



MARIN COUNTY
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AGENCY
ALEX HINDS, DIRECTOR

May 7, 2007

Marin County Planning Commission
3501 Civic Center Drive
San Rafael, California 94903

SUBJECT: Public Hearing on Draft Marin Countywide Plan Update (CWP)

Dear Planning Commission Members:

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. Conduct public hearing.
2. Ratify proposed CWP changes to guide the Final EIR
3. Continue the public hearing to June 11th

Today's meeting is the 12th public hearing in 2007 on the Draft Marin Countywide Plan (CWP) Update. This hearing will focus on reviewing Planning Commission directed modifications to the Draft CWP. Subsequent meetings will focus on final Planning Commission recommendations on the Final Environmental Impact Report and the Draft CWP. Unless amended, the dates for FEIR and final Planning Commission meetings are:

<u>Date</u>	<u>Topic</u>
June 11	FEIR
June 25	FEIR
July 9	FEIR
July 23	Action on Draft CWP and FEIR

Following today's public hearing, it will be necessary to continue the public hearing to a specific date and time. In order to keep to the schedule, staff is recommending that each topic area be reviewed as follows:

1. Staff presentation and introduction of topics for discussion
2. Public testimony (limited to three minutes or less per individual or 6 minutes or less per organization.)
3. Close public testimony and conduct Commission deliberations and direction on final review of major issues from the Built Environment and Socioeconomic Elements.
4. Conduct straw votes. Straw votes are non binding motions of intent that will be taken on selected issues.

The purpose of this process is to obtain a tentative decision from the Commission as each topic is addressed in order to finalize the Commission's recommendation on the CWP and FEIR by July 23, 2007.

Overview

The Commission has reviewed major issues related to each of the Natural Systems and Agriculture, Built Environment, and Socioeconomic Elements over 11 public hearings beginning February 12, 2007. The Countywide Plan topics covered by the Commission to date are summarized below.

- February 12, 2007** – All topics
- February 26, 2007** – Stream Conservation Area and Wetland Conservation Area
- March 5, 2007** – Baylands Corridor
- March 12, 2007** – Agricultural home sizes, agriculture regulations, and trails
- March 19, 2007** – Remainder of Natural Systems Element
- March 26, 2007** – Continued topics from the Natural Systems Element
- April 2, 2007** – Natural Systems Element: review of tentative decisions
- April 9, 2007** – Housing Overlay Designation, circulation and buildout
- April 16, 2007** – Water, circulation continued, and other Built Environment topics
- April 23, 2007** – Planning Areas, Ridge and Upland Greenbelt, other Built Environment topics
- April 30, 2007** – Socioeconomic Element, HOD and Mixed-Use continued, and other Built Environment Topics
- May 7, 2007** – Built Environment and Socioeconomic Elements: review of tentative decisions

Through this process the Planning Commission has tentatively accepted the mitigation measures proposed in the DEIR along with modifications to text, policies and programs in the Draft CWP. The policy choices in the Draft CWP and proposed mitigation measures from the DEIR received straw votes by the Commission at each hearing. See Attachment 1 for the Tentative Decision Tables which include modified policies, programs, maps, text and other changes to the CWP as directed by the Commission since February 26, 2007.

The Staff report below highlights some of the more major modifications to the Draft CWP directed by the Planning Commission. The PC may call up other modifications in Attachment 1 during deliberations.

ITEM 1: Proposed Text, Map, Policy and Programs for Baylands Corridor

Discussion

On April 2, 2007, the Planning Commission directed staff to bring revised language reflecting their direction for the Baylands Corridor, as follows.

