existing and Proposed Policy Comparison
Recreation and Visitor-Serving Facilities

Policy Status

The concept of this policy has been carried forward to LCPA Policy **C-PK-6**, which also draws language from Unit II Recreation and Visitor Serving Facilities Policy 3.h (p. 52).

of the enterprise and whose primary residence is on the premises where the inn accommodations are located.

(PC app. 9/19/11, 1/24/11)

[Adapted from Unit I Recreation and Visitor-Serving Facilities Policy 15, p. 14, and Unit II Recreation and Visitor-Serving Facilities Policy 3.h, p. 52]

**Unit I
Existing and Proposed Policy Comparison
State and Federal Parklands**

Unit I State and Federal Parklands	
Unit I - Existing Policy	LCPA - Proposed Policy
<p><u>Policy 16, page 14</u> <u>Role and Relationship of Federal Parklands to LCP Policies.</u> The extensive amount of federal parkland within the coastal zone of Unit I provides significant opportunities for development of coastal access, recreational facilities and visitor support services. Such development opportunities reduce the need to plan for and provide such facilities on the private lands within the coastal zone. The LCP assumes that a major proportion of the access and visitor service needs within Unit I would and can be successfully integrated into federal park development and management programs.</p> <p><u>Policy Status</u> This policy has not been carried forward to the LCPA, since it does not provide any policy direction to guide decision-making bodies. However, language to encourage appropriate uses of federal parks and to guide development of state parks has been included in LCPA Policy C-PK-10 (p. 112).</p>	<p>n/a</p>
<p><u>Policy 17, pg. 14</u> <u>Mt. Tamalpais State Park and Lands.</u> The development of additional recreational and visitor services on those portions of the Mount Tamalpais State Park within the coastal zone, including hiking trails, equestrian trails, a "primitive" hostel at the Steep Ravine cabins and improved parking and support facilities at Red Rock are consistent with the LCP policies. Such facilities shall be similar in design, size and/or location as those proposed by the Mount Tamalpais State Park Plan. Consistent with the protection of significant resources, additional trail development to improve access to public tidelands is encouraged.</p> <p><u>Policy Status</u> This policy was unintentionally left out of the LCPA (as of February 2012). Staff will propose that it be incorporated into LCPA Policy C-PK-11 (p. 113) during the LCPA review with the Board of Supervisors in Spring 2012.</p>	<p>C-PK-11 State Parks. The State Department of Parks and Recreation has numerous holdings in the Coastal Zone, several of which have not been developed. Collectively, these holdings form Tomales Bay State Park and limited portions of Mount Tamalpais State Park. The Department has prepared a general Plan for both Tomales Bay State Park, which includes most of the state park lands in Marin County's Coastal Zone, as well as Mount Tamalpais State Park. Development within the state parks should be consistent with their adopted General Plans as described below.</p> <p>Mount Tamalpais State Park. The development of additional recreational and visitor services on those portions of the Mount Tamalpais State park within the coastal zone, including hiking trails, equestrian trails, a "primitive" hostel at the Steep Ravine Cabins and improved parking and support facilities at Red Rock are consistent with the LCP policies. Such facilities shall be similar in design, size and/or location as those proposed by the Mount Tamalpais State Park Plan. Consistent with the protection of significant resources, additional trail development to improve access to public tidelands is encouraged.</p> <p>Tomales Bay State Park. The Tomales Bay State Park General Plan states that it</p>

Unit I
Existing and Proposed Policy Comparison
State and Federal Parklands

“aims to preserve what works well now in the park and only recommends changes to park management, activities, and recreational and administrative facilities that can harmonize with the area’s sensitive values and support valuable visitor experiences of Tomales Bay and its surrounding landscape.” Support development at Tomales Bay State Park consistent with the adopted General Plan:

1. Focus and anchor east shore recreation at Marconi Cove and west shore recreation at Heart’s Desire area.
2. Manage the greater part of park areas for their habitat, watershed, and aesthetic values and for low-impact and low-density recreation opportunities such as trail use, nature observation, and picnicking.
3. Enhance trail connections with Point Reyes National Seashore in the Heart’s Desire and Inverness areas.
4. Improve recreational opportunities along the Highway One corridor where recent acquisitions present new opportunities.
5. Formalize small-scale camping opportunities in previously developed areas.
6. Provide watercraft and sailboard launching opportunities at Marconi Cove and provide hiking and mountain biking recreational opportunities at the proposed trail in the Millerton Uplands.
7. Use sustainable design in siting, construction, and maintenance of park facilities. Furthermore, the following guidelines shall be applied as standards for coastal project permit review for proposed development in the park:

Heart’s Desire Area

1. Preserve and enhance the forest structure and age classes of the Jepson Grove/Bishop pine forest and forest growth by improving *Pinus muricata* growth.
2. Continue to manage Heart’s Desire Beach as the only “drive-up” beach access in the park.
3. Preserve and enhance the Indian Beach estuary and protect its cultural

Unit I
Existing and Proposed Policy Comparison
State and Federal Parklands

attributes including the midden site.

4. Restore the natural outlet of the estuary that was lost when the parking lot was built at Heart's Desire Beach in the 1960s.
5. Redesign and relocate picnic facilities to better blend with the natural environment and to provide a sense of seclusion where appropriate.
6. Adapt former hike-bike campground to a group campground.
7. Develop small walk-in campground (maximum of 15 sites) above the entrance station provided, however, that accommodation may be made for vehicles to provide any necessary disability access.
8. Encourage the Point Reyes National Seashore to extend its trail system to help complete the California Coastal Trail in two locations: connect the Indian Beach Trail to Marshall Beach Trail, and connect the Johnstone Trail to the Mount Vision Road and Inverness Ridge Trail.

Inverness Area

1. Manage these parcels as natural watershed, viewshed and wildlife habitat.
2. On the North Dream Farm property, consider developing a day-use trailhead, a self-guided nature trail loop, and an extension of the nature trail which would connect with the ridgetop trails of Point Reyes National Seashore.
3. Consider acquisitions from willing sellers, land exchanges, or land-use agreements to consolidate the park's three discontinuous Inverness Area parcels and make them more usable for public hiking both on the Tomales Bay side and to connect with trails in the Point Reyes National Seashore.
4. Encourage the State Department of Parks and Recreation to consider transferring to the Inverness Public Utility District the management or ownership of the three Assessors Parcels located around the District's watershed lands.

Millerton Area

1. Preserve and protect the Tomasini Point estuary area as habitat for native plants and animals.
2. Create a Millerton Uplands trail as part of a new segment of the California Coastal Trail.
3. Consider establishment of two trailheads to support the proposed Millerton Uplands trail—a southern trailhead near Millerton Point and a northern trailhead at Tomasini Point, including, if necessary for safety, a modest-sized and sensitively located and screened parking lot and restroom facilities on the east side of the highway near the

Unit I
Existing and Proposed Policy Comparison
State and Federal Parklands

entrance to Sheep Ranch Road.

4. Encourage the State Department of Parks and Recreation to maintain existing agricultural operations on acquired lands on the east shore of Tomales Bay until such time as the lands are developed for recreational purposes.

Marconi Cove Area

1. Provide day-use picnicking and boating facilities, including boat launch ramp, at this former marina/campground site.
2. Provide environmental campsites which could accommodate, but would not be limited to, camping needs of bicyclists, boaters, and future hikers of the California Coastal Trail.
3. Consider adaptation of the bathhouse (potentially historic) along Highway One to use as staff or campground host housing or for another park use.
4. Provide parking facilities, park entrance, restrooms, landscaping, interpretive signage, pathways, fencing, lighting, and campground amenities such as fire rings, tables, and food lockers.
5. Retain natural values, especially where the property is narrowest, on the south end.
6. Ensure that development and operation of recreational facilities at Marconi Cove consider potential impacts to freshwater and baywater quality, wildlife, and to existing state water bottom leases utilized for commercial shellfish aquaculture.

North Marshall Area

1. Preserve the natural resources and open space character of this property and consider future potential for low-intensity public access and use.
2. Since this property is remote from the park's other holdings and has limited recreational potential, explore the environmental and operational benefits that may be available through land exchanges, memoranda of understandings, or other arrangements with interested organizational stakeholders to achieve common goals of protecting and managing the natural resources and open space of this area.

[BOS app. 12/11/2012]

(PC app. 11/7/11, 9/19/11, 2/8/10)

[Adapted from Unit II Recreation and Visitor-Serving Facilities Policy 2.b, p. 42]

**Unit I
Existing and Proposed Policy Comparison
Stream Protection**

Unit I Stream Protection	
Unit I - Existing Policy	LCPA - Proposed Policy
<p><u>Policy I, pg. 19</u></p> <p>Stream impoundments and diversions shall be limited to necessary water supply projects, flood control projects where no other method for protecting existing structures in the flood plain is feasible and where such protection is necessary for public safety or to protect existing development, or developments where the primary function is the improvement of fish and wildlife habitat. Before any such activities are permitted, minimum flows necessary to maintain fish habitat and existing water quality, and to protect downstream resources (e.g. riparian vegetation, groundwater recharge areas, receiving waters, estuarine habitats, spawning areas) and other downstream users shall be determined by the Department of Fish and Game and the Division of Water Rights of the State Water Resources Control Board. New impoundments or diversions which, individually or cumulatively, would decrease streamflows below the minimum shall not be permitted.</p> <p><u>Policy Status</u></p> <p>The concept and standard of this policy is carried forward to LCPA Policy C-BIO-24, which also draws language from Unit I Stream Protection Policy 2 (p. 19), and Unit II Natural Resources Policy 3 (p. 72).</p>	<p>C-BIO-24 Coastal Streams and Riparian Vegetation.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>Stream alterations.</u> Limit channelizations, diversions, dams, or similar substantial alterations of coastal streams to the following purposes: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Necessary water supply projects where no other less environmentally damaging method of water supply is feasible; b. Flood control projects where no other method for protecting existing structures in the flood plain is feasible and where such protection is necessary for public safety or to protect existing development; or c. Developments where the primary function is the improvement of fish and wildlife habitat. <p>Before any such substantial alterations that would significantly disrupt the habitat value of a stream are permitted, minimum flows necessary to maintain fish habitat and water quality, and to protect downstream resources (e.g. riparian vegetation, groundwater recharge areas, receiving waters, spawning habitats, etc.) and downstream users shall be determined by the Department of Fish and Wildlife and the Division of Water Rights of the State Water Resources Control Board. Prohibit new impoundments which, individually or cumulatively, would decrease streamflows below the minimum.</p> 2. <u>Access and Utility Crossings.</u> Access and utility crossings shall be accomplished by clear span bridging, unless other methods are determined to be less disruptive to the stream and/or riparian ESHA. Wherever possible, shared bridges or other crossings shall be used to provide access and utilities to groups of lots covered by this policy. Bridge abutments shall be located outside stream channels and designed to minimize disturbance of riparian vegetation. 3. <u>Conditions.</u> Minimize the alteration of streams allowed for the purposes listed in (1) and (2) above in order to protect streamwater quality and the volume and rate of streamflow. Require all developments to incorporate the best mitigation measures feasible, including erosion and runoff control measures, and re-vegetation of disturbed areas with native species. Minimize the disturbance of riparian vegetation and require revegetation. <p>[BOS app. 10/2/2012, 11/13/2012] (PC app. 12/1/11, 1/24/11)</p>

Unit I
Existing and Proposed Policy Comparison
Stream Protection

	<p><i>[Adapted from Unit I Stream Protection Policies 1 and 2, p. 19, and Unit II Natural Resources Policy 3, p. 72]</i></p>
<p><u>Policy 2, pg. 19</u></p> <p>The alteration of stream channels and banks shall be allowed only for the developments identified in Policy II-1 in order to protect streamwater quality and the volume and rate of streamflow. All such developments shall incorporate the best mitigation measures feasible, including erosion and runoff control measures and revegetation of disturbed areas with native species.</p> <p><u>Policy Status</u></p> <p>Language from this policy is carried forward to LCPA Policy C-BIO-24, which also draws language from Unit I Stream Protection Policy I (p. 19), and Unit II Natural Resources Policy 3 (p. 72).</p>	<p>C-BIO-24 Coastal Streams and Riparian Vegetation.</p> <p>(See policy language above)</p>
<p><u>Policy 3, pg. 19</u></p> <p>A riparian protection area and a stream buffer area shall be established for all streams within Unit I. The riparian protection area shall include all existing riparian vegetation on both sides of the stream. The stream buffer area shall extend a minimum of 50 feet from the outer edge of the riparian vegetation, but in no case shall be less than 100 feet from the banks of the stream.</p> <p><u>Policy Status</u></p> <p>Language from this policy is carried forward to LCPA Policy C-BIO-“TBD”, which also draws language from Unit II Natural Resources Policy 3 (p. 72).</p>	<p>C-BIO-“TBD” Coastal Stream and Riparian Vegetation Buffers.</p> <p>Consistent with Policy C-BIO-3.1 (ESHA Buffers), establish buffers to protect streams from the impacts of adjacent uses including development impacts from construction and post-construction activities, and maintain such buffers in a natural condition. The buffer shall be the wider of the following on both sides of the stream: (a) the area 50 feet landward from the outer edge of the riparian vegetation, or (b) the area 100 feet landward from the top of the stream banks. No development shall be permitted in the stream or riparian vegetation buffer unless such development is authorized by C-BIO-2 (ESHA Protection), C-BIO-24 (Coastal Streams and Riparian Vegetation) or C-BIO-25 (Stream and Riparian Buffer Adjustments).</p> <p>[BOS app. 10/2/2012, 11/13/2012] (PC app. 12/1/11, 1/24/11)</p> <p><i>[Adapted from Unit I Stream Protection Policy 3, p. 19, and Unit II Natural Resources Policy 3, p. 72]</i></p>
<p><u>Policy 4, pg. 19</u></p> <p>No construction, alteration of land forms, or vegetation removal, shall be permitted within the riparian protection area. However, if a parcel is located entirely within the stream buffer, design review shall be required for any proposed structure and shall consider impacts on water quality, riparian vegetation/and the rate and volume of streamflow. In general, development shall be located on that portion of the site which results in the least impact on the stream, and shall include provision for mitigation measures to control erosion and runoff and to provide restoration of disturbed areas by replanting with plant species naturally</p>	<p>C-BIO-24 Coastal Streams and Riparian Vegetation.</p> <p>(See policy language above)</p> <p>C-BIO-25 Stream Buffer Adjustments and Exceptions.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A Coastal Permit that requires a buffer adjustment may be considered only if it conforms with zoning and: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. It is proposed on a legal lot of record located entirely within the buffer; or

Unit I
Existing and Proposed Policy Comparison
Stream Protection

found on the site.

Policy Status

The concept of this policy is carried forward to LCPA Policies **C-BIO-24** and **C-BIO-25**. LCPA Policy C-BIO-24 also draws language from Unit I Stream Protection Policies 1, 2 and 3 (p. 19), and Unit II Natural Resources Policy 3 (p. 72). See also LCPA Policy C-BIO-4 (p. 23) regarding the removal of “Major Vegetation.”

- b. It is demonstrated that permitted development cannot be feasibly accommodated entirely outside the required buffer; or
- c. It is demonstrated that the permitted development outside the buffer would have greater impact on the stream or riparian ESHA and the continuance of its habitat than development within the buffer.

2. A buffer adjustment may be granted only if supported by the findings of a site assessment which demonstrate that the adjusted buffer, in combination with incorporated siting, design or other mitigation measures, will prevent impacts that significantly degrade the stream or riparian vegetation, and will be compatible with the continuance of the stream/riparian ESHA.
3. A Coastal Permit authorizing a buffer adjustment shall require measures that create a net environmental improvement over existing conditions, in addition to what is otherwise required by minimum applicable site development standards. Such measures shall be commensurate with the nature and scope of the project and shall be determined at the site level, supported by the findings of a site assessment or other technical document. Work required in accordance with this Policy shall be completed prior to occupancy. Appropriate measures may include but are not limited to:
 - a. Retrofitting existing improvements or implementing new measures to reduce the rate or volume of stormwater run-off and improve the quality of stormwater run-off (e.g., permeable “hardscape” materials and landscape or site features designed to capture, absorb and filter stormwater);
 - b. Elimination of on-site invasive species;
 - c. Increasing native vegetation cover (e.g., expand continuous riparian vegetation cover, reduce turf areas, provide native groundcover, shrubs and trees);
 - d. Improvement of streambank or in-stream conditions (e.g., replace bank armoring, slope back streambanks, create inset floodplains, install large woody debris structures), in order to restore habitat;
 - e. Reduction in water consumption for irrigation (e.g., drought-tolerant landscaping or high efficiency irrigation systems);
 - f. Other measures that reduce overall similar site-related environmental impacts.
4. The buffer shall not be adjusted to a distance of less than 50 feet in width

Unit I
Existing and Proposed Policy Comparison
Stream Protection

	<p style="text-align: center;">from the edge of the stream/riparian ESHA.</p> <p>[BOS app. 10/2/2012, 11/13/2012, 1/15/2013, 2/26/2013] (PC app. 2/13/12, 12/1/11, 6/28/10) <i>[Adapted from Unit I Stream Protection Policy 4, p. 19]</i></p>
<p><u>Policy 5, pg. 20</u> <u>Pine Gulch Creek.</u> The USGS should install a stream gaging station as part of the Army Corps study of Lagoon to measure creek flow below the last significant stream diversion or at a location selected by the Department of Fish and Game, This station shall be monitored by the County Employee who patrols the Duxbury Reef/Bolinas Lagoon area.</p> <p><u>Policy Status</u> Beginning in 1998, the National Parks Service has maintained a water monitoring station with gauges located down stream of Olema-Bolinas Road bridge to document low flow conditions. This effort has been undertaken to support the Pine Gulch Creek Watershed Enhancement Project that was proposed through the Coho Salmon and Steelhead Trout Restoration Project.</p> <p>The stream monitoring program implemented by the National Parks Service is consistent with the goals of this policy, although the actual government agency conducting the monitoring is not the USGS or Marin County. The National Parks Service has collaborated with the Department of Fish and Game, Marin County, and local property owners in conducting this water monitoring. Staff considers this policy to have been implemented and is not carried forward.</p>	<p>n/a</p>
<p><u>Policy 6, pg. 20</u> <u>Pine Gulch Creek.</u> The Department of Fish and Game should begin studies to empirically determine the instream flow requirements of Pine Gulch Creek necessary to maintain the steelhead and silver salmon resource. In the event no funding is available for this work, Coastal Conservancy funds should be sought.</p> <p><u>Policy Status</u> Beginning in 1998, the National Parks Service has maintained water monitoring station with gauges located down stream of Olema-Bolinas Road bridge to document low flow conditions. This effort has been undertaken to support the Pine Gulch Creek Watershed Enhancement Project that was proposed through the Coho Salmon and Steelhead Trout Restoration Project, and has empirically determined the instream flow requirements for anadromous fish in Pine Gulch</p>	<p>n/a</p>

Unit I
Existing and Proposed Policy Comparison
Stream Protection

<p>Creek.</p> <p>The stream monitoring program implemented by the National Parks Service is consistent with the goals of this policy, although the actual government agency conducting the monitoring is not the Department of Fish and Game. The National Parks Service has collaborated with the Department of Fish and Game, Marin County, and local property owners in conducting this water monitoring. Staff considers this policy to have been implemented and has not been carried forward.</p>	
<p><u>Policy 7, pg. 20</u></p> <p><u>Pine Gulch Creek.</u> The County, landowners within the Pine Gulch Creek watershed, and the Soil Conservation Service should undertake a joint study to recommend agricultural uses and practices which will protect the water quality of the creek and also Bolinas Lagoon. The report should be prepared by the Soil Conservation Service. This report should also recommend alternative methods of supply water to agricultural users in the event stream diversions must be halted to protect anadromous resources. The report shall be distributed to all landowners within the watershed. SCS will be contacted to undertake the study upon adoption of this LCP. Where necessary, the findings of the study should be incorporated into the LCP as amendments. Recommended restoration techniques appropriate to permit applications should be included as conditions of permit approval.</p> <p><u>Policy Status</u></p> <p>The Soil Conservation Service did not conduct this study and there were no amendments to the LCP to address this issue. However, as indicated above in the discussion under policies 5 and 6, the Pine Gulch Creek Enhancement Project has been undertaken to maintain minimum stream flows for anadromous fish. The principal scientist for the project was Brannen Ketchum, a biologist working for the National Parks Service, but it involves private landowners, the California Water Resources Board, the California Department of Fish and Game, and Marin County. The Pine Gulch Creek Enhancement Project is achieving the intended purpose of this policy. Staff considers this policy to have been implemented and is not carried forward.</p> <p>The Pine Gulch Creek Enhancement Project is predicated on the approach that farmers can normally withdraw water from Pine Gulch Creek during the wet season without reducing instream flows below the level needed by anadromous fish, while water withdrawals during the dry season could adversely affect fish habitat. Water withdrawals are governed by State law, and may require permits from the California Water Resources Board and the Department of Fish and Game, but do not require permits from Marin County. However, for a farmer to</p>	<p>n/a</p>

Unit I
Existing and Proposed Policy Comparison
Stream Protection

<p>develop water reservoirs large enough to store sufficient water from the wet season to irrigate crops during the dry season, a Coastal Permit would be required.</p> <p>The Pine Gulch Creek Enhancement Project is a model of statewide importance because it effectively balances the water needs of both farmers and anadromous fish. Funding from the Coastal Conservancy is critical to the project's full implementation. Staff recommends a policy in the LCP amendment that would apply to all coastal stream courses that support anadromous fish which would encourage farmers to shift their water withdrawals from the dry season to the wet season, and support grant requests to the Coastal Conservancy for implementation.</p>																																																													
<p>Policy 8, pg. 20</p> <p><u>Redwood Creek</u>. The biotic resources of Redwood Creek shall be protected from intense development by the redesignation of the privately owned parcels along the Creek from 10,000 square feet lot size zoning to a 1 acre lot size zoning (See Policy IV-27).</p> <p>Policy Status: The table below indicates information regarding the lots referred to in this policy, represented as Assessor's Parcels. As indicated, with the exception of lots zoned for exclusive open space uses and owned by the National Parks Service, subsequent to the adoption of the LCP all the lots were rezoned to have a 1-acre minimum lot size by Board of Supervisors Ordinance 2638. Staff considers this policy to have been implemented, and thus the policy language is not carried forward to the LCFA.</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse; margin-top: 10px;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left;">APNs</th> <th style="text-align: left;">Zoning</th> <th style="text-align: left;">Minimum Size</th> <th style="text-align: left;">Lot</th> <th style="text-align: left;">Actual Lot Size</th> <th style="text-align: left;">Ordinance No.</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>199-150-30</td> <td>OA, C-OA (USA owned)</td> <td>none</td> <td></td> <td>8,285,528 sq. ft. 190.2 acres</td> <td>2292 2638</td> </tr> <tr> <td>199-181-06</td> <td>C-RA-B4</td> <td>1 acre</td> <td></td> <td>41,806 sq. ft. 0.9597 acre</td> <td>2638</td> </tr> <tr> <td>199-181-13</td> <td>C-RA-B4</td> <td>1 acre</td> <td></td> <td>32,362.75 sq. ft. 0.743 acre</td> <td>2638</td> </tr> <tr> <td>199-181-14</td> <td>C-RA-B4</td> <td>1 acre</td> <td></td> <td>9,039.87 sq. ft.</td> <td>2638</td> </tr> <tr> <td>199-191-13</td> <td>C-RA-B4 (USA owned)</td> <td>1 acre</td> <td></td> <td>260,676.54 sq. ft. 5.9843 acres</td> <td>2638</td> </tr> <tr> <td>199-192-17</td> <td>C-RA-B4</td> <td>1 acre</td> <td></td> <td>28,451.8 sq. ft. 0.653 acre</td> <td>2638</td> </tr> <tr> <td>199-192-18</td> <td>C-RA-B4</td> <td>1 acre</td> <td></td> <td>22,294.7 sq. ft. 0.512 acre</td> <td>2638</td> </tr> <tr> <td>199-192-19</td> <td>C-RA-B4</td> <td>1 acre</td> <td></td> <td>21,172.55 sq. ft. 0.486 acre</td> <td>2638</td> </tr> <tr> <td>199-192-20</td> <td>C-RA-B4</td> <td>1 acre</td> <td></td> <td>18,723.3 sq. ft. 0.43 acre</td> <td>2638</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	APNs	Zoning	Minimum Size	Lot	Actual Lot Size	Ordinance No.	199-150-30	OA, C-OA (USA owned)	none		8,285,528 sq. ft. 190.2 acres	2292 2638	199-181-06	C-RA-B4	1 acre		41,806 sq. ft. 0.9597 acre	2638	199-181-13	C-RA-B4	1 acre		32,362.75 sq. ft. 0.743 acre	2638	199-181-14	C-RA-B4	1 acre		9,039.87 sq. ft.	2638	199-191-13	C-RA-B4 (USA owned)	1 acre		260,676.54 sq. ft. 5.9843 acres	2638	199-192-17	C-RA-B4	1 acre		28,451.8 sq. ft. 0.653 acre	2638	199-192-18	C-RA-B4	1 acre		22,294.7 sq. ft. 0.512 acre	2638	199-192-19	C-RA-B4	1 acre		21,172.55 sq. ft. 0.486 acre	2638	199-192-20	C-RA-B4	1 acre		18,723.3 sq. ft. 0.43 acre	2638	n/a
APNs	Zoning	Minimum Size	Lot	Actual Lot Size	Ordinance No.																																																								
199-150-30	OA, C-OA (USA owned)	none		8,285,528 sq. ft. 190.2 acres	2292 2638																																																								
199-181-06	C-RA-B4	1 acre		41,806 sq. ft. 0.9597 acre	2638																																																								
199-181-13	C-RA-B4	1 acre		32,362.75 sq. ft. 0.743 acre	2638																																																								
199-181-14	C-RA-B4	1 acre		9,039.87 sq. ft.	2638																																																								
199-191-13	C-RA-B4 (USA owned)	1 acre		260,676.54 sq. ft. 5.9843 acres	2638																																																								
199-192-17	C-RA-B4	1 acre		28,451.8 sq. ft. 0.653 acre	2638																																																								
199-192-18	C-RA-B4	1 acre		22,294.7 sq. ft. 0.512 acre	2638																																																								
199-192-19	C-RA-B4	1 acre		21,172.55 sq. ft. 0.486 acre	2638																																																								
199-192-20	C-RA-B4	1 acre		18,723.3 sq. ft. 0.43 acre	2638																																																								

Unit I
Existing and Proposed Policy Comparison
Stream Protection

199-192-21	C-RA-B4	1 acre	47,302.47 sq. ft. 1.086 acres	2638	
199-211-02	C-RA-B4	1 acre	9,718.48 sq. ft.	2638	
199-213-05	C-RA-B4 (USA owned)	1 acre	71,292.66 sq. ft. 1.6366 acres	2638	
199-213-06	C-ARP-60	1 unit/60 acres	45,774.9 sq. ft. 1.0508 acres	2638	
199-241-03	C-OA (USA owned)		923,884.55 sq. ft. 21.21 acre	2292 2638	
<p><u>Policy 9, pg. 20</u></p> <p><u>Redwood Creek.</u> The USGS should install a stream gaging station to measure creek flow below the last significant stream diversion at a location selected by the National Park Service and California Department of Fish and Game. This station should be monitored by the Park Service.</p> <p><u>Policy Status</u></p> <p>On May 13, 2008, the Board of Supervisors Certified the “Wetland and Creek Restoration at Big Lagoon, Muir Beach, Marin County EIR/EIS” prepared under the joint sponsorship of Marin County and the National Parks Service. The EIR/EIS contains a level of analysis that far exceeds the level of analysis encouraged in this policy with respect to Redwood Creek including the maintenance and monitoring of stream gauge stations. Staff considers this policy to have been implemented, and thus the policy language is not carried forward to the LCPA.</p>					n/a
<p><u>Policy 10, pg. 20</u></p> <p><u>Redwood Creek.</u> The Department of Fish and Game should begin studies to empirically determine the instream flow requirements of Redwood Creek necessary to maintain the steelhead and silver salmon resource. In the event no funding is available for this work, Coastal Conservancy funds shall be sought.</p> <p><u>Policy Status</u></p> <p>On May 13, 2008, the Board of Supervisors Certified the “Wetland and Creek Restoration at Big Lagoon, Muir Beach, Marin County EIR/EIS” prepared under the joint sponsorship of Marin County and the National Parks Service. The EIR/EIS contains a level of analysis that far exceeds the level of analysis encouraged in this policy with respect to Redwood Creek including the maintenance and monitoring of stream gauge stations. Staff considers this policy to have been implemented, and thus the policy language is not carried forward to the LCPA.</p>					n/a
<p><u>Policy 11, pg. 20</u></p>					

Unit I
Existing and Proposed Policy Comparison
Stream Protection

<p><u>Redwood Creek</u>. The National Park Service should be encouraged to investigate the possibility of creating artificial pools through Muir Woods National Monument to increase the streams carrying capacity of one and two year old salmonids. This would increase the number of salmonids spawning within the boundaries of the National Monument, and provide a better opportunity for the public to view salmonid reproductive behavior.</p> <p><u>Policy Status</u></p> <p>Staff has contacted the Muir Woods National Monument to determine whether their staff has created artificial pools to improve stream habitat for salmonids. Park Service staff* has indicated that the NPS has focused restoration efforts for a number of years on improving the habitat in the creek for salmonids by no longer removing woody debris from the creek, and that the NPS has placed woody debris in the creek in at least five locations to encourage the natural dynamic and complexity of the stream channel. These activities have been undertaken in part to provide the public with a view of fish habitat that has been restored to its original state, to the degree possible. Staff considers this policy to have been implemented, and thus the policy language is not carried forward to the LCPA.</p>	<p>n/a</p>
---	------------

**Unit I
Existing and Proposed Policy Comparison
Lagoon Protection**

Unit I Lagoon Protection	
Unit I - Existing Policy	LCPA - Proposed Policy
<p><u>Policy 12, pg. 25</u></p> <p>A single, coordinated resource management plan to guide the future use and activities in and around Bolinas Lagoon shall be developed with the involvement of the various public agencies that have specific legislative and regulatory responsibilities over different activities in and around the Lagoon. This plan would identify:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The level, type and location of recreational facilities and uses; • The level, type and location of commercial fishing and aquaculture activities; • The location and types of educational and scientific programs and facilities; • The legal and physical programs necessary to protect and enhance specific wildlife and marine resources and habitats; and • The management techniques, programs and responsibilities to successfully implement such a resource management plan. <p>Such a joint agency/organization resource planning program shall be established within 12 months of final certification of the LCP. The County of Marin would seek Coastal Commission or Conservancy funding to establish this management program.</p> <p><u>Policy Status</u></p> <p>The majority of the area comprising the wetlands of Bolinas Lagoon are owned and managed by the Marin County Department of Parks and Open Space (which includes the Open Space District). Portions of Bolinas Lagoon are also owned by the National Parks Service, and a portion of Kent Island, which is in Bolinas Lagoon, is owned by Audubon Canyon Ranch. Bolinas Lagoon is included in the Gulf of the Farallones National Marine Sanctuary and is within the original jurisdiction of the Coastal Commission.</p> <p>In conformance with this policy, the Bolinas Lagoon Technical Advisory Committee was first established as a standing committee of the Parks, Open Space and Cultural Commission on February 21, 1974, and then reestablished as a Committee of the Board of Supervisors on May 6, 2008, and meets on a periodic basis to provide advice to Parks and Open Space staff regarding lagoon management decisions. The Technical Advisory Committee consists of thirteen representatives from public agencies and other stake holders, including the</p>	<p>n/a</p>

Unit I
Existing and Proposed Policy Comparison
Lagoon Protection

<p>National Parks Service, the Army Corps of Engineers, Gulf of the Farallones National Marine Sanctuary, Audubon Canyon Ranch, PRBO Conservation Science, and others.</p> <p>Several planning and environmental review documents have been prepared subsequent to the original Bolinas Lagoon Plan of 1972. Among these are the Bolinas Lagoon Management Plan Update of 1996 and, most recently, the Bolinas Lagoon Ecosystem Restoration Project Recommendations for Restoration and Management, which was adopted by the Marin County Board of Supervisors (which also serves as the Open Space District Board) in August, 2008.</p> <p>The Bolinas Lagoon Management Plan update and the Lagoon Ecosystem Restoration Project Recommendations for Restoration and Management were developed with the input of a wide variety of public agencies, including the National Parks Service, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Agency (NOAA), the Army Corp of Engineers, the California Department of Fish and Game, Audubon Canyon Ranch, PRBO Conservation Science, and others. These policy documents are based on substantial scientific study over the course of many years and contain management guidelines and recommend restoration priorities. These policies address the items listed in the policy. Staff considers this policy to have been implemented, and thus the policy language is not carried forward to the LCPA.</p>	
<p><u>Policy 13, pg. 26</u></p> <p>Prior to the completion of the joint agency resource planning program described in Policy 11-12, above, the following policies shall apply:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Except where modified below, the Bolinas Lagoon Plan's Policies are incorporated by reference as the LCP policies governing uses and development in and around the Lagoon. b. The diking, filling, dredging and other alterations of these wetlands shall occur only for minor public works projects and shall be in conformance with Coastal Act Section 30233. The construction of physical improvements along the Bolinas Lagoon parklands is not consistent with these Lagoon policies. c. Maintenance dredging of existing boating channels may occur prior to final recommendations of the present Army Corps of Engineers study. Additional alteration of these wetlands will be considered as an LCP amendment following review of this study's recommendations. d. Commercial extraction of marine species should be prohibited pending completion of adequate base studies and the management program. Recreational fishing activities should be monitored by the Department of Fish and Game to establish any necessary modifications in open areas or take 	<p>n/a</p>

Unit I
Existing and Proposed Policy Comparison
Lagoon Protection

<p>limits.</p> <p>e. The Lagoon's waters continue to experience significant pollution and degraded quality from past and present adjoining land use activities. The correction of those factors contributing to poor water quality shall continue. However, until tests substantiate conclusive improvements in water quality, the health, safety and welfare of the general public require continuation of existing health quarantine for the Lagoon.</p> <p>f. A five mile per hour speed limit will be established within the Lagoon in order to protect wildlife habitat from disturbances and to minimize conflicts between swimmers, fishermen, naturalists, boaters, and other lagoon users. An ordinance that, at the minimum, includes such a speed limit shall be presented to the State Coastal Commission for certification within 120 days of the adoption of the land use plan.</p> <p><u>Policy Status</u></p> <p>As indicated in the discussion above for Policy 12, joint agency management plans for Bolinas Lagoon have been developed, including the Bolinas Lagoon Management Plan Update and the Bolinas Lagoon Ecosystem Restoration Project Recommendations for Restoration and Management. Marin County Code section 11.32.030, Harbors and Waterways Bolinas Lagoon Nature Preserve, established a speed limit of 5 miles per hour in Bolinas Lagoon. Staff considers this policy to have been implemented, and thus the policy language is not carried forward to the LCPA.</p>	
<p><u>Policy 14, pg. 26</u></p> <p>The use of toxic substances to control algae growth in any body of water which is discharged into a public waterway shall be subject to a discharge permit from the Regional Water Quality Control Board.</p> <p><u>Policy Status</u></p> <p>This policy simply describes a state agency's regulatory requirement, rather than stating an objective that could guide the actions of the County or State agencies. Therefore, this policy is not carried forward to the LCPA.</p>	n/a
<p><u>Policy 15, pg. 26</u></p> <p>The possibility of a publicly-sponsored restoration project to eliminate all vacant lots along the north side of Calle del Arroyo through acquisition or the transfer of what limited development potential such parcels may have to another area is encouraged. The Coastal Conservancy, the Audubon Society and other potentially</p>	n/a

Unit I
Existing and Proposed Policy Comparison
Lagoon Protection

<p>interested agencies or organizations should be advised of the importance of pursuing such a restoration project.</p> <p><u>Policy Status</u></p> <p>The area referred to in this policy is an area of deferred certification, frequently referred to as a “white hole” where the Coastal Commission maintains their original jurisdiction. As such, this policy was not incorporated into the “Development Requirements, standards, and conditions” indicated in Section 22.56.130I of the Interim Title 22 Zoning Ordinance. Pursuant to Ordinance 2638, these lots were excluded from the Coastal Zoning District designation. Coastal Permits for development in this area are reviewed and issued by the Coastal Commission rather than Marin County. Since this would continue to be an area of deferred certification, this policy is inapplicable and is not carried forward to the LCPA.</p>	
<p><u>Policy 16, pg. 27</u></p> <p>Pending implementation of a restoration project for the vacant lots along the north side of Calle del Arroyo, the area shall be redesignated as a "Resource Management Area" for a use or uses consistent with the maintenance of the marsh areas located both on and adjacent to the lots. The designation of the area as a "Resource Management Area" will recognize the severe development constraints affecting these properties due to their size and location in proximity to Bolinas Lagoon, and will thus assure conformity with Sections 30233 and 30240 (a) and (b) of the Coastal Act.</p> <p>Permitted uses of the Resource Management Area shall include fishing, birdwatching, photography, nature study, and other similar scientific and recreational uses. In addition, other uses may be permitted by use permit which will assure that such uses are sited and designed to be of controlled intensity and location such that they will not adversely affect the adjacent marsh area. The use permit procedure shall also assure that the uses are compatible with the character of the adjacent community. Uses which may be permitted by use permit shall include: small boat and equipment storage, non-commercial private parking, apiaries, truck farming, (provided that the application of pesticides, herbicides and other toxic chemicals is prohibited), and other uses of similar type and intensity.</p> <p>Existing dwellings shall be designated non-conforming uses but shall be allowed to rebuild if damaged or destroyed by natural disaster, provided however, that the floor area, height and bulk of the new structure shall not exceed that of the destroyed structure by more than 10 percent, and that the new structure is set back as far as feasible from the wetland area. Any proposed improvement to an existing home which results in more than a 10 percent increase in internal floor</p>	<p>n/a</p>

Unit I
Existing and Proposed Policy Comparison
Lagoon Protection

area of the structure shall require a coastal permit in order to assure that such an improvement is sited and designed to minimize impacts on the adjacent marsh. Such improvements shall only be permitted if an acceptable wastewater system is provided in accordance with the applicable LCP policy, and if the improvements are located as far as feasible from the adjacent wetland area.