Baylands Corridor Policy: The Baylands Corridor is described on Maps 2-5a and 2-5b. The Baylands Corridor consists of areas previously included in the Bayfront Conservation Zone as well as lands and associated habitat from San Francisco Bay to Highway 101 in the Las Gallinas Planning Area. The Baylands Corridor consists of land containing historic bay marshlands based on maps prepared by the San Francisco Estuary Institute. Where applicable for large parcels (more than two acres in size) which are primarily undeveloped and, based upon site specific characteristics, an additional area of 300 feet or more of associated habitat is included. The inclusion of the 300 foot buffer is consistent with the minimum set back recommendations contained in the 1999 *Baylands Ecosystem Habitat Goals*. This portion of the corridor serves to both recognize the biological importance of associated uplands adjacent to remaining tidelands and to provide the opportunity to improve habitat values as part of future restoration of historic tidelands. (Except in the Tam Junction area, the Baylands Corridor does not extend west of Highway 101.)

Within the Baylands Corridor, potential residential density and commercial floor area ratios shall be calculated at the low end of the applicable ranges. This provision does not apply to small parcels (two acres or less in size) which were legally created prior to January 1, 2007. Within PD-ERA areas, the density and floor area ratios shall be as specified for those areas. Section 22.14.060 of the Development Code should be updated to reflect these policies.

For parcels of all sizes, existing lawful uses are grandfathered. And, creation of the Baylands Corridor does not create an additional layer of government review. No additional regulations are imposed upon small parcels (two acres or less in size) than apply to lands previously applied to lands within the Bayfront Conservation Zone. Creation of the Baylands Corridor will not subject currently allowed activities to additional County regulation. Such activities include repair and maintenance of bank erosion protection (riprap, plantings, etc.) and docks, levees or dredging of existing dredged channels (such as Novato Creek) including existing dredge disposal sites.

Detailed resource mapping and biological analysis should be undertaken to determine whether it is appropriate to include additional associated habitats located on large primarily undeveloped lands within the Baylands Corridor. Small parcels not currently subject to tidal influence should be evaluated to determine whether they should be added to or omitted from the Baylands Corridor.

Recommendation

Accept the Baylands Corridor language as proposed above and revise Maps 2-5a and b, *Baylands Corridor*, accordingly. The proposed language would be incorporated into the Biological Resources Section of the Plan under Goal **BIO-5**, *Baylands Conservation*.

ITEM 2: Ridge and Upland Greenbelt

Discussion

On April 23, 2007, the Planning Commission tentatively accepted the proposed Ridge and Upland Greenbelt (RUG) boundaries as proposed on Map 3-4, subject to staff meeting with David Hansen, Planning Acquisition Manager of the Marin County Parks and Open Space, to confirm the map includes all existing and proposed RUG areas.

In addition, on April 23, 2007, the Commission tentatively accepted Policies DES-4.d and DES-4.e, as modified below, which provide for view protection in the Ridge and Upland Greenbelt. The Planning Commission further requested that staff ascertain whether there were any developed areas that met RUG criteria that could be added to the RUG map prior to final Planning Commission action on the draft CWP or whether this should be the subject of a future study as called for by DES-4.e as modified.

On April 27, 2007 staff met with David Hansen to review the RUG maps and to discuss the possible inclusion of developed areas prior to final Commission action on the draft CWP. The initial review of maps indicates that the proposed RUG maps include all areas currently in the RUG. Staff will be following up to ensure the RUG map included in the revised draft CWP for the Commission's final consideration in July 2007 includes all existing areas identified in the RUG. As to the question of whether to consider including already developed areas in the RUG at this time, David Hansen strongly urged that this be the subject of a future study as currently called for in **DES-4.e** *Protect Views of Ridge and Upland Greenbelt Areas*. Mr. Hansen noted that this evaluation needs to be carefully undertaken to be sure any areas included are consistent with the intent of the RUG including protecting the visual aspects of ridges of countywide significance and maintaining community identity.

Recommendation

Confirm direction to staff to be sure the RUG map in the revised CWP being prepared for final Commission consideration in July 2007 includes all areas currently in the RUG. No further changes to the RUG programs are needed.

ITEM 3: St. Vincent's / Silveira

Discussion

On April 23, 2007, the Planning Commission modified **SV-2.5**, *Establish Land Use Categories* as follows (Options 1-4 would be deleted):

SV-2.5 Establish Land Use Categories. The St. Vincent's/Silveira area is assigned the Planned Designation – ~~Agricultural~~ Agricultural and Environmental Resource Area land use category. Potential uses include agricultural and related uses, residential development, education and tourism, places of worship, institutional, and small-scale hospitality uses, as described more fully in SV-2.3.