Policy Status

The area referred to in this policy is an area of deferred certification. As such, this policy was not incorporated into the “Development Requirements, standards, and conditions” indicated in Section 22.56.1301 of the Interim Title 22 Zoning Ordinance. Pursuant to Ordinance 2638, these lots were excluded from the Coastal Zoning District designation. Coastal Permits for development in this area are reviewed and issued by the Coastal Commission rather than Marin County.

Staff has conducted research into the lots affected by this policy, and provided summary information in the table below. This information was taken from the County’s GIS system layers that show orthophotographs, Assessor’s Parcel lines and numbers, ownership information, and the National Hydrographic Database. If physical structures are shown on the 2007 orthophotos, then the Assessor’s Parcel is indicated to be developed. Approximate measurements were taken from the edge of wetlands and streams to estimate apparent constraints, but this information has not been verified in the field. Therefore, in some instances it will be inaccurate. Staff believes that all of the Assessor’s Parcels listed are separate legal lots of record. All the properties are within Assessor’s Book 195.

APN	Ownership	Zoning	Status	Apparent Constraints
132-31	Beacock	C-H-1	Undeveloped	All stream/ riparian buffer
132-30	Harris	C-H-1	Developed	Partial stream/ riparian buffer
132-29	Harris	C-H-1	Developed	Partial stream/ riparian buffer
132-28	SB County Water District	C-H-1	Developed	Partial stream/ riparian buffer
101-16	Avella	C-H-1	Undeveloped	Partial stream/ riparian buffer
101-01	Lanigan	R-1	Developed	Partial riparian buffer
101-02	Lanigan	R-1	Undeveloped	Partial riparian buffer
101-03	Lanigan	R-1	Undeveloped	Partial riparian buffer
101-04	Lanigan	R-1	Undeveloped	Partial riparian buffer
101-05	Christesen	R-1	Developed	Partial riparian buffer
101-06	Gilman	R-1	Developed	Partial riparian buffer
101-07	Lynch	R-1	Developed	Partial riparian buffer
101-18	Roberts	R-1	Developed	Partial riparian buffer
101-10	Brooke	R-1	Developed	Partial riparian buffer
101-11	Streitfeld	R-1	Developed	Partial riparian buffer
101-12	Yuill-Thornton	R-1	Developed	Partial riparian buffer

Unit I
Existing and Proposed Policy Comparison
Lagoon Protection

101-13 101-17 101-05	Wood Raymond County of Marin	R-1 R-1 R-1	Developed Developed Undeveloped Open Space	Partial riparian buffer Partial riparian buffer All wetland/ stream/ buffer	
061-01	County of Marin	R-1	Undeveloped Open Space	Partial wetland buffer	
061-12	County of Marin	R-1	Undeveloped Open Space	Partial wetland buffer	
061-13	County of Marin	R-1	Undeveloped Open Space	Partial wetland buffer	
061-15	County of Marin	R-1	Undeveloped Open Space	Partial wetland buffer	
061-16	Shauf	R-1	Developed	Partial wetland buffer	
061-16	Shauf	R-1	Developed	Partial wetland buffer	
061-17	Shauf	R-1	Developed	Partial wetland buffer	
061-18	Shauf	R-1	Developed	All wetland buffer	
061-22	Audubon Canyon Ranch	R-1	Undeveloped	Partial wetland buffer	
061-21	County of Marin	R-1	Undeveloped	Partial wetland buffer	
090-54	Seadrift Association	R-1	Undeveloped	Partial wetland buffer	
<p>As indicated in the table above, many of the Assessor's Parcels are developed, and all of them are potentially constrained by streams, riparian areas, wetlands and buffers. The LCPA policies that protect streams, riparian areas, wetlands and buffers would adequately protect these resources where they occur in this area. Further, much of this area has been purchased for permanent protection by the Marin County Department of Parks and Open Space or Audubon Canyon Ranch. Since this area would remain within the permitting jurisdiction of the Coastal Commission, this policy is inapplicable and is not carried forward to the LCPA.</p>					
<p><u>Policy 17, pg. 27</u></p> <p>The eleven-acre Henry Wilkins property (Assessor Parcel Numbers 195290-13 and 24) is the only remaining hightide roost for shorebirds and water fowl in Bolinas Lagoon that is protected from significant disturbance, and is the only habitat adjacent to the lagoon for snipe (<i>Capella gallinago</i>), with a population of about 100 individuals. In addition, it is one of the few locations around the lagoon where there is a transition from salt marsh to freshwater marsh habitats and thereby adds to the total diversity of habitat areas around the lagoon. In order to protect the wetland and upland habitat values of the parcel, changes in existing grazing use of the site shall be preceded by detailed environmental investigation and shall assure protection of the habitat values of the site in accordance with other policies in the LCP. Public acquisition of the site is encouraged.</p>					n/a

**Unit I
Existing and Proposed Policy Comparison
Lagoon Protection**

<p><u>Policy Status</u></p> <p>This policy is related to the same issue that is addressed in Natural Resources policy 26 (need a correct reference), which also refers to upland bird habitat near Bolinas Lagoon. By tracing the history of this policy through previous documents, including a 1975 study conducted by the PRBO entitled “Aspects of the Ecology of Shorebirds on Bolinas Lagoon” and the subsequent Bolinas Community Plan, it is evident that the central concern regarding this property and the other properties located on the west shore of Bolinas Lagoon south of Pine Gulch Creek was structural development, rather than changing use between grazing and other forms of agriculture. Further, development in general is subject to Coastal Permit requirements, so it is not necessary to impose a different standard for this property then would be required for any other property that may have upland bird habitat near Bolinas Lagoon. Staff does not recommend incorporating this policy into the LCP amendment.</p>	
<p><u>Policy 18, pg. 28</u></p> <p>To the maximum extent feasible, a buffer strip, a minimum of 100 feet in width, shall be maintained in natural condition along the periphery of all wetlands as delineated by the Department of Fish and Game and in accordance with Section 30121 of the Coastal Act and with the criteria developed by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. No uses other than those dependent upon the resources shall be allowed within the buffer strip.</p> <p><u>Policy Status</u></p> <p>This policy has been carried forward to policy C-BIO-19, which also draws language from Unit II Natural Resources Policy 4 (p. 74).</p>	<p>C-BIO-19 Wetland Buffers. Consistent with Policy C-BIO-3.1 (ESHA Buffers), maintain a buffer area, a minimum of 100 feet in width, in a natural condition along the periphery of all wetlands. A wider buffer may be required based on the results of a site assessment, if such an assessment is determined to be necessary, and the site assessment concludes that a buffer greater than 100 feet in width is necessary to protect wetland resources from the impacts of the proposed development, including construction and post-construction impacts. No development shall be permitted within the wetland buffer, unless such development is authorized by C-BIO-2 (ESHA Protection), C-BIO-14 (Wetlands), C-BIO-15 (Diking, Filling, Draining and Dredging), or C-BIO-20 (Wetland Buffer Adjustments). [BOS app. 10/2/2012, 11/13/2012] (PC app. 12/1/11, 6/28/10) <i>[Adapted from Unit I Lagoon Protection policy 18, p. 28, and Unit II Natural Resources Policy 4.d, p. 74]</i></p>

**Unit I
Existing and Proposed Policy Comparison
Natural Dune and Sandy Beach Protection**

Unit I Natural Dune and Sandy Beach Protection	
Unit I - Existing Policy	LCPA - Proposed Policy
<p><u>Policy 19, pg. 29</u></p> <p>In order to preserve the natural sand dune formation and sandy beach habitat, and to protect potential prescriptive rights over the dry sand areas west of the Patios, development of the existing lots west of the paper street Mira Vista shall not be permitted. These lots shall be rezoned from R-1 to RSP-2.0, and contiguous ownerships across Mira Vista shall be consolidated in order to assure protection of the existing sandy beach areas. No development, including erection of fences, signs, or other structures, shall be permitted west of Mira Vista in order to preserve both the natural dune habitat values, vegetation and contours, as well as the natural sandy beach habitat, and to protect potential public prescriptive rights over the area.</p> <p>The County shall continue to pursue a land trade between the lots seaward of Mira Vista and the street right-of-way as proposed in the Stinson Beach Community plan, in order to more clearly establish and define the boundaries between public and private beach areas.</p> <p><u>Policy Status</u></p> <p>This policy has been carried forward to LCPA Policy C-BIO-9, which also draws language from Unit I Natural Dune and Sandy Beach Protection Policy 20 (p. 29).</p>	<p>C-BIO-9 Stinson Beach Dune and Beach Areas. Prohibit development that would adversely impact the natural sand dune formation and sandy beach habitat in the areas west of the paper street Mira Vista and the dry sand areas west of the Patios. Prohibit development west of Mira Vista, including erection of fences, signs, or other structures, to preserve the natural dune habitat values, vegetation and contours, as well as the natural sandy beach habitat. Continue to pursue a land trade between the lots seaward of Mira Vista and the street right-of-way to more clearly establish and define the boundaries between public and private beach areas.</p> <p>Site development of other shorefront lots within the Stinson Beach and Seadrift areas outside of the natural sand dune formations, consistent with LUP Policy C-BIO-7 (Coastal Dunes). Where no dunes are evident, any new development on shorefront lots shall be set back behind the first line of terrestrial vegetation to the maximum extent feasible, in order to minimize the need for protective works, protect sandy beach habitat, and provide a buffer area between private and public use areas to protect both the scenic and visual character of the beach, and the public right of access to the use and enjoyment of dry sand areas. [BOS app. 11/13/2012, 1/15/2013] (PC app. 12/1/11, 6/28/10) [Adapted from Unit I Natural Dune and Sandy Beach Protection Policies 19 and 20, p. 29]</p>
<p><u>Policy 20, pg. 29</u></p> <p>Development of other shorefront lots within the Stinson Beach and Seadrift areas shall assure preservation of the natural sand dune formations in order to protect environmentally sensitive dune habitat and vegetation and to maintain the natural protection from wave runup that such natural dunes provide. Where no dunes are evident, any new development on shorefront lots shall be set back behind the first line of terrestrial vegetation to the maximum extent feasible, in order to minimize the need for protective works, to protect sandy beach habitat, and to provide a buffer area between private and public use areas in order to protect both the scenic and visual character of the beach, and the public right of access to the use and enjoyment of dry sand areas.</p> <p><u>Policy Status</u></p>	<p>C-BIO-9 Stinson Beach Dune and Beach Areas.</p> <p>(See policy language above)</p>

Unit I
Existing and Proposed Policy Comparison
Natural Dune and Sandy Beach Protection

<p>This policy has been carried forward to LCPA Policy C-BIO-9, which also draws language from Unit I Natural Dune and Sandy Beach Protection Policy 19 (p. 29).</p>	
<p><u>Policy 21, pg. 30</u></p> <p>No additional subdivision of beachfront lots shall be permitted in recognition of the cumulative negative impacts such divisions would have on both public and private use of the beach, except if a finding is made that such a subdivision will be consistent with the above policy. Similarly, the erection of fences, signs, or other structures seaward of any existing or proposed development and the modification of any dune or sandy beach area shall not be permitted except as provided in Chapter III of the LCP in order to protect natural shoreline processes, the scenic and visual character of the beach, and the public and private use of dry sand areas in accordance with Section 30211 of the Coastal Act.</p> <p><u>Policy Status</u></p> <p>This policy has been carried forward to LCPA Policy C-CD-10.</p>	<p>C-CD-10 Subdivision of Beachfront Lots. No additional subdivision of beachfront lots shall be permitted in recognition of the cumulative negative impacts such divisions would have on both public and private use of the beach, except if a finding is made that such a subdivision will be consistent with the development of shoreline lots within the Stinson Beach and Seadrift areas in Biological Resources Policy C-BIO-9. Similarly, the erection of fences, signs, or other structures seaward of any existing or proposed development and the modification of any dune or sandy beach area shall not be permitted except as provided in the Environmental Hazards policies in order to protect natural shoreline processes, the scenic and visual character of the beach, and the public and private use of dry sand areas in accordance with Section 30211 of the Coastal Act.</p> <p>(PC app. 9/19/11, 7/29/10)</p> <p><i>[Adapted from Unit I Natural Dune and Sandy Beach Protection Policy 21, p. 30]</i></p>

**Unit I
Existing and Proposed Policy Comparison
Habitat Protection**

Unit I Habitat Protection	
Unit I - Existing Policy	LCPA - Proposed Policy
<p><u>Policy 22, pg. 34</u> Butterfly trees and other trees or vegetation identified on the natural resource maps on file with the Marin County Planning Department, which provide roosting and/or nesting habitat of wildlife, shall be considered major vegetation, and significant alteration or removal of such vegetation shall require a coastal project permit pursuant to Section 30106 of the Coastal Act. Such trees shall not be altered or removed except where they pose a threat to life or property.</p> <p><u>Policy Status</u> This policy has been carried forward to LCPA Policies C-BIO-4 and C-BIO-10.</p>	<p>C-BIO-4 Protect Major Vegetation. Require a Coastal Permit for the removal or harvesting of major vegetation. Coastal Permits shall allow the management or removal of major vegetation where necessary to minimize risks to life and property or to promote the health and survival of surrounding vegetation native to the locale, while avoiding adverse impacts to an ESHA or its buffer, coastal waters, and public views, and shall not conflict with prior conditions of approval, consistent with Policy C-EH-25 (Vegetation Management in an ESHA). [BOS app. 10/2/2012] (PC app. 2/13/12, 1/23/12, 6/28/10) <i>[Adapted from Unit I Habitat Protection Policy 22, p. 34, and Interim County Code Section 22.56.055]</i></p> <p>C-BIO-10 Roosting and Nesting Habitat. Prohibit the alteration or removal of groves of trees that provide colonial nesting and roosting habitat for monarch butterflies or other wildlife, except where the trees pose a threat to life or property. [BOS app. 10/2/2012] (PC app. 12/1/11, 6/28/10) <i>[Adapted from Unit I Habitat Protection Policy 22, p. 34]</i></p>
<p><u>Policy 23, pg. 34</u> Development adjacent to wildlife nesting and roosting areas shall be set back a sufficient distance to minimize impacts on the habitat area. Such development activities shall be timed so that disturbance to nesting and breeding wildlife is minimized and shall, to the extent practical, use native vegetation for landscaping.</p> <p><u>Policy Status</u> This policy has been carried forward to LCPA Policy C-BIO-11.</p>	<p>C-BIO-11 Development Adjacent to Roosting and Nesting Habitat. Development adjacent to wildlife nesting and roosting areas shall be set back a sufficient distance to protect against disruption in nesting and roosting activities and designed to avoid impacts on the habitat area. Time such development activities so that disturbance to nesting and breeding wildlife is minimized. To the extent feasible, use native vegetation for landscaping. (PC app. 12/1/11, 6/28/10) <i>[Adapted Unit I Habitat Protection Policy 23, p. 34]</i></p>
<p><u>Policy 24, pg. 34</u> Public access to these identified sensitive habitat areas, including the timing, intensity, and location of such access, shall be controlled to minimize disturbance</p>	<p>C-BIO-1 Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas (ESHAs).</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. An environmentally sensitive habitat area (ESHA) is any area in which plant or animal life or their habitats are either rare or especially valuable because of

**Unit I
Existing and Proposed Policy Comparison
Habitat Protection**

<p>to wildlife.</p> <p><u>Policy Status</u></p> <p>This policy has been carried forward to LCPA Policy C-BIO-I, which also draws language from Unit I Habitat Protection Policy 25 (p. 34) and Unit II Natural Resources Policy 5 (p. 74).</p>	<p>their special nature or role in an ecosystem and which could be easily disturbed or degraded by human activities and developments.</p> <p>2. ESHA consists of three general categories: wetlands, streams and riparian vegetation, and terrestrial ESHAs. Terrestrial ESHA refers to those non-aquatic habitats that support rare and endangered species; coastal dunes as referenced in C-BIO-7 (Coastal Dunes); roosting and nesting habitats as referenced in C-BIO-10 (Roosting and Nesting Habitats); and riparian vegetation that is not associated with a perennial or intermittent stream. The ESHA policies of C-BIO-2 (ESHA Protection) and C-BIO-3 (ESHA Buffers) apply to all categories of ESHA, except where modified by the more specific policies of the LCP.</p> <p>[BOS app. 10/2/2012, 11/13/2012, 1/15/2013] (PC app. 1/23/12, 12/1/11, 1/24/11)</p> <p>[Adapted from Unit I Habitat Protection Policies 24 and 25, p. 34, and Unit II Natural Resources Policy 5, p. 74]</p>
<p><u>Policy 25, p. 34</u></p> <p>Fences, roads, and structures which significantly inhibit wildlife movement, particularly access to water, shall be avoided.</p> <p><u>Policy Status</u></p> <p>This policy has been carried forward to LCPA Policy C-BIO-I, which also draws language from Unit I Habitat Protection Policy 25 (p. 34) and Unit II Natural Resources Policy 5 (p. 74).</p>	<p>C-BIO-I Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas (ESHAs).</p> <p>(See policy language above)</p>
<p><u>Policy 26, p. 34</u></p> <p>Upland grassland feeding areas shall be protected against any significant disruption of habitat values.</p> <p><u>Policy Status</u></p> <p>This policy has been carried forward to LCPA Program C-BIO-11.a.</p>	<p>Program C-BIO-11.a Grassy Uplands Surrounding Bolinas Lagoon.</p> <p>Collect and evaluate data and studies to determine the habitat values of upland grassland feeding areas around Bolinas Lagoon for shorebirds, and develop effective policies to protect these areas against significant disruption of habitat values. Limited agricultural use of these lands may be permitted.</p> <p>[BOS app. 10/2/2012] (PC app. 12/1/11, 1/24/11)</p> <p>[Adapted from Unit I Habitat Protection Policy 26, p. 34]</p>
<p><u>Policy 27, pg. 34</u></p> <p>Use of Duxbury reef shall continue to be regulated in accordance with existing State laws. The area should continue to be patrolled by a representative of the County Parks and Recreation Department on a daily basis.</p>	<p>n/a</p>

Unit I
Existing and Proposed Policy Comparison
Habitat Protection

<p><u>Policy Status</u></p> <p>Marin County Park Rangers patrol and maintain the area adjacent to Duxbury Reef, including the Agate Beach Park parking lot, trail, and beach area. Park Rangers perform outreach and education activities to inform the public about existing regulations and protecting sensitive marine resources. Park Rangers patrol the Agate Beach Park area two times per week. Marin County Park Rangers do not have citation powers. Marin County Sheriff Officers have citation powers for activities under their authority. California Department of Fish and Game (DFG) is responsible for enforcing Fish and Game code</p> <p>Duxbury Reef is presumably State Lands. The reef lies within the Gulf of the Farallones National Marine Sanctuary (GNMS) Duxbury Reef is also part of the State's system of marine protected areas (MPA), the "Duxbury State Marine Park" (Duxbury SMP). GNMS and the State, through the Duxbury SMP designation, manage the reef, ocean waters, near-shore environment, and adjacent areas to protect and conserve habitat, ecological processes, species diversity and abundance (including protected species and those of economic value), marine heritage, and to improve recreational, educational, and study opportunities. The State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) considers Duxbury Reef a "Critical Coastal Area", and identifies it as an "Area of Special Biological Significance" (ASBS). Therefore, multiple agencies at the County, State and Federal levels of government regulate and enforce protections at Duxbury Reef. Given the uncertainty of funding priorities for County patrols of the area, this policy is not carried forward to the LCPA. Decisions regarding patrols will be left to the Marin County Department of Parks and Open Space and to the other agencies that are responsible for protecting Duxbury Reef.</p>	
<p><u>Policy 28, pg. 34</u></p> <p>Invasive exotic plant species are proliferating in the Coastal Zone at the expense of native plants. In order to preserve indigenous native plant species within the Coastal Zone, development permits shall be conditioned, where applicable, to require the removal of any invasive, non-indigenous plant species such as Pampas Grass, Brooms, and Thistles.</p> <p><u>Policy Status</u></p> <p>This policy has been carried forward to LCPA Policy C-BIO-6.</p>	<p>C-BIO-6 Invasive Plants. Where feasible, require the removal of non-native, invasive plant species such as pampas grass, brooms, iceplant, thistles and other invasive plant species on the list maintained by the California Invasive Plant Council in the areas of development and revegetate those areas with native plants as specified in Coastal Permit approvals. Ensure that required landscaping avoids use of non-native, invasive trees and plants in accordance with Policy C-DES-9 Landscaping. This policy does not apply to agricultural crops and pastures. [BOS app. 10/2/2012] (PC app. 12/1/11, 1/24/11) <i>[Adapted from Unit I Habitat Protection Policy 28, p. 34]</i></p>

**Unit I
Existing and Proposed Policy Comparison
Agriculture**

Unit I Agriculture	
Unit I - Existing Policy	LCPA - Proposed Policy
<p><u>Policy 29, pg. 35</u></p> <p>Certification of the remaining large agricultural holdings within Unit I which are greater than 60 acres in size shall be deferred until consideration of the Unit II LCP in order to facilitate development and application of a coordinated and consistent approach to the protection of large agricultural holdings within the total Marin County Coastal Zone. These areas consist of the following Assessor's Parcel Numbers:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">188-090-02, 04, 05, 06, 09, 10, 11</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">188-120-09, 11, 15, 19</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">188-170-01, 06, 18, 56, 57</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">199-150-20, 21</p> <p><u>Policy Status</u></p> <p>This policy is no longer relevant and thus is not carried forward to the LCPA.</p>	<p>n/a</p>
<p><u>Policy 30, pg. 35</u></p> <p>In order to preserve the maximum amount of agricultural land, protect important upland grassland feeding areas and to promote the concentration of development in accordance with Section 30240 (a) and (b), 30241, 30242 and 30250 of the Coastal Act, the land now designated as A-5 and A-10 zoning districts shall be rezoned to ARP-5 and ARP-10 to encourage greater flexibility in the design of future land divisions within the area. New land divisions shall be designed to provide the maximum feasible clustering of new units and by easement or similar recorded instrument shall provide both the retention of the maximum amount of land in agricultural use and the protection of important upland feeding areas, which are identified on the resource maps on file in the Marin County Planning Department.</p> <p><u>Policy Status</u></p> <p>The concepts of this policy have been carried forward to LCPA Policies C-AG-3 and C-AG-7(B.1). LCPA Policy C-AG-7 also draws language from Unit II Agriculture Policies 4 and 5 (pp. 98-99).</p>	<p>C-AG-3 Coastal Agricultural Residential Planned Zone (C-ARP). Apply the Coastal Agricultural Residential Planned Zone (C-ARP) designation to lands adjacent to residential areas, and at the edges of Agricultural Production Zones in the Coastal Zone that have potential for agricultural production but do not otherwise qualify for protection under Policy C-AG-2. The intent of the C-ARP Zone is to provide flexibility in lot size and building locations in order to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Promote the concentration of residential and accessory uses to maintain the maximum amount of land available for agricultural use, and 2. Maintain the visual, natural resource and wildlife habitat values of subject properties and surrounding areas. The C-ARP district requires proposed development to be clustered in a group or groups around existing development nodes to avoid impacts to environmental and other coastal resources. <p>[BOS app. 7/30/2013] (PC app. 10/10/11, 1/24/11)</p> <p><i>[Adapted from Interim County Code Section 22.57.040. This policy also carries forward the concept of Unit I Agriculture Policy 30, p. 35]</i></p>

Unit I
Existing and Proposed Policy Comparison
Agriculture

C-AG-7 Development Standards for the Agricultural Production Zone (C-APZ) Lands.

Proposed development in the C-APZ zone shall be designed and constructed to preserve agricultural lands and to be consistent with all applicable standards and requirements of the LCP, and in particular the policies of the Natural Systems and Agriculture Element of the LUP.

...

B. Standards for Non-Agricultural Uses:

In addition to the standards of Section A above, all of the following development standards apply to non-agricultural uses, including division of agricultural lands or construction of two or more dwelling units (excluding agricultural worker or intergenerational housing). The County shall determine the density of permitted residential units only upon applying Policy C-AG-6 and the following standards and making all of the findings listed below.

- I. In order to retain the maximum amount of land in agricultural production or available for future agricultural use, homes, roads, residential support facilities, and other non-agricultural development shall be placed in one or more groups on a total of no more than five percent of the gross acreage, to the extent feasible, with the remaining acreage retained in or available for agricultural production or open space. Proposed development shall be located close to existing roads, or shall not require new road construction or improvements resulting in significant impacts on agriculture, natural topography, major vegetation, or significant natural visual qualities of the site. Proposed development shall be sited to minimize impacts on scenic resources, wildlife habitat and streams, and adjacent agricultural operations and shall be designed and sited to avoid hazardous areas.

...

[Rest of policy not shown]

[BOS app. 10/2/2012, 11/13/2012, 2/26/2013]

(PC app. 2/13/12, 1/24/11, 1/9/11)

[Adapted from Unit II Agriculture Policies 4 and 5, pp. 98-99. This policy also carries forward Unit I Agriculture Policy 30, p. 35.]

Unit I
Existing and Proposed Policy Comparison
Shoreline Protection and Hazard Areas

Unit I Shoreline Protection and Hazard Areas	
Unit I - Existing Policy	LCPA - Proposed Policy
<p><u>Policy 1, pg. 40</u></p> <p>New structure shall be set back from the Bolinas and Muir Beach bluffs a sufficient distance to ensure with reasonable certainty that they are not threatened from cliff retreat within their economic life expectancies. Adequate setback distances will be determined from information contained in required geologic reports and the setback formula established below. These setbacks will be of sufficient distance to eliminate the need for shoreline protective works.</p> <p>In view of the fact that the retreat rate varies markedly along the cliffs, and that the life expectancy of different kinds of structures varies greatly, the following formula will be used to determine setbacks from the bluff for new structures:</p> <p>Setback (meters) = structure life (yrs.) X retreat rate (meters/yr.) In areas where vigorous sliding is taking place, an additional 15 meters should be added as a safety factor.</p> <p>The retreat rate will be determined by a complete geotechnical investigation which will be required if one or both of the following conditions are met: The building or proposed development site is within 150 feet of the blufftop, or the site is located in stability zones 2, 3 or 4 as indicated on the Slope Stability of the Bolinas Peninsula Study Area map which accompanies Wagner's 1977 report, "Geology for Planning, Western Marin County". This report and accompanying maps is incorporated by reference as part of the LCP.</p> <p><u>Policy Status</u></p> <p>The concept of this policy has been carried forward to LCPA Policy C-EH-5, which also draws language from Unit II New Development and Land Use Policy 5.b (p. 207).</p>	<p>C-EH-5 New Blufftop Development. Ensure that new blufftop development is safe from bluff retreat. New structures except as provided by C-EH-15 and C-EH-16 including accessory structures and infill development (i.e., new development between adjacent developed parcels) shall be set back from the bluff edge a sufficient distance to reasonably ensure their stability for the economic life of the development and to eliminate the need for shoreline protective works. Such assurance shall take the form of a quantitative slope stability analysis demonstrating a minimum factor of safety against sliding of 1.5 (static) or 1.2 (pseudostatic, k=0.15 or determined through analysis by the geotechnical engineer). Such stability must be demonstrated for the predicted position of the bluff following bluff recession during the 100-year economic life of the development. The predicted bluff retreat shall be evaluated considering not only historical bluff retreat data, but also acceleration of bluff retreat due to continued and accelerated sea level rise, and other climate impacts according to best available science.</p> <p>(PC app. 12/1/11, 1/25/10)</p> <p><i>[Adapted from Unit I Shoreline Protection and Hazard Areas Policy 1, pp. 40-41, and Unit II New Development and Land Use Policy 5.b, p. 207]</i></p>
<p><u>Policy 2, pg. 41</u></p> <p>Development shall continue to be required to meet the seismic safety standards of the Alquist-Priolo Act as it has been implemented by the County.</p> <p>The County shall request that the State Geologist's Office review the recent study, "Depositional History and Fault-Related Studies, Bolinas Lagoon, California", by Joel R. Bergquist, U.S.G.S. Open File Report 78-802, to determine if the Alquist-Priolo Special Study Zone should be extended in the Bolinas Lagoon</p>	<p>C-EH-4 Seismic Hazard Standards. Require development to meet the seismic safety standards of the Alquist-Priolo Act (Calif. Public Resources Code Section 2621, et seq.).</p> <p>(PC app. 12/1/11, 5/26/09)</p> <p><i>[Adapted from Unit I Shoreline Protection and Hazard Policy 2, p. 41]</i></p>

Unit I
Existing and Proposed Policy Comparison
Shoreline Protection and Hazard Areas

<p>vicinity.</p> <p>Policy Status</p> <p>The concept of this policy has been carried forward to LCPA Policy C-EH-4.</p>	
<p>Policy 3, pg. 41</p> <p>The County shall seek public funds to contract with the State Division of Mines and Geology to initiate a study to identify lots and/or structures threatened with cliff retreat within their economic life expectancy. The results of this study shall be incorporated into the general restoration program for the Bolinas Mesa as described in Chapter II of the LCP.</p> <p>Policy Status</p> <p>This policy has been carried forward to Program C-EH-22.b.</p>	<p>Program C-EH-22.b Study Bluff Retreat. The County shall seek funds for a study to identify threats of bluff retreat taking into account accelerated sea level rise.</p> <p>(PC app. 12/1/11, 1/24/11)</p> <p><i>[Adapted from Unit I Shoreline Protection and Hazard Areas Policy 3, p. 41]</i></p>
<p>Policy 4, pg. 41</p> <p>Many of the building sites in Unit I are characterized by one or more potential geologic hazards. The development of residential structures on such parcels may be subject to often sudden and destructive geologic phenomenon. The County of Marin does not encourage new residential development of such parcels and expressly states that the issuance of a coastal development permit for such property does not warrant said property's safety from geologic hazards. Further, the County of Marin will not accept liability for subsequent personal or property damage caused by geologic processes on said properties. To assure that the builder and subsequent purchasers are expressly aware of the policy, a "waiver of liability" shall be executed and recorded by said for short-term, emergency food, shelter, and said property owner prior to the issuance of a coastal development permit. Further, the County of Marin will not participate in emergency or disaster relief funding for properties so identified and would recommend such limitations on State and/or federal disaster/emergency grants and/or loans.</p> <p>Existing geologic information indicates this geologic hazard policy shall apply to new development (excluding improvements to existing structures that would not result in an increase of 50 percent or more of internal floor area of the structure) on lots located in the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lands located in the "Alquist-Priolo" earthquake hazard zones, as said zones may be amended. • Development within 300 feet of the mean high tide of the sea. • Development on parcels with slopes averaging over 35 percent. 	<p>C-EH-2 Avoidance of Environmental Hazards. Require applicants for development in areas potentially subject to geologic or other hazards as mapped by the County at the time of coastal permit application, including Alquist-Priolo earthquake hazards zones, areas subject to tsunami runup, landslides, liquefaction, beach or bluff erosion, steep slopes averaging greater than 35%, unstable slopes regardless of steepness, flood hazard areas, or areas potentially inundated by accelerated sea level rise to demonstrate that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The area of construction is stable for development, 2. The development will not create a hazard or diminish the stability of the area, and 3. The development will not require the construction of shoreline protective devices during its economic life (100 years). <p>(PC app. 12/1/11, 3/16/09)</p> <p><i>[Adapted from Unit I New Development and Land Use Policy 4, p. 41, and Unit II New Development and Land Use Policy 5.a, p. 207]</i></p> <p>C-EH-3 Applicant's Assumption of Risk. As a condition of coastal permit approval for development in hazardous areas, require the applicant to record a document exempting the County from liability for any personal or property damage caused by natural hazards on such properties and acknowledging that future shoreline protective devices to protect structures authorized by such coastal permit will not be allowed during the structure's economic life.</p>

Unit I
Existing and Proposed Policy Comparison
Shoreline Protection and Hazard Areas

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All lots within the Seadrift sandspit to include the Patios, Calles and Seadrift Subdivision. <p>(Those lands covered by this "geologic hazards" policy are shown on the geologic hazard maps on file in the Marin County Planning Department)</p> <p><u>Policy Status</u></p> <p>The concepts of this policy have been carried forward to Policy C-EH-2 and C-EH-3, which also draw language from Unit II New Development and Land Use Policy 5.a (p. 207).</p>	<p>(PC app. 12/1/11, 1/24/11)</p> <p><i>[Adapted from Unit I Shoreline Protection and Hazard Areas Policy 4, p. 41, and Unit II New Development and Land Use Policy 5.a, p. 207]</i></p>
<p><u>Policy 5, pg. 42</u></p> <p>The following policy from Section 30235 of the Coastal Act is incorporated into the County LCP:</p> <p>Revetments, breakwaters, groins, harbor channels, seawalls, cliff retaining walls, and other such construction that alters natural shoreline process shall be permitted when required to serve coastal-dependent uses or to protect existing structures (constructed before adoption of the LCP), or public beaches in danger from erosion and when designed to eliminate or mitigate adverse impacts on local shoreline sand supply.</p> <p><u>Policy Status</u></p> <p>The concept of this policy has been carried forward to LCPA Policy C-EH-13, which also draws language from Unit II Shoreline Structures Policies 1 and 2 (p. 132).</p>	<p>C-EH-13 Shoreline Protective Devices. Discourage shoreline protective devices (i.e., shoreline armoring) in the Coastal Zone due to their visual impacts, obstruction of public access, interference with natural shoreline processes and water circulation, and effects on marine habitats and water quality.</p> <p>Allow the construction or reconstruction of a shoreline protective device, including revetments, breakwaters, groins, seawalls, or other artificial structures for coastal erosion control, only if each of the following criteria is met:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The shoreline protective device is required to serve a coastal-dependent use or to protect a principal structure, residence, or second residential unit in existence prior to the adoption of the Local Coastal Program (May 13, 1982) or a public beach in danger from erosion. 2. No other non-structural alternative, such as sand replenishment, beach nourishment, or managed retreat is feasible. 3. The condition causing the problem is site specific and not attributable to a general erosion trend, or the project reduces the need for a number of individual projects and solves a regional erosion problem. 4. It can be shown that a shoreline protective device will successfully eliminate or mitigate its effects on local shoreline sand supply and that the device will not adversely affect adjacent or other sections of the shoreline. 5. The shoreline protective device will not be located in wetlands or other significant resource or habitat area, and will not cause significant adverse impacts to fish or wildlife. 6. There will be no reduction in public access, use, or enjoyment of the natural shoreline environment, and construction of a shoreline protective device will preserve or provide access to related public recreational lands or facilities. 7. The shoreline protective device will not restrict navigation, mariculture,