The base density and intensity for the combined St. Vincents and Silveira sites is up to 350 dwelling units together with all existing non-residential uses. ~~In addition to existing uses, a combined total on both the St. Vincents and Silveira sites of up to 350 dwelling units and~~ As an alternative to any density bonus authorized by State law, an additional a density bonus of 150 units shall be allowed for ~~of~~ affordable housing for seniors, employees and others ~~density bonus units may be allowed.~~ Dwelling units shall be

allocated proportionally to the respective St. Vincent's and Silveira areas based on the total acreage of the St. Vincent's/Silveira area as determined by the County at the time of the first application for development of more than four units or their equivalent in the area. ~~attorneys to add procedure language~~ Senior units may include a combination of apartment style and/or congregate care units at varying degrees of affordability within the total allowable (with density bonus) dwelling unit cap of 500 units. Only senior care units with kitchens would be considered dwelling units subject to the dwelling unit limitations. Within these standards, the Master Plan approval process will determine the specific types and amounts of development suitable for these properties taking into consideration environmental constraints and the community benefits associated with providing higher levels of housing affordable to low and very low income persons and smaller residential unit sizes. Pursuant to the PD-Agricultural and Environmental Resource Area land use category, non-residential uses may be permitted in lieu of some dwelling units, provided that the impacts of the non-residential development on peak hour traffic do not exceed those projected for the residential development being replaced.

On April 23, 2007, the Planning Commission also modified **SV-2.4, Cluster Development**, as follows:

SV-2.4 Cluster Development. New non-agricultural development on either the St. Vincent's or the Silveira property shall be clustered on up to five percent of the land area of each property, or as determined through a site specific analysis of agricultural and environmental constraints and resources, observing habitat protection policies including, but not limited to, streamside conservation, ridge and upland greenbelt, wetlands, tidelands, and community separation. Existing development shall not be counted toward the 5 percent cluster requirement for the land area for each property.

In addition, development on the St. Vincent's property ~~shall~~ should be clustered around the "H" complex with the Chapel and the "H" complex buildings retained as the community center as determined by a Master Plan process.

On April 23, 2007 the Planning Commission accepted the following policy modifications related to St Vincent's and Silveira:

SV-2.6 Avoid Impact of Odors from Sewage Treatment Plan. Avoid impacts associated with odors from the Las Gallinas Valley sewage treatment plant and ponds.

The St. Vincent's and Silveira map(s) in the CWP will be revised to show:

MAP 2.4: Tidal properties should be designated Open Space

Map 3-34 *TO SHOW AREAS OF LIQUEFACTION, VIEW CORRIDOR AND DRAINAGE CORRIDOR PER POLICIES AND PROGRAMS

*Drainage swale per policy SV-1.9.

*View corridor per policy SV-1.5.

SV-6.1 Provide Transportation Improvements. Provide the transportation improvements identified in the transportation section of the Built Environment Element in conjunction with development {*Check for consistency with Circulation language – TR-1.5*}

Recommendation

Accept the policies and programs related to St. Vincent's and Silveira as modified.

OVERVIEW – MIXED USE AND HOD

The HOD and Mixed Use designations have the same basic purpose: To enhance opportunities for the provision of work force and affordable housing. While there are minor differences between the incentives and limitations for each designation, mixed use development caps are provided to provide certainty as to the maximum amount of new development under the Countywide Plan.

ITEM 4: Housing Overlay Designation

Discussion

On April 30, 2007 the Planning Commission directed Staff to bring back the HOD policy and program with modifications including:

- Increase potential HOD units in the Marin City Traffic Impact Area by 75 units to a total of 150;
- Change the total HOD units to 658;
- Include a Map of Traffic Impact Areas based on both screenlines and HOD locational criteria to limit the geographic extent of Traffic Impact Areas;
- Clarification that on large commercial sites HOD unit square footage would be offset by a reduction in permissible commercial square footage;
- Clarification that senior units must be within the peak hour traffic generated by the permissible development on a site;
- Clarification that 25 units/acre refers to the density of only that portion of the site developed for housing;
- Development within an HOD designated or approved area may utilize the state density bonus or the alternative density bonus provided by Exhibit 5.0-15, but not both; and
- Encouragement of a community planning process.