Unit I
Existing and Proposed Policy Comparison
Shoreline Protection and Hazard Areas

	<p>or other coastal use and will not create a hazard in the area in which it is built.</p> <p>8. The shoreline protective device may be authorized for a specified time period depending on the nature of the project and other possible changing conditions. Maintenance beyond the specified time period, modification, or expansion of the approved device shall require approval of an amendment to the Coastal Permit.</p> <p>(PC app. 1/23/12)</p> <p><i>[Adapted from Unit I Shoreline Protection and Hazard Areas Policy 5, p. 42, and Unit II Shoreline Structure Policies 1 and 2, p. 132]</i></p>
<p><u>Policy 6, pg. 42</u></p> <p>To minimize visual and sand transport impacts on Stinson Beach, any permit granted to construct erosion control structures shall require the re-establishment of the former dune contour and appearance. In case of emergency permits, the property-owner of record shall agree, in writing, that such restoration work will be accomplished within 60 days after the threat of damage has passed.</p> <p><u>Policy Status</u></p> <p>This policy has been carried forward to LCPA Policy C-EH-18.</p>	<p>C-EH-18 Re-Establishment of Dunes in Conjunction with Shoreline Protective Devices. To minimize visual and sand transport impacts, require that any permit granted to construct a shoreline protective device shall include the re-establishment of the former dune contour and appearance, where feasible.</p> <p>(PC app. 12/1/11, 5/26/09)</p> <p><i>[Adapted from Unit I Shoreline Protection and Hazard Areas Policy 6, p. 42]</i></p>
<p><u>Policy 7, pg. 42</u></p> <p>Because revetments, seawalls or other shoreline protective works can be detrimental to maintenance of natural shoreline processes and can interfere with visual enjoyment and coastal access, such works are discouraged. The County of Marin through the LCP and other documentation has identified those coastal areas potentially subject to significant wave and run-off erosion. Because such probable risk areas are identified, sufficient opportunity for private investigation and response to such hazards is available. Therefore, the County of Marin shall not finance or construct emergency shoreline protective devices for the benefit of private developments.</p> <p><u>Policy Status</u></p> <p>The concept of this policy has been carried forward to LCPA Policy C-EH-20, which draws language from Unit I Shoreline Protection and Hazard Areas Policy 8 (p. 42).</p>	<p>C-EH-20 Advance Planning for Emergency Shoreline Protection Needs. Encourage property owners subject to ocean-front erosion hazards to develop responses to such hazards prior to emergency conditions. Where contiguous properties are subject to generally similar erosion hazards, joint program development should occur.</p> <p>(PC app. 12/1/11, 5/26/09)</p> <p><i>[Adapted from Unit I Shoreline Protection and Hazard Areas Policy 8, p. 42. This policy also carries forward the concept of Unit I Shoreline Protection and Hazard Areas Policy 7, p. 42]</i></p>
<p><u>Policy 8, pg. 42</u></p>	<p>C-EH-20 Advance Planning for Emergency Shoreline Protection</p>

Unit I
Existing and Proposed Policy Comparison
Shoreline Protection and Hazard Areas

<p>It shall be County policy to encourage property owners subject to ocean-front erosion hazards to develop responses to such hazards prior to emergency conditions. Where contiguous properties are subject to generally similar erosion hazards, joint program development should occur. The County will not finance such engineering studies (or any subsequent construction activities), but will seek aid from Federal and State agencies, colleges and universities to assist private consulting engineers in such review and recommendations. Where existing community organizations or special districts are unable to provide organizational support for such area-wide joint studies, the County, upon request, will assist in the organization and administration of such privately funded studies.</p> <p><u>Policy Status</u></p> <p>This policy has been carried forward to LCPA Policy C-EH-20, which also carries forward the concept from Unit I Shoreline Protection and Hazard Areas Policy 7 (p. 42).</p>	<p>Needs.</p> <p>(See policy language above)</p>
<p><u>Policy 9, pg. 43</u></p> <p>In the absence of an overall wave hazard/shoreline erosion study, any permit application for seawalls, riprap or other protective structures on beaches, shall be accompanied by engineering reports stating the nature and extent of wave erosion hazard along the beach area and an explanation of how the proposed protective works will mitigate the hazard, both on and off the project site. This policy shall not apply to emergency permit applications applied for within three years of the date of adoption of the LCP. Emergency permit applications after that date shall be subject to report requirement or shall specifically establish why the need for such protective devices was not foreseen.</p> <p><u>Policy Status</u></p> <p>This policy language is more appropriate for the development code rather than the Land Use Plan. Therefore, this policy has been carried forward to Development Code Section 22.70.140.B.5.</p>	<p>22.70.140 – Emergency Coastal Permits</p> <p>...</p> <p>B. Required information. The applicant shall report to the Director the following information, either during or as soon after the emergency as possible:</p> <p>...</p> <p>5. An application for an emergency shoreline protective device shall be accompanied by an engineering report as described in Development Code Sec. 22.64.060.A.4. If the applicant is unable to provide all such information due to the nature of the emergency, then the applicant shall provide at a minimum (a) a description of what measures, if any, were taken in advance in order to mitigate the hazard and (b) and analysis of alternatives, including the “no action” alternative.</p> <p><i>[Rest of section not shown]</i></p>

**Unit I
Existing and Proposed Policy Comparison
Public Services**

Unit I Public Services	
Unit I - Existing Policy	LCPA - Proposed Policy
General	
<p><u>Policy 1, pg. 48</u> Roads, flood control projects and utility service expansions shall be limited to the minimum necessary to serve development as identified by LCP land use policies. All such public works projects shall be reviewed under resource and visual policies of the LCP.</p> <p><u>Policy Status</u> This policy has been carried forward to LCPA Policy C-PFS-2.</p>	<p>C-PFS-2 Expansion of Public Services. Limit new or expanded roads, flood control projects, utility services, and other public service facilities, whether publicly owned or not, to the minimum necessary to adequately serve development as identified by LCP land use policies, including existing development. Take into account existing and probable future availability of other public services so that expansion does not accommodate growth which cannot be handled by other public service facilities. All such public service projects shall be subject to the LCP.</p> <p>(PC app. 11/7/11, 9/19/11, 7/29/10) <i>[Adapted from Unit I Public Services Policy 1, p. 48]</i></p>
<p><u>Policy 2, pg. 48</u> Because of the unique, natural resources and recreational opportunities of the Unit I coastal zone, industrial and energy facilities are not appropriate and shall not be permitted.</p> <p><u>Policy Status</u> The concept of this policy has been carried forward to LCPA Policy C-EN-6, which also carries forward the language of Unit II New Development and Land Use Policy 7 (p. 209) verbatim.</p>	<p>C-EN-6 Energy and Industrial Development. The Coastal Zone contains unique natural resources and recreational opportunities of nationwide significance. Because of these priceless resources and the very significant adverse impacts which would result if major energy or industrial development were to occur, such development, both on and offshore, is not appropriate and shall not be permitted. The development of alternative energy sources such as solar or wind energy shall be exempted from this policy.</p> <p>(PC app. 1/9/11, 11/7/11) <i>[Continued from LCP Unit II New Development and Land Use Policy 7, p.209. This policy also carries forward Unit I Public Services Policy 2, p. 48]</i></p>
Water Supply	
<p><u>Policy 3, pg. 48</u> Within the service area of a community or mutual system the use of individual domestic water wells to serve new construction shall be permitted provided: a) the community or mutual system is unable or unwilling to provide service, or, b) the distribution system improvements are physically and/or economically unfeasible to construct to the site. Additionally, wells or water sources shall be at least 100 feet from property lines or, a finding shall be made that no development constraints are placed on neighboring properties.</p>	<p>C-PFS-14 Adequacy of Water Supply Within Water System Service Areas. Ensure that new development within a water system service area is served with adequate, safe water supplies. Prohibit development of individual domestic water wells or other individual water sources to serve new development, including land divisions, on lots in areas served or within the boundaries of a public or private water system, with the following exceptions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. For agricultural or horticultural use if allowed by the water system operators; 2. The community or mutual water system is unable or unwilling to provide

Unit I
Existing and Proposed Policy Comparison
Public Services

<p><u>Policy Status</u></p> <p>This policy has been carried forward to Policy C-PFS-14, which also draws language from Unit II Public Services Policy 2.a (p. 187).</p>	<p>service; or,</p> <p>3. Extension of physical distribution improvements to the project site is economically or physically infeasible.</p> <p>The exceptions specified in 1, 2, or 3 shall not be granted because of a water shortage that is caused by periodic drought. Additionally, wells or water sources shall be at least 100 feet from property lines, or a finding shall be made that no development constraints are placed on neighboring properties</p> <p>(PC app. 9/19/11, 1/24/11)</p> <p><i>[Adapted from LCP Unit I Public Services Policy 3, p. 48, and Unit II Public Services Policy 2.a, p. 187]</i></p>
<p><u>Policy 4, pg. 48</u></p> <p>New community and mutual water wells serving five or more parcels shall demonstrate by professional engineering studies, including, as necessary, long-term monitoring programs, that such groundwater withdrawal will not adversely affect coastal resources, including groundwater aquifers. Such engineering studies shall provide the basis of establishing safe sustained yields from these wells.</p> <p><u>Policy Status</u></p> <p>This policy has been carried forward to LCPA Policy C-PFS-13, which also draws language from Unit II Public Services Policies 2.a (p. 187) and 2.e.3 (p. 189).</p>	<p>C-PFS-13 New Water Sources Serving Five or More Parcels.</p> <p>Professional engineering or other studies are required for coastal permit applications for new water wells or other sources serving 5 or more parcels. These studies must demonstrate that such groundwater or stream withdrawals will not have adverse direct or cumulative impacts on coastal resources, including groundwater basins, aquifers, and streams, and shall include as necessary, long-term monitoring programs, in-stream flow studies, or hydrologic studies. Such studies shall provide the basis for establishing safe sustained yields from these sources. Wells or water sources shall be at least 100 feet from property lines, or a finding shall be made that no development constraints are placed on neighboring properties.</p> <p>(PC app. 9/19/11, 7/29/10)</p> <p><i>[Adapted from Unit I Public Services Policy 4, p. 48, and Unit II Public Services Policies 2.a and 2.e (3), pp. 187-189]</i></p>
<p><u>Policy 5, pg. 48</u></p> <p>Prior to the authorization of subdivision or construction of projects utilizing individual water wells, the applicant shall demonstrate that a sustained water yield of at least 1.5 gallons per minute per residential unit. Additional requirements for fire protection, including increased yield rates, water storage facilities and fire hydrants shall be installed as recommended by the applicable fire protection agency.</p> <p><u>Policy Status</u></p> <p>This policy has been carried forward to LCPA Policy C-PFS-16, which also draws language from Unit II Public Services Policies 2.a (p. 187) and 2.e.2 (p. 189), and Section 22.56.1301.A of the Interim Title 22 Zoning Code.</p>	<p>C-PFS-16 Standards for Water Supply Wells and Other Water Sources.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In areas where individual water wells or other individual domestic water sources are permitted, require on-site tests that demonstrate a sustained pumping rate, or equivalent, of 1.5 gpm for each residential unit or subdivided parcel. Higher yields, storage and other facilities may be required for fire protection purposes, as recommended by the appropriate fire protection agency. 2. Require that well or water sources shall be at least 100 feet from property lines, unless a finding is made that no development constraints are placed on neighboring properties. 3. Allow a well only where a finding is made that it will not have adverse direct or cumulative impacts on coastal resources.

**Unit I
Existing and Proposed Policy Comparison
Public Services**

	<p>4. Within the Inverness Planning Area, allow no individual wells on parcels less than 2.8 acres in size, unless a specific exception is granted based on findings required by the coastal permitting chapter of the Development Code and on a demonstration to the satisfaction of the Health Officer that a well can be developed on the substandard size parcel in a completely safe and sanitary manner.</p> <p>5. Within the Inverness Public Utility District (IPUD), permit no individual wells for domestic use in the same watershed, at an elevation higher than the IPUD surface water sources existing as of June 14, 1983.</p> <p>(PC app. 2/13/12, 9/19/11, 7/29/10)</p> <p><i>[Adapted from Unit I Public Services Policy 5, p. 48, and Unit II Public Services Policies 2.a and 2.e(2), pp. 187-189; and Interim County Code Section 22.56.130.A]</i></p>
<p><u>Policy 6, pg. 48</u></p> <p>In acting on any coastal project permit for expansion of the water facilities of the Bolinas Public Utility District, the County shall determine that adequate water is guaranteed from the expanded facilities to serve VCR-zoned property in the village core.</p> <p><u>Policy Status</u></p> <p>This policy has been carried forward to LCPA Policy C-PFS-4, which also draws language from Unit I Public Services Policy 12 (p. 49).</p>	<p>C-PFS-4 High-Priority Visitor-Serving Land Uses. In acting on any coastal project permit for the extension or enlargement of community water or community sewage treatment facilities, determine that adequate treatment capacity is available and reserved in the system to serve VCR- and RCR-zoned property and other visitor-serving uses.</p> <p>(PC app. 11/7/11, 7/29/10)</p> <p><i>[Adapted from Unit I Public Services Policies 6 and 12, pp. 48-49]</i></p>
Septic System Standards	
<p><u>Policy 7, pg. 48</u></p> <p>All septic systems within the Coastal Zone shall conform with the Minimum Guidelines for the Control of Individual Wastewater Treatment and Disposal Systems adopted by the Regional Water Quality Control Board on April 17, 1979. No waivers shall be permitted except where a public entity has formally assumed responsibility for inspecting, monitoring and enforcing the maintenance of the system in accordance with criteria adopted by the Regional Water Quality Control Board, or where such waivers have otherwise been reviewed and approved under standards established by the Regional Water Quality Control Board.</p> <p><u>Policy Status</u></p> <p>The concept of this policy has been carried forward to LCPA Policies C-PFS-8</p>	<p>C-PFS-8 Sewage Disposal Systems Requirements for New Lots. Require all sewage disposal systems on newly created lots to comply in all respects, without variance, with applicable County and state septic system regulations.</p> <p>(PC app. 9/19/11, 1/24/11)</p> <p><i>[Adapted from Unit I Public Services Policies 7 and 9, pp. 48-49, Unit II Public Services Policy 3.a, p. 189, and County Regulations Section 301]</i></p> <p>C-PFS-10 Adequate On-Site Sewage Disposal Systems for Existing Development. Ensure that existing on-site sewage disposal systems function properly by complying with all rules and regulations of the Regional Water Quality Control Board, including any requirements adopted pursuant to AB 885. Where repairs to existing systems are necessary, take corrective action in the following priority order as appropriate:</p>

**Unit I
Existing and Proposed Policy Comparison
Public Services**

<p>and C-PFS-10. LCPA Policy C-PFS-8 also carries forward the concept of Unit I Public Services Policy 9 (p. 49) and Unit II Public Services Policy 3.a (p. 189).</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Require connection to a public sewer, if the property is within 400 feet of a public sewer main and it is physically and legally possible to connect to such main; or 2. Require system repair using a standard drainfield; or 3. Require construction of an alternative or innovative system. <p>(PC app. 9/19/11, 7/29/10) [Adapted from Unit I Public Services Policy 7, p. 48, and County Regulations Section 304]</p>
<p><u>Policy 8, pg. 49</u></p> <p>Alternate waste disposal systems shall be approved only where a public entity has formally assumed responsibility for inspecting, monitoring and enforcing the maintenance of the system in accordance with criteria adopted by the Regional Water Quality Control Board.</p> <p><u>Policy Status</u></p> <p>The concept of this policy has been carried forward to LCPA Policy C-PFS-11, which also draws language from County Regulations Sections 801, 802, and 803.</p>	<p>C-PFS-11 Alternative On-Site Sewage Disposal Systems. Approve alternative on-site sewage disposal systems where the County Health Officer or designee determines that (a) sewage cannot be disposed of in a sanitary manner by a standard septic system, or (b) that an alternative system will protect the public health in a manner equal to or better than a standard system.</p> <p>Approval of an alternative system shall require, at a minimum:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Design plans signed by a professional who is knowledgeable and experienced in the field of onsite sewage disposal; 2. Submittal of a site-specific contingency plan which shall outline specific actions to be taken to repair, expand, or replace the system, should it fail to operate as planned; 3. Operation, maintenance, and monitoring instructions for the system owner; and 4. A written statement granting permission to the Health Officer to access the property to periodically assess system functioning. <p>In addition to a construction permit, an operating permit shall be required for all alternative systems. The operating permit shall be renewed annually or as otherwise specified by the Health Officer. The Health Officer has discretion to exempt from the operating permit requirement alternative systems installed solely for repair of existing systems.</p> <p>(PC app. 9/19/11, 1/24/11) [Adapted from Unit I Public Services Policy 8, p. 49, Unit II Public Services Policy 3.a, p. 189, and County Regulations Sections 801, 802, and 803]</p>
<p><u>Policy 9, pg. 49</u></p> <p>Where a Coastal Development permit is necessary for any enlargement or change in type or intensity in use of an existing structure, a septic system that is adequate to conform to current Regional Water Quality Control Board Guidelines or such other program and standards approved by the Board shall be installed.</p>	<p>C-PFS-7 Adequately Sized Sewage Disposal Systems. Require new and expanded sewage disposal systems to be sized adequately to meet the needs of proposed development, including any changes in type or intensity in use of an existing structure.</p> <p>(PC app. 9/19/11, 7/29/10)</p>

**Unit I
Existing and Proposed Policy Comparison
Public Services**

<p><u>Policy Status</u> This policy has been carried forward to LCPA Policy C-PFS-7.</p>	<p><i>[Adapted from Unit I Public Services Policy 9, p. 49]</i></p>
<p><u>Policy 10, pg. 49</u> In order to minimize the generation of wastewater and to encourage the conservation of Coastal water resources, the use of water saving devices shall be required in all new developments.</p> <p><u>Policy Status</u> This policy has been carried forward to LCPA Policy C-PFS-17.</p>	<p>C-PFS-17 Conservation of Water. To minimize generation of wastewater and encourage conservation of Coastal water resources, require use of water saving devices as prescribed by the local water provider in all new developments. (PC app. 9/19/11, 7/29/10) <i>[Adapted from Unit I Public Services Policy 10, p. 49]</i></p>
<p><u>Policy 11, pg. 49</u> The existing water quality monitoring agreement between the North Central Coast Regional Commission, the Stinson Beach County Water District, and the Regional Water Quality Control Board, and conducted by the Water District, shall be continued.</p> <p><u>Policy Status</u> This policy has been carried forward to LCPA Program C-PFS-10.a, which also draws language from Unit I Location and Density of New Development Policy 34 (p. 81).</p>	<p>Program C-PFS-10.a Continue Stinson Beach Water Quality Monitoring Program. Support the existing water quality monitoring program conducted by the Stinson Beach County Water District, consistent with the agreement with the Regional Water Quality Control Board. (PC app. 9/19/11, 7/29/10) <i>[Adapted from Unit I Public Services Policy 11, p. 49, and Unit I Location and Density of New Development Policy 34, p. 81]</i></p>
Bolinas Sewage Disposal System	
<p><u>Policy 12, pg. 49</u> In acting on any coastal project permit for the extension or enlargement of the sewer treatment facilities of the Bolinas Public Utility District, the County shall determine that adequate treatment capacity is available in the system to serve VCR-zoned property in the village core.</p> <p><u>Policy Status</u> This policy has been carried forward to LCPA Policy C-PFS-4, which also draws language from Unit I Public Services Policy 6 (p. 48).</p>	<p>C-PFS-4 High-Priority Visitor-Serving Land Uses. In acting on any coastal project permit for the extension or enlargement of community water or community sewage treatment facilities, determine that adequate treatment capacity is available and reserved in the system to serve VCR- and RCR-zoned property and other visitor-serving uses. (PC app. 11/7/11, 7/29/10) <i>[Adapted from Unit I Public Services Policies 6 and 12, pp. 48-49]</i></p>
Transportation	

Unit I
Existing and Proposed Policy Comparison
Public Services

<p><u>Policy 13, pg. 49</u></p> <p>Highway I provides an important and limited access route to the coastal zone. The narrow, twisting two-lane roadway successfully complements the rugged, open character of this coastal area. Highway I shall remain a scenic, two-lane roadway. Roadway improvement projects shall not, either individually or cumulatively distract from the rural scenic characteristics of the present roadway. Improvements (beyond repair and maintenance) shall be limited to minor roadway improvements as identified below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Slope stabilization, drainage control and minor safety improvements such as guardrail placement, signing, etc. • Expansion of roadway shoulder paving to accommodate bicycle/ pedestrian traffic along the highway shoulder. • Creation of slow traffic and vista turnouts, as a safety and convenience improvement. <p>Other minor selected roadway improvements necessary to adequately accommodate public transit consistent with the goals of the following policy: no filling of streams or wetlands shall be permitted.</p> <p><u>Policy Status</u></p> <p>This policy has been carried forward to LCPA Policy C-TR-2, which also draws language from Unit II Public Services Policy 4.a (p. 191).</p>	<p>C-TR-2 Scenic Quality of Highway One. Ensure that Highway One shall remain a scenic two-lane roadway throughout Marin’s Coastal Zone. Maintain the existing narrow, twisty two-lane roadway that successfully complements the rugged, open character unique to the coastal area from the southern boundary of Marin’s Coastal Zone northward to the Bolinas Lagoon. Ensure that improvements shall not, either individually or cumulatively, detract from the rural scenic characteristics of the highway throughout the Coastal Zone and shall be limited to improvements necessary for the continued use of the highway: slope stabilization, drainage control, and minor safety improvements such as guardrail placement, signing, etc.; expansion of shoulder paving to accommodate bicycle or pedestrian traffic; creation of slow traffic and vista turn-outs, as a safety and convenience improvement; and other minor improvements necessary to adequately accommodate public transit. Avoid incursions and other adverse impacts in ESHAs and their buffers. These improvements shall limit the site alterations to the minimum amount necessary to carry out the project and minimize environmental impacts.</p> <p>[BOS app. 12/11/2012] (PC app. 2/13/12, 9/19/11, 4/27/09)</p> <p>[Adapted from Unit I Public Services Policy 13, p. 49, and Unit II Public Services Policy 4.a, p. 191]</p>
<p><u>Policy 14, pg. 49</u></p> <p>Public transit service to and through Unit I is presently limited to commuter services and selected recreational service routes. The expansion of public and recreational areas and facilities in Unit I will accelerate the need to increase opportunities in providing public access to the coastal areas of Marin. The development of such programs shall rely extensively on public transit as the most appropriate and consistent method of increasing public access and recreational opportunities in Unit I. The development of new transit service routes and associated loading and turn areas is consistent with the policy to utilize public transit in meeting the increased use of coastal access and recreational areas.</p> <p><u>Policy Status</u></p> <p>The concept from this policy to support and provide adequate and affordable public transportation to the coastal zone has been carried forward to LCPA Policies C-TR-10 and C-TR-11, and LCPA Program C-TR-10.a, which also draw</p>	<p>C-TR-10 Adequate and Affordable Public Transportation. Provide efficient, affordable public transportation service in and to the Coastal Zone and support expansion of alternative modes of transportation.</p> <p>(PC app. 9/19/11, 4/27/09)</p> <p>[Adapted from Unit I Public Services Policy 14, p. 49, Unit II Public Services Policy 4.c, p. 191, and CWP Goal TR-3, p. 3-162]</p> <p>Program C-TR-10.a Encourage Additional Transit Service. Encourage programs, such as the development of new transit service routes and associated loading and turning areas, parking management and enforcement, and other programs as listed below, consistent with the goal of utilizing public transit to meet current and future increased use of coastal access and recreational areas. Develop stable funding streams for such programs, potentially including congestion or parking fees, in cooperation with appropriate county, regional, state and federal agencies.</p>

Unit I
Existing and Proposed Policy Comparison
Public Services

concepts from Unit II Public Services Policy 4 (p. 191).

1. Support continuation and expansion of Marin Transit's Stagecoach service to West Marin;
2. Seek installation of transit waiting shelters as appropriate;
3. Post transit schedules at transit stops; and
4. Consider utilizing the principle of "flag stops" to receive or discharge transit patrons along the transit route as a further inducement to transit patronage.

[BOS app. 2/26/2013]

(PC app. 11/7/11, 4/27/09)

[Adapted from Unit I Public Services Policy 14, p. 49, and Unit II Public Services Policy 4.c, p. 192]

C-TR-11 Reduction of Visitor Traffic Congestion in West Marin. Consult with Caltrans, local, state, and federal parkland agencies, and local communities to provide alternatives to private automobile travel to recreational areas in the Coastal Zone.

(PC app. 9/19/11, 4/27/09)

[Adapted from Unit I Public Services Policy 14, p. 49, Unit II Public Services Policy 4.c, p. 191, and CWP Policy TR-3.6, p. 3-163]

**Unit I
Existing and Proposed Policy Comparison
New Development and Land Use**

Unit I New Development and Land Use	
Unit I - Existing Policy	LCPA - Proposed Policy
Historic Resources	
<p><u>Policy 15, pg. 64</u></p> <p>In order to protect the unique qualities and character of coastal communities in the Unit I coastal zone, historic structures shall be preserved and restored. The following means shall be used to protect and preserve historic structures:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. "Historic areas" shall be established in Stinson Beach and Bolinas. The boundaries of these areas are described and mapped in Appendix F of the Unit I LCP. Within these historic area boundaries, all new construction shall conform in scale, design, materials and texture with the surrounding community character. b. Alterations and Additions. Alterations or additions to any structure built prior to 1930 shall require a coastal project permit; except that, maintenance or repair to restore any pre-1930 structure to its original architectural character shall be exempt from the requirement of a coastal permit. Alterations or additions to any pre-1930 structure shall retain the scale and original architectural features of the structure, especially for the front facade. c. Demolitions. Demolition of any structure built prior to 1930 shall require a Coastal Project Permit; except that, demolition of any secondary or agricultural building built prior to 1930, may be exempted from the requirement for a coastal permit upon a finding by the Planning Director or appropriate hearing body that such structure is not a significant historic resource. Issuance of a Coastal Project Permit for the demolition of any pre-1930 structure may be delayed for a period not to exceed six months. During this period, the property owner or local historic group or society may attempt to find a purchaser or alternate location for the structure. This six month period may be waived by the Planning Director or appropriate hearing body upon a finding that the structure is not historically significant or cannot be rehabilitated. <p><u>Policy Status</u></p> <p>The concept of this policy has been carried forward to LCPA Policies C-HAR-4, C-HAR-6, C-HAR-7, and C-HAR-8, which also draw language from Unit II New Development and Land Use Policy I (p. 206).</p>	<p>C-HAR-4 Structures of Special Character and Visitor Appeal. Preserve and restore structures with special character and visitor appeal in coastal communities. (PC app. 9/19/11, 2/8/10) <i>[Adapted from Unit I New Development and Land Use Policy 15, p. 64, and Unit II New Development and Land Use Policy 1.a, p. 206]</i></p> <p>C-HAR-6 Alterations and Additions to Structures of Special Character and Visitor Appeal. Require a coastal permit for substantial alterations or additions to any structure built prior to 1930 that would otherwise be exempt from a coastal permit, except for (a) maintenance or repair to any pre-1930's structure consistent with its original architectural character and (b) maintenance or repair that includes replacement-in-kind of building components. Alterations or additions to any pre-1930's structure shall retain the scale and original architectural character of the structure, especially for the front facade. (PC app. 9/19/11, 2/8/10) <i>[Adapted from Unit I New Development and Land Use Policy 15.b, p. 64, and Unit II New Development and Land Use Policy 1.a(2), p. 206]</i></p> <p>C-HAR-7 Proposed Demolition of Structures of Special Character and Visitor Appeal. Review the proposed demolition of any structure built prior to 1930 for its impacts on community character, except that demolition of any secondary or agricultural building built prior to 1930 may be exempted from this requirement upon a finding by the Planning Director or appropriate hearing body that such structure is not a significant resource. Issuance of a coastal project permit for the demolition of any pre-1930 structure may provide for such demolition to be delayed for a period not to exceed six months. During this period, the property owner or local historic group or society may attempt to find a purchaser or alternate location for the structure. This six month period may be waived by the Planning Director or appropriate hearing body upon a finding that the structure is not significant to community character or to visitor appeal or</p>

**Unit I
Existing and Proposed Policy Comparison
New Development and Land Use**

	<p>cannot be rehabilitated. (PC app. 9/19/11, 2/8/10) <i>[Adapted from Unit I New Development and Land Use Policy 15.c, p. 64, and Unit II New Development and Land Use Policy 1.a.(3), p. 206]</i></p> <p>C-HAR-8 Village Areas with Special Character and Visitor Appeal. Ensure that all new construction conforms in scale, design, materials and texture with surrounding community character within areas having special character and visitor appeal including mapped historic areas in Stinson Beach, Bolinas, Tomales, Marshall, Point Reyes Station, Olema, and Inverness. (PC app. 9/19/11, 2/8/10) <i>[Adapted from Unit I New Development and Land Use Policy 15.a, p. 64, and Unit II New Development and Land Use Policy 1.a.(1), p. 206]</i></p>
<p><u>Policy 16, pg. 64</u> All Coastal Project Permits for projects located within the boundaries of an historic area, and for projects involving pre-1930 buildings, shall be reviewed in accordance with:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The “design Guidelines For Construction in Historic Areas and For Pre-1930 Structures” and, b. The “Historic Review Checklist,” both located in Appendix F of the Unit I LCP. <p><u>Policy Status</u> This policy has been carried forward to LCPA Policy C-HAR-5, which also draws language from Unit II New Development and Land Use Policy 1.b (p. 206).</p>	<p>C-HAR-5 Proposed Development that Affects Areas and Structures of Special Character and Visitor Appeal. Review all coastal permits for projects that (1) are located within the boundaries of those areas designated as having special character and visitor appeal, including historic areas, and (2) involve pre-1930 buildings to conform to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. "Design Guidelines for Construction in Areas of Special Character and Visitor Appeal and for pre-1930 Structures" and, 2. "Coastal Village Community Character Review Checklist", both located in the Appendix of the LCP. <p>(PC app. 9/19/11, 2/8/10) <i>[Adapted from Unit I New Development and Land Use Policy 16, p. 64, and Unit II New Development and Land Use Policy 1.b, p. 206]</i></p>
<p><u>Policy 17, pg. 64</u> All Coastal Project Permits for historic structures shall be revised by established local planning or design review groups, where these groups exist.</p> <p><u>Policy Status</u> The concept of this policy has been carried forward to LCPA Policy C-HAR-8, which also draws language from Unit II New Development and Land Use Policy 1.a.(1) (p. 206).</p>	<p>C-HAR-8 Village Areas with Special Character and Visitor Appeal. Ensure that all new construction conforms in scale, design, materials and texture with surrounding community character within areas having special character and visitor appeal including mapped historic areas in Stinson Beach, Bolinas, Tomales, Marshall, Point Reyes Station, Olema, and Inverness. (PC app. 9/19/11, 2/8/10) <i>[Adapted from Unit I New Development and Land Use Policy 15.a, p. 64, and Unit II New Development and Land Use Policy 1.a.(1), p. 206]</i></p>

**Unit I
Existing and Proposed Policy Comparison
New Development and Land Use**

Archaeological Resources	
<p><u>Policy 18, pg. 64</u> The County shall maintain a file, including maps of currently known and probable archaeological sites within the coastal zone of Unit I, in cooperation with the State Office of Historic Preservation. Additional information regarding areas of archaeological significance that becomes available through the Environmental Impact Report process or by other means shall be added to the file. The file shall be kept confidential in order to prevent vandalism of any known or probable archaeological sites that have been recorded</p> <p><u>Policy Status</u> This policy has been carried forward to LCPA Policy C-HAR-1, which also draws language from Unit II New Development and Land Use Policy 2.a (p. 206).</p>	<p>C-HAR-1 Maintenance of Information on Archaeological and Paleontological Resources. Maintain a file on known and suspected archaeological and paleontological sites in the Coastal Zone, in cooperation with the area clearinghouse, for use in carrying out Policy C-HAR-2. Additional information on such sites that becomes available through the EIR process or by other means shall be added to the file and forwarded to the Northwest Information Center (NWIC). The file shall be kept confidential in order to prevent vandalism of sites. (PC app. 9/19/11, 11/23/09) <i>[Adapted from Unit I New Development and Land Use Policy 18, p. 64, and Unit II New Development and Land Use Policy 2.a, p. 206]</i></p>
<p><u>Policy 19, pg. 64</u> Prior to the approval of any proposed development within an area of known or probable archaeological significance, a limited field survey by a qualified professional at the applicant's expense shall be required to determine the extent of the archaeological resources on the site. Results of such field survey shall be transmitted to the State Historical Preservation Officer or his/her designee for comment</p> <p><u>Policy Status</u> The concept of this policy has been carried forward to LCPA Policy C-HAR-2, which also draws language from Unit II New Development and Land Use Policy 2.b (p. 206).</p>	<p>C-HAR-2 Potential Impacts of Development on Archaeological and Paleontological Resources. Prior to the approval of a coastal project permit for any development proposed within an area of known or likely archaeological or paleontological significance, including sites identified in the file described in Policy C-HAR-1, require a field survey by a state-qualified archaeologist recommended by the Sacred Sites Protection Committee of the Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria or by a qualified paleontologist at the applicant's expense to determine the extent of archaeological or paleontological resources on the site. Where development would adversely impact identified resources, require mitigation measures, as appropriate, including avoidance and permanent protection as open space, if feasible, as recommended in the field survey. (PC app. 11/7/11, 11/23/09) <i>[Adapted from Unit I New Development and Land Use Policy 19, p. 64, Unit II New Development and Land Use Policy 2.b, p. 206, and Countywide Plan Programs HAR-1.d and HAR-1.3]</i></p>