The proposed modifications to policy **CD-2.3** and program **CD-2.d** per the Commission’s direction are reflected in the revised language below.

CD-2.3 Establish a *Housing Overlay Designation*.

Establish a Housing Overlay Designation. The Housing Overlay Designation (“HOD”) is established, as shown on Maps 3-2a and 3-2b. The purpose of the HOD is to encourage construction of units to meet the need for workforce housing, especially for very low- and low-income households, and for special needs housing, in the City-Centered Corridor close to transit, employment, and/or public services, including reuse of existing shopping centers or other underutilized sites. Development within the HOD that meets the standards in Program CD-2.d shall be eligible for a density bonus as an alternative to any density bonus authorized by State law. Development pursuant to the HOD Policy and Program on sites designated as both mixed use and as suggested HOD sites are subject to the HOD criteria for development and not as mixed use site. On commercially designated parcels over 12 acres in size including Marin City, each square foot of HOD housing shall be offset by an equal reduction in the square footage of the permissible commercial development. Up to 658 housing units may be approved within the Housing Overlay Designation subject to a discretionary approval process.

The criteria used in establishing the Housing Overlay Designation include:

Designated by the Countywide Plan as Planned Designation (PD) Transit Village Area or Reclamation Area, Multifamily (MF), General Commercial (GC), Neighborhood Commercial (NC), Office Commercial (OC), Recreation Commercial (RC), or Public Facility (PF). Located within:

- The unincorporated portion of the City-Centered Corridor:
- One-half mile of a transit node or route with daily, regularly scheduled service:
and
- One mile of a medical facility, library, post office, or commercial center.
- The area to be developed:
 - Does not exceed an average 20 percent slope and is not within the Ridge and Upland Greenbelt;
 - Is not within a Wetlands Conservation Area or Streamside Conservation Area;
 - Is not a park or public open space area; and
 - Is not primarily located within the 100 year flood plain.

- Preliminary feasibility of site to meet affordability requirements.

The County will engage in discussions with cities and towns within Marin County regarding the possibility of locating residential units otherwise allocated to the Housing Overlay Designation within these cities and towns, subject to the criteria described above.

Based on the above, the potential Housing Overlay Designation suggested sites and unit allocations by traffic impact areas are listed in **Exhibit 5.0-15** and shown in **Exhibit 5.0-16**.

Exhibit 5.0-15

<i>Exhibit 5.0-15</i>		
<u>Traffic Impact Areas as determined by Screenlines and HOD site criteria (See Exhibit 5.0-16 forthcoming)</u>	HOD Unit Potential for Traffic Impact Areas (including Density Bonus Units)	Suggested Qualifying Sites within Traffic Impact Areas
Screenline 13:	50	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Lomita Park (San Rafael) ○ <u>Other qualifying sites</u>
Screenline 22:	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Oak Manor ○ <u>Other qualifying sites</u>
Screenline 7:	110	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Marinwood Shopping Center ○ <u>Idylberry School</u> ○ <u>Other qualifying sites</u>
Screenline 19:	50	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Fireside Motel
Screenline 23:	163	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ College of Marin ○ Marin General Hospital ○ Toussin ○ <u>Other qualifying sites</u>
Screenline 8:	25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Gallinas Elementary School ○ <u>Other qualifying sites</u>
Screenline 17:	100	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Strawberry Shopping Center ○ <u>Other qualifying sites</u>
Screenline 21:	<u>150</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Marin City Shopping Center ○ <u>Other qualifying sites</u>
	Total: <u>658</u>	Total Potential HOD Units including Density Bonus Units

Proposed Modifications to Program **CD-2.d**:

CD-2.d *Implement the Housing Overlay Designation Program.* The reviewing authority may allocate HOD