Unit I
Existing and Proposed Policy Comparison
New Development and Land Use

<p><u>Policy 20, pg. 65</u></p> <p>Where development would adversely impact archaeological resources or paleontological resources which have been identified, reasonable mitigation measures shall be required as may be recommended by the field survey or by the State Historic Preservation officer his/her designee. Such mitigation measures shall include acquisition of unique sites for long-term preservation where feasible, or preservation of the sites by incorporating them into open space areas protected by easement, or a requirement that the site be opened to an approved qualified professional and educational groups for scientific exploration for a specified period of time before development begins. Where construction is permitted, special construction techniques shall be employed to protect the resources intact and reasonably accessible underground.</p> <p><u>Policy Status</u></p> <p>The concept of this policy has been carried forward to LCPA Policy C-HAR-2, which also draws language from Unit I New Development and Land Use Policy 19 (p. 64) and Unit II New Development and Land Use Policy 2.b (p. 206).</p>	<p>C-HAR-2 Potential Impacts of Development on Archaeological and Paleontological Resources.</p> <p>(See policy language above)</p>
Visual Resources	
<p><u>Policy 21, pg. 65</u></p> <p>Existing development standards and the design review ordinance (Chapter 22.52) shall continue to be enforced. The following explicit standards shall apply to selected areas and projects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All new construction in Bolinas, Stinson Beach and Muir Beach shall be limited to a maximum height of twenty-five (25) feet; except that in the Highlands neighborhood of Stinson Beach, the maximum height shall be seventeen (17) feet, and in the Seadrift section of Stinson Beach, the maximum height shall not exceed fifteen (15) feet. • To the maximum extent feasible, new development shall not impair or obstruct an existing view of the ocean, Bolinas Lagoon, or the national or State parklands from Highway I or Panoramic Highway <p><u>Policy Status</u></p> <p>The policy has been carried forward to LCPA Policies C-DES-2 and C-DES-4. Policy C-DES-4 also carries forward the concept of Unit I Location and Density of New Development Policy 35 (p. 81).</p>	<p>C-DES-2 Protection of Visual Resources. Ensure appropriate siting and design of structures to protect significant views, including views both to and along the coast as seen from public viewing areas such as highways, roads, beaches, parks, coastal trails and accessways, vista points, and coastal streams and waters used for recreational purposes. The intent of this policy is the protection of significant public views rather than coastal views from private residential areas. Require development to be screened with appropriate landscaping provided that when mature, such landscaping shall not interfere with public views to and along the coast. The use of drought tolerant, native coastal plant species is encouraged. Continue to keep road and driveway construction, grading, and utility extensions to a minimum, except that longer road and driveway extensions may be necessary in highly visible areas in order to avoid or minimize other impacts. [BOS app. 7/30/2013] (PC app. 11/7/11, 1/24/11) <i>[Adapted from Unit I New Development and Land Use Policy 21, p. 65, and Unit II New Development and Land Use Policy 3.b, p. 207]</i></p> <p>C-DES-4 Limited Height of New Structures. Limit all new construction to a maximum height of twenty-five (25) feet with the following exceptions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> I. In the Highlands neighborhood of Stinson Beach, the maximum height

**Unit I
Existing and Proposed Policy Comparison
New Development and Land Use**

	<p>shall be no more than seventeen (17) feet (see Map 17 – Stinson Beach Highlands Subdivision).</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. In FEMA special flood hazard (V) zones within the Seadrift Subdivision, the maximum building height of 15 feet shall be measured from the minimum floor elevation required by the flood hazard zone designation (see also <i>Environmental Hazards Policy C-EH-11: Minimum Floor Elevations in the Flood Velocity Zone at Seadrift</i>). 3. On the shoreline of Tomales Bay, the maximum height shall be fifteen (15) feet. (See also <i>Community Development Policy C-CD-6: Standards for Development on the Shoreline of Tomales Bay</i>). <p>(PC app. 9/19/11, 7/29/10) <i>[Adapted from Unit I New Development and Land Use Policy 21, p. 65. This policy also carries forward the concept of Unit I Location and Density of New Development Policy 35, p. 81]</i></p>
Housing	
<p><u>Policy 22, pg. 66</u></p> <p>In order to protect housing opportunities for persons of low and moderate income (as defined by "HUD" Guidelines), as well as preserve the existing character of coastal villages, existing structures providing such housing opportunities shall be demolished only when:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The structure poses an immediate and established health or safety hazard; or • The Planning Commission finds, based upon established procedures, that the rehabilitation of the existing structure is not feasible. (Feasible is defined in Section 30108 of the Coastal Act.); and • Such demolition coupled with subsequent reconstruction would provide replacement housing of comparable rental value either on site or within the immediate coastal zone area. <p><u>Policy Status</u></p> <p>The concept of this policy has been carried forward to LCPA Policy C-HS-1, which also draws the concept from Unit II New Development and Land Use Policy 4 (p. 207).</p>	<p>C-HS-1 Protection of Existing Affordable Housing. Continue to protect and provide affordable housing opportunities for very low, low, and moderate income households. Prohibit demolition of existing deed restricted very low, low, and moderate income housing except when:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Demolition is necessary for health and safety reasons; or 2. Costs of rehabilitation would be prohibitively expensive and impact affordability of homes for very low, low and moderate income households; and 3. Units to be demolished are replaced on a one-for-one basis with units of comparable rental value on site or within the immediate Coastal Zone area. <p>(PC app. 9/19/11, 7/29/10) <i>[Adapted from Unit I New Development and Land Use Policy 22, p. 66, and Unit II New Development and Land Use Policy 4.a, p. 207]</i></p>
<p><u>Policy 23, pg. 66</u></p> <p>Housing assistance programs that provide moderate-cost housing opportunities in existing units shall continue to be administered in the coastal zone.</p>	<p>n/a</p>

**Unit I
Existing and Proposed Policy Comparison
New Development and Land Use**

<p><u>Policy Status</u></p> <p>The County has ongoing housing assistance programs that are applicable throughout the entire County, not just the coastal zone. Therefore, this policy is redundant and not necessary and has not been carried forward to the LCPA.</p>	
Grading	
<p><u>Policy 24, pg. 66</u></p> <p>Development shall be designed to fit a site's topography and existing soil, geological, and hydrological conditions so that grading, cut and fill operations, and other site preparation are kept to an absolute minimum and natural landforms are preserved. Areas of a site which are not suited to development because of known soil, geologic, flood, erosion or other hazards that exist to a degree that no amount of corrective work consistent with these policies, including but not limited to the protection of natural landforms, can eliminate or substantially reduce the hazards to the property endangered thereby shall remain in open space.</p> <p><u>Policy Status</u></p> <p>The concept of this policy has been carried forward to LCPA Policy C-WR-4, which also draws language from Unit II New Development and Land Use Policy 6 (p. 208).</p>	<p>C-WR-4 Grading and Vegetation Removal. Design development to fit a site's topography, soils, geology, hydrology, and any other existing conditions. Orient development so that grading, cut and fill operations, and other site preparation are kept to an absolute minimum. Natural features, landforms, and native vegetation shall be preserved to the maximum extent feasible. Areas of a site which are not suited to development because of known soil, geologic, flood, erosion or other hazards shall be kept undeveloped.</p> <p>(PC app. 12/1/11, 3/16/09)</p> <p><i>[Adapted from Unit I New Development and Land Use Policy 24, p. 66, and Unit II New Development and Land Use Policy 6.a, p. 208]</i></p>
<p><u>Policy 25, pg. 66</u></p> <p>For necessary grading operations, the smallest practicable area of land shall be exposed at any one time during development and the length of exposure shall be kept to the shortest practicable time. The clearing of land shall be discouraged during the winter rainy season and stabilizing-slopes-shall be in place before the beginning of the rainy season.</p> <p><u>Policy Status</u></p> <p>This policy has been carried forward to LCPA Policies C-WR-6 and C-WR-7, which also draw language from Unit II New Development and Land Use Policy 6.b (p. 208).</p>	<p>C-WR-6 Soil Exposure. Allow any necessary grading operations only such that the smallest practicable area of land shall be exposed at any one time during development and the length of exposure shall be kept to the shortest practicable time. Erosion and sedimentation control measures shall be incorporated in development plans. An erosion and sedimentation control plan, subject to approval by the Department of Public Works, shall be required for development of any site of 1 acre or more in size or, at the discretion of the Department of Public Works, for any site of less than 1 acre because of a high risk of erosion and sedimentation.</p> <p>(PC app. 12/1/11, 3/16/09)</p> <p><i>[Adapted from Unit I New Development and Land Use Policy 25, p. 66, and Unit II New Development and Land Use Policy 6.b, p. 208]</i></p> <p>C-WR-7 Wintertime Clearing and Grading. Avoid land clearing and grading during the winter rainy season (October 15th through April 15th). Ensure that all measures for removing sediments and stabilizing slopes shall be in place before the</p>

Unit I
Existing and Proposed Policy Comparison
New Development and Land Use

	<p>beginning of the rainy season. Permit land clearing and grading during the rainy season only upon prior approval by the Department of Public Works of an erosion control plan, which shall demonstrate that at no stage of the work will there be any substantial risk of increased sediment discharge from the site.</p> <p>(PC app. 12/1/11, 3/16/09)</p> <p><i>[Adapted from Unit I New Development and Land Use Policy 25, p. 66, Unit II New Development and Land Use Policy 6.b., p. 208, and County Code Sections 22.70.070.C.3 and 24.04.625.]</i></p>
<p><u>Policy 26, pg. 66</u></p> <p>Development plans shall include sediment, erosion, runoff controls, and revegetation measures. The following measures shall be included in all cases; additional conditions as required pursuant to Section 23.08.090 of Marin County Code shall also be included where appropriate.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sediment basins (including debris basins, desilting basins, or silt traps), shall be installed at the beginning of grading operations and maintained throughout the development process to remove sediment from runoff waters. All sediment shall be retained on site. • The extent of impervious surfaces shall be minimized to the greatest degree possible. Water runoff beyond natural levels shall be retained on-site whenever possible to facilitate maximum groundwater recharge. In order to prevent on-site gullying and downstream erosion of-existing stream channels, the velocity of runoff on and off the site shall be dissipated through the application of appropriate drainage controls so that the runoff rate does not exceed the storm water runoff from the area in its natural or undeveloped state for all intensities and durations of rainfall. Grassed waterways are preferred to concrete storm drains for runoff conveyance. • Pollutants such as chemicals, fuels, and other harmful materials shall be collected and disposed of in an approved manner in accordance with the best engineering technology available. • Temporary vegetation, seeding, mulching, or other suitable stabilization methods shall be used to protect soils which have been exposed during grading or development. Cut and fill slopes shall be permanently stabilized as soon as possible with native plants or other suitable landscaping techniques. • Where topsoil is removed by grading operations, it shall be stockpiled for reuse and shall be protected from compaction and wind or erosion during stockpiling. • All debris shall be removed from the site upon the completion of the project. • Permit applications for grading which involve cut slopes in excess of 8 feet or 	<p>C-WR-3 Storm Water Runoff. Where a project would add or create a total of 10,000 square feet or more of impervious surface (collectively over the entire project site) or where altered or increased flows from a project site have the potential to accelerate erosion or affect beneficial uses downstream, incorporate drainage controls so that the post-project peak flow and velocity of runoff from the project site for 2 and 10-year intensity storms do not exceed the peak flow and velocity of runoff from the site in its pre-project (existing) state. Where a drainage problem unrelated to a proposed project already exists, the project applicant and neighboring property owners shall be encouraged to develop a solution.</p> <p>(PC app. 1/23/12, 1/25/10)</p> <p><i>[Adapted from Unit I New Development and Land Use Policy 26, p. 67, and Unit II New Development and Land Use Policy 6.f, p. 208]</i></p> <p>C-WR-8 Disturbed Soils. Use temporary vegetation, seeding or hydroseeding with non-invasive native seeds, mulching, or other suitable stabilization methods to protect soils that have been exposed during grading or development. Stabilize cut and fill slopes immediately with plantings of native species, appropriate non-native plants, or with accepted landscaping practices.</p> <p>(PC app. 2/13/12, 12/1/11, 3/16/09)</p> <p><i>[Adapted from Unit I New Development and Land Use Policy 26, p. 66, and Unit II New Development and Land Use Policy 6.d, p. 209]</i></p> <p>C-WR-9 Topsoil. Where topsoil is removed by grading operations, stockpile it for reuse and protect it from compaction and wind or erosion during stockpiling.</p> <p>(PC app. 12/1/11, 3/16/09)</p> <p><i>[Adapted from Unit I New Development and Land Use Policy 26, p. 66, and Unit II New Development and Land Use Policy 6.e, p. 209]</i></p>

Unit I
Existing and Proposed Policy Comparison
New Development and Land Use

fill in excess of 5 feet shall include a report from a registered soils or civil engineer.

Policy Status

The concepts in this policy have been carried forward to LCPA Policies **C-WR-3**, **C-WR-8**, and **C-WR-9**, which also draw language from Unit II New Development and Land Use Policy 6 (p. 209).

**Unit I
Existing and Proposed Policy Comparison
Location and Density of New Development**

Unit I Location and Density of New Development	
Unit I - Existing Policy	LCPA - Proposed Policy
Muir Beach	
<p><u>Policy 27, pg. 79</u> Redesignate residential lot size of parcels along Redwood Creek from 10,000 square feet to 1 acre minimum lot size. (See also Policy I 1-8)</p> <p><u>Policy Status</u> The recommended rezonings of this policy have been implemented by Ordinance 2638. Parcels 199-191-12 & 13, 199-192-10, 11, 12, 13 and 17-20; 199-213-05; 199-212-02,12, and 15; and 199-211-02 were all rezoned from R-A:B-2 to C-R-A:B-4. Since this has already been implemented, the policy language is not carried forward to the LCPA.</p>	n/a
<p><u>Policy 28, pg. 79</u> Make no LCP recommendation for agricultural lands of over 60 acres. (See also Policy II - 29)</p> <p><u>Policy Status</u> This policy is no longer relevant and thus has not been carried forward to the LCPA.</p>	n/a
Stinson Beach (excluding Seadrift)	
<p><u>Policy 29, pg. 79</u> The existing R-2 zoning designation in Stinson Beach shall be retained in order to protect and maintain the existing character of the community, provided, however, that no development other than single-family residences shall be permitted on any parcel of less than 7,500 square feet in area in order to minimize septic tank problems and the cumulative impacts of such development on public access along Calle del Arroyo. All development within these zones shall conform with LCP policies on septic systems and housing. Repair or replacement of existing duplex residential use on a parcel of less than 7,500 square feet damaged or destroyed by natural disaster shall be permitted.</p>	<p>C-SB-1 Community Character of Stinson Beach. Maintain the existing character of residential, small-scale commercial and visitor-serving recreational development in Stinson Beach. New development must be designed to be consistent with community character and protection of scenic resources. [BOS app. 7/30/2013] (PC app. 9/19/11, 7/29/10) [Adapted from Unit I New Development and Land Use Policy 29, p. 79]</p> <p>C-SB-6 R-2 Zoning. Maintain the existing R-2 zoning in Stinson Beach in order to protect and maintain the existing character of the community.</p>

Unit I
Existing and Proposed Policy Comparison
Location and Density of New Development

<p><u>Policy Status</u></p> <p>This policy has been carried forward to LCPA Policies C-SB-1, C-SB-6 and C-SB-7.</p>	<p>(PC app. 9/19/11) <i>[Adapted from Unit I Location and Density of New Development Policy 29, p. 79]</i></p> <p>C-SB-7 Repair or Replacement of Structures. Allow the repair or replacement of existing duplex residential uses on parcels less than 7,500 square feet in the R-2 zoning district that are damaged or destroyed by natural disaster in Stinson Beach.</p> <p>(PC app. 9/19/11) <i>[Adapted from Unit I Location and Density of New Development Policy 29, p. 79]</i></p>
<p><u>Policy 30, pg. 79</u></p> <p>The properties presently zoned R-3 along Shoreline Highway shall be rezoned to R-2 in order to minimize flood hazards and the adverse impacts on Easkoot Creek which would result from such development (Easkoot Creek runs across the subject properties). Redesignation of the R-3 properties to R-2 will also assure development consistent with the existing character of the community. Development shall not be permitted within the 100-year floodplain of Easkoot Creek and shall otherwise conform with LCP Policies on septic systems and stream protection</p> <p><u>Policy Status</u></p> <p>The rezonings required by this policy have already been implemented. Since this has already been implemented, the policy language is not carried forward to the LCPA.</p>	<p>n/a</p>
<p><u>Policy 31, pg. 8</u></p> <p>The properties presently zoned R-1 on the east side of Calle del Arroyo should be redesignated to a "Resource Management Area" in order to assure protection of the adjacent marsh areas of Bolinas Lagoon. (See also Chapter II.)</p> <p><u>Policy Status</u></p> <p>These areas are still zoned R-1, and appear to be part of the Area of Deferred Certification. Therefore, this policy is no longer relevant and has not been carried forward to the LCPA.</p>	<p>n/a</p>
<p><u>Policy 32, pg. 8</u></p>	<p>n/a</p>

**Unit I
Existing and Proposed Policy Comparison
Location and Density of New Development**

<p>The properties presently zoned R-I on the seaward side of the paper street Mira Vista should be redesignated to RSP-2.0 in order to assure preservation of the natural sand dunes and sandy beach areas located seaward of Mira Vista</p> <p><u>Policy Status</u></p> <p>All of the seaward parcels on Mira Vista that were zoned R-I have been rezoned via Ordinance 2638 to C-RSP-2.0. The following parcels were rezoned:</p> <p>195-066-01, 02, 03 195-105-04, 05, 06, 07, 08 195-067-01, 02, 03 195-106-03, 04, 05, 06, 07 195-068-01, 02, 03, 04 195-109-03, 04, 05, 06, 09, 10, 11</p> <p>Since this has already been implemented, the policy language is not carried forward to the LCPA.</p>	
Seadrift	
<p><u>Policy 33, pg. 80</u></p> <p><u>Access program.</u> The access program for the land and water surrounding the Seadrift subdivision consists of two separate sub-elements.</p> <p><u>Ocean Beach Access.</u> The LCP establishes continued moderate access and use of selected areas of the Seadrift Beach. Guaranteed public use of this beach and ocean area would be accomplished in one of three ways: (1) an easement agreement with the property owners, (2) public purchase or (3) litigation to establish the public's prescriptive rights gained via historic use. Option #1 presents the preferred approach for achieving this access element.</p> <p><u>Lagoon Access.</u> The LCP identifies this section of shoreline as an important wildlife habitat area requiring controlled public access to protect that resource. Therefore, only limited public access across those unsubdivided Seadrift subdivision lands fronting Bolinas Lagoon is proposed. Such access easement (2) shall be required as a condition of development of lands owned by the William Kent Estate Co.</p> <p>As a condition of future development approval, an open space and limited pedestrian access easement over the strip of Lagoon-front land (20 acres) shall be offered to the County of Marin or other approved agency/organization. This</p>	<p>C-SB-2 Limited Access in Seadrift. Allow only limited public access across the open space area generally located north of Dipsea Road and adjacent to Bolinas Lagoon in the Seadrift subdivision to protect wildlife habitat subject to the Deed of an Open Space and Limited Pedestrian Easement and Declaration of Restrictions as recorded March 26, 1986 as Instrument No. 86-15531. This area includes parcels 195-070-35 and 36; 195-080-29; 195-090-44; 195-320-62 and 78; and 195-340-71, 72, and 73.</p> <p>(PC app. 1/9/12, 9/19/11, 7/29/10)</p> <p><i>[Adapted from Unit I New Development and Land Use Policy 33, p. 80]</i></p>

**Unit I
Existing and Proposed Policy Comparison
Location and Density of New Development**

<p>easement shall provide educational and scientific access and use of these lands as subsequently approved by the County of Marin or its designee.</p> <p>The developer shall deed to the County of Marin a recorded irrevocable offer of a roadway dedication over the general area of the old causeway. Said roadway offer shall have a common boundary with a public street. The developer shall also agree to financially participate in subsequent construction of the causeway, should it be built. Costs of any causeway reconstruction shall be primarily borne by new development in the area.</p> <p>To provide emergency pedestrian egress from the beach and the Seadrift subdivisions, landowners possessing an interest in the roads, including the right to preclude the public from using the roads, in Seadrift shall record an agreement allowing the public emergency egress during periods of highwater or high tides when the beach is impassable. The County shall cause signing of such emergency access opportunity along the Seadrift Spit. Sign should be placed near the public use area along the Seadrift Spit. Signs should be placed near the public use area at Walla Vista adjacent to Seadrift beach and the northwest end of the Seadrift Spit. The County shall request input from the Seadrift Property Owners Association and the Village Association regarding the exact wording of the signs. The County will through applications for new development ensure emergency vertical egress form the beach to Seadrift Road at the northwest end of the beach and other locations found appropriate.</p> <p><u>Policy Status</u></p> <p>The general concept of this policy has been carried forward to LCPA Policy C-SB-2. However, this policy as well as Unit I Public Access Policy 13 (p. 9), have been superseded by the Seadrift settlement agreement adopted after the LCP was certified [see LCPA Appendix 9], and thus have not been carried forward verbatim.</p>	
<p><u>Policy 34, pg. 81</u></p> <p><u>Water Quality.</u> The existing water quality monitoring agreement between the North Central Coast Regional Commission, the Stinson Beach County Water District, and the Regional Water Quality Control Board, and conducted by the Water District, shall be continued. Should such water quality monitoring data warrant, the County would support a moratorium on additional development pending satisfactory improvement in water quality. New septic systems at Seadrift shall be designed in accordance with Marin County Code, Section 18.06, and waivers to that Section shall comply with the technical report accepted by the Regional Water Quality Control Board, adopted January 2, 1979.</p>	<p><i>Program C-PFS-10.a Continue Stinson Beach Water Quality Monitoring Program.</i> Support the existing water quality monitoring program conducted by the Stinson Beach County Water District, consistent with the agreement with the Regional Water Quality Control Board.</p> <p>(PC app. 9/19/11, 7/29/10)</p> <p><i>[Adapted from Unit I Public Services Policy 11, p. 49, and Unit I Location and Density of New Development Policy 34, p. 81]</i></p>

Unit I
Existing and Proposed Policy Comparison
Location and Density of New Development

<p>Policy Status</p> <p>This policy has been carried forward to LCPA Program C-PFS-10.a, which also draws language from Unit I Public Services Policy 11 (p. 49).</p>	
<p>Policy 35, pg. 81</p> <p>Visual Resources. Height of new construction at Seadrift shall be restricted to one story. (See Also Policy IV-21.)</p> <p>Policy Status</p> <p>The concept of this policy has been carried forward to LCPA Policy C-DES-4, which also draws language from Unit I New Development and Land Use Policy 21 (p. 65).</p>	<p>C-DES-4 Limited Height of New Structures. Limit all new construction to a maximum height of twenty-five (25) feet with the following exceptions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In the Highlands neighborhood of Stinson Beach, the maximum height shall be no more than seventeen (17) feet (see Map 17 – Stinson Beach Highlands Subdivision). 2. In FEMA special flood hazard (V) zones within the Seadrift Subdivision, the maximum building height of 15 feet shall be measured from the minimum floor elevation required by the flood hazard zone designation (see also <i>Environmental Hazards Policy C-EH-11: Minimum Floor Elevations in the Flood Velocity Zone at Seadrift</i>). 3. On the shoreline of Tomales Bay, the maximum height shall be fifteen (15) feet. (See also <i>Community Development Policy C-CD-6: Standards for Development on the Shoreline of Tomales Bay</i>). <p>(PC app. 9/19/11, 7/29/10)</p> <p>[Adapted from Unit I New Development and Land Use Policy 21, p. 65. This policy also carries forward the concept of Unit I Location and Density of New Development Policy 35, p. 81]</p>
<p>Policy 36, pg. 81-84</p> <p><u>Density and Location of Seadrift Development.</u> For purposes of this policy, the Subdivision is divided into sub-areas as follows: (Refer to Figure 4.)</p> <p><u>Area 1:</u> Those lots fronting on the Pacific Ocean and generally south of Seadrift Road (total lots: 123);</p> <p><u>Area 2:</u> Those lots generally between Seadrift Lagoon and Seadrift Road (total lots: 100 94, Separation of Areas 2 and 4 occurs at lot lines between AP #195-320-19 and 195-320-57 and AP #195-090-04, 28 195-051-24 and 195-090-03, 29 195-051-23).</p> <p><u>Area 3:</u> Those lots fronting on Bolinas Lagoon and generally west of Dipsea Road (total lots: 19);</p> <p><u>Area 4:</u> Those lots fronting on Dipsea Road (total lots: 103 109). Area 4 is further divided into Areas 4A and 4B with the division occurring between parcels AP #195-070-07 and 195-070-08.</p> <p><u>Area 5:</u> That unsubdivided land consisting of 26 acres adjacent to the Bolinas Lagoon and the entrance gate of Seadrift.</p>	<p>C-SB-3 Density and Location of Development in Seadrift. Development of the approximately 327 lots within the Seadrift Subdivision shall be allowed consistent with the provisions of the July 12, 1983 Memorandum of Understanding for the settlement of the litigation between Steven Wisenbaker and the William Kent Estate Company, and the County of Marin, and consistent with the terms of the March 16, 1994, Settlement Agreement in the litigation titled Kelly et al. v. California Coastal Commission, Marin County Superior Court Case No. 152998 between the Seadrift Association and the County of Marin. Minimum lot sizes shall be as shown on the final subdivision maps approved by Marin County, as modified by the referenced settlement agreements. See Appendix 5: Seadrift Settlement Agreement.</p> <p>[BOS app. 7/30/2013]</p> <p>(PC app. 1/9/12, 9/19/11, 07/29/10)</p> <p>[Adapted from Unit I Location and Density of New Development Policy 36, p. 81]</p>

Unit I
Existing and Proposed Policy Comparison
Location and Density of New Development

Based upon the present available information and after extensive public hearings and investigation, the following program policies for density reduction and/or location of development at Seadrift are enacted.

- a. Area 1. Those properties in Area 1 present the least potential for adverse impacts by new development activities because of their size, their location relative to lagoon waters, and their build-out potential. Development on existing lots in Area 1 may proceed (consistent with other LCP policies) based upon a new zoning classification of 15,000 square foot minimum lot size. Lot consolidation (of adjacent lots under like ownership) shall occur only by side-by-side lot consolidation, if necessary to achieve the minimum lot size.
- b. Area 2. Those properties in Area 2 are smaller lots with a large amount of build-out potential adjacent to the interior Seadrift Lagoon. Lots in Area 2 shall be rezoned to a 30,000 square foot minimum parcel size. Contiguous (side-by-side) lots under like ownership shall be consolidated to achieve the minimum parcel size requirement.
- c. Area 3. These properties of varying size are located immediately adjacent to Bolinas Lagoon. Development in Area 3 may proceed (consistent with other LCP policies) based upon a new zoning classification establishing 30,000 square foot minimum lot size. Contiguous (side-by-side) lots under like ownership shall be consolidated to achieve minimum building site size established by the rezoning.
- d. Area 4. Except as noted herein, properties in Area 4 shall be rezoned from the existing 75,000 square foot minimum parcel size to a 112,500 square foot (2.5 acre) minimum parcel size. Contiguous properties under the same ownership shall be merged to create building sites totaling up to this lot size, where possible. This Policy shall be implemented by means of a master plan zoning district.

Based upon a Memorandum of Understanding for the settlement of litigation between the County and, Steven Wisenbaker and the William Kent Estate Company, dated July 12, 1983, the portions of area four (4) listed below shall be subject to the following policies:

1. All of the lots listed herein shall be subject to master plan approval pursuant to Chapter 22.45. Any master plan approval shall include all of the lots listed herein and, be subject to all of the policies contained herein;
2. Lot 201 of Seadrift Lagoon Subdivision No. 2 shall be designated as a non-building site in the master plan. This lot may be combined with an adjacent developed lot or developable lot; however, the resultant

Unit I
Existing and Proposed Policy Comparison
Location and Density of New Development

combined lot shall be used as a single lot. A lot line adjustment application pursuant to Title 20 of Marin County Code shall be required to accomplish the combining of a non-buildable lot with a developable lot.

3. Lots 167 through 175 of Seadrift Lagoon Subdivision No. 2 shall be consolidated into seven (7) building sites in the master plan. These lots shall be rezoned to C-RSPS-4.5;
4. Lots 95 through 97 of Seadrift Lagoon Subdivision No. 1 and lots 98 through 102 of Seadrift Lagoon No. 2 shall be consolidated into a maximum of five (5) lots in the master plan. These lots shall be rezoned to C-RSPS-3.5;
5. Lots 104 through 145 of Seadrift Lagoon Subdivision No. 2 shall be consolidated into 32 building sites in the master plan. These lots shall be rezoned to C-RSPS-4.39;
6. Lots 186 and 187 shall be consolidated into one (1) building site in the master plan;
7. The consolidation of all lots shall be accomplished via a tentative and final subdivision map pursuant to Title 20 of Marin County Code;
8. The master plan and tentative map approvals shall provide for a mechanism whereby all of the lots included in the master plan shall be assessed an appropriate share of the cost of developing the proposed access over the old causeway. The appropriate share shall be based upon a consideration of all of the lots that will benefit from the proposed access;
9. The master plan and tentative map approvals shall provide that the front property line for lots abutting Dipsea Road shall not be considered property lines for the purposes of establishing setbacks for leach field areas, so that the private road right-of-way or portions thereof may be used for leach field areas for lots abutting that private roadway. Additionally, the owners of such lots shall retain the right to cross the private right-of-way to the unsubdivided parcel for the installation of leach field areas. This may only be done in a manner consistent with Marin County Code 18.06 and "Septic Tank and Leach Field Waivers" dated November 27, 1978, Marin County Department of Public Works. The use of the private road right-of-way and/or the unsubdivided parcel for the installation of leach fields shall only occur if: a) each lot or user has a discrete sewage disposal system; b) each lot or user has a recorded easement over the necessary portion of the unsubdivided parcel; c) no leach fields are

Unit I
Existing and Proposed Policy Comparison
Location and Density of New Development

<p>located within 100 feet of the mean high tide line of the Bolinas Lagoon; and d) after an opportunity for review and comment has been provided to the Stinson Beach County Water Board.</p> <p>e. <u>Area 5</u>. This area includes approximately 26 acres consisting of 2 parcels of approximately 6 and 20 acres respectively. This land is unsubdivided; however, portions of the property are improved with underground utility services. Although Area 5 is not an explicit part of the Seadrift Subdivision, it is included in this policy because of the physical relationship, and ownership of the land.</p> <p>Because of its location and general configuration, development of Area 5 presents potentially significant conflicts with several findings and policy objectives identified in this Seadrift Section. Therefore, proposals for development of Area 5 shall be controlled by a Master Plan development providing the following development standards:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Additional development in Area 5 shall be limited to no more than 7 additional single-family, detached dwellings and shall be limited to the 6 acre parcel of Area 5; 2. All improvements shall be located a minimum of 100 feet from the waters of Bolinas Lagoon; 3. Development shall be limited to one-story in height, not to exceed 18 feet from average finished grade; 4. Development shall be designed to provide future vehicle and pedestrian access over the site as follows: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Roadway dedications to provide possible future connections of the causeway; b. Pedestrian easements to provide limited public access to and along the Bolinas Lagoon edge. <p><u>Policy Status</u></p> <p>The allowed density and location of development in Seadrift is now addressed by LCPA Policy C-SB-3.</p>	
<p><u>Policy 37, pg. 85</u></p> <p><u>Public Acquisition of Seadrift Subdivision Lands</u>. The Seadrift Subdivision is an existing, subdivided development with approximately one-third of the lots presently developed with single-family houses. Coastal policy issues connected with continued development of this subdivision center upon minimizing of geologic hazards, reducing the possible adverse impacts on water quality, public access to</p>	<p>n/a</p>

Unit I
Existing and Proposed Policy Comparison
Location and Density of New Development

<p>beach and tideland areas, protection of wildlife and habitat resources and maintenance of views along the coast.</p> <p>In review of the Seadrift Subdivision, the County examined these issues and has proposed a regulatory program which successfully acknowledges and addresses the significant aspects of these issues. The County recognizes that public purchase of the lands at the Seadrift Subdivision presents a definitive vehicle for public management of the resource. However, in light of other methods available, the cost of such acquisition would be extremely high in relationship to the needs, principles and goals that have been identified at Seadrift. The proposed program for lot reduction at Seadrift successfully mitigates the coastal issues identified. Only if portions of the program cannot be achieved as envisioned, should public acquisition be considered a program option.</p> <p><u>Policy Status</u></p> <p>This policy does not provide specific policy direction, is out of date, and is no longer relevant. Therefore, it has not been carried forward to the LCPA.</p>	
<p><u>Policy 38, pg. 85</u></p> <p><u>Public trust.</u> Portions of the Seadrift Subdivision may be subject to the doctrine of public trust, whereby easements benefiting selected public uses run with the property. The LCP adequately identifies and provides a balanced level of public use on and adjacent to the land of Seadrift. However, to assure thorough consideration of the public trust issues, the following policy is proposed:</p> <p>The County of Marin will notify the State Lands Commission when an application for a coastal development permit is filed with the County on property identified as potentially subject to the public trust. Such notification shall be on lands shown on maps, supplied by the State Lands Commission, as being potentially subject to the trust easement. The State Lands Commission shall be requested to make a statement as to whether the lands are subject to the public trust, and whether a permit or lease will be required for such proposed development, prior to the issuance of the coastal permit by the County.</p> <p><u>Policy Status</u></p> <p>The contents of this policy are more appropriate for the development code rather than the land use plan. Therefore, this language has been modified and carried forward to LCPA Development Code Section 22.68.080 (p. 96), which also</p>	<p>22.68.080 – Projects Requiring a Coastal Commission Permit</p> <p>A. Coastal Commission approval required. Development or new land uses proposed on tidelands, submerged lands, public trust lands, or otherwise located seaward of the line of Coastal Commission jurisdiction, shall require a Coastal Permit from the Coastal Commission in compliance with Public Resources Code Section 30519(b). Also under the Coastal Commission’s continuing jurisdiction are amendments or extensions to coastal permits issued by the Coastal Commission; thermal power plants of 50 megawatts or greater along with the transmission lines, fuel supply lines, and related facilities to serve them; state university or college projects; and non-federal projects on federal land.</p> <p>B. Determination of jurisdiction. The determination of jurisdiction shall be made by the Coastal Commission based upon maps and other descriptive information that the County, Coastal Commission and/or State Lands Commission may supply.</p> <p>C. Referral. Before issuing a Coastal Permit, the Coastal Commission will refer the application to the State Lands Commission for a determination whether a State Lands Commission permit or lease is required for the proposed development, and whether the State Lands Commission finds it appropriate to exercise the easement over that property. The Coastal Commission shall also refer the application to the County for review and comment.</p>

Unit I
Existing and Proposed Policy Comparison
Location and Density of New Development

<p>carries forward Unit II Public Trust Lands Policy I (p. 129).</p>	<p>D. County land use designations and zoning districts. County land use designations and zoning districts on public trust lands and federal lands shall be advisory only for purposes of the Coastal Commission's review of a coastal permit application.</p>
<p>Bolinas</p>	
<p><u>Policy 39, pg. 85</u> Those lands designated A-5 and A-10 within the Bolinas Planning Area shall be redesignated to an ARP-5 and ARP-10 zone classification to encourage flexible lot patterns. (See Policy 11-30.)</p> <p><u>Policy Status</u> This policy has already been implemented and the referenced parcels rezoned to C-ARP-5 and C-ARP-10 by Ordinance 2638. Since this has been implemented, the policy language has not been carried forward to the LCPA.</p>	<p>n/a</p>
<p><u>Policy 40, pg. 86</u> Redevelopment/rehabilitation of existing structures and new construction on the Bolinas Gridded Mesa shall be permitted in accordance with the adopted policies of the Bolinas Gridded Mesa Plan (original language superseded by Resolution 84-564 adopted by the Board of Supervisors on November 27, 1984).</p> <p><u>Policy Status</u> This policy has been carried forward to LCPA Policy C-BOL-3.</p>	<p>C-BOL-3 New Development on the Bolinas Gridded Mesa. Permit new construction and redevelopment and rehabilitation of existing structures on the Bolinas Mesa in accordance with adopted policies of the Bolinas Gridded Mesa Plan, which has been certified by the California Coastal Commission. (PC app. 11/7/11, 7/29/10) <i>[Adapted from Unit I Location and Density of New Development Policy 40, p. 86]</i></p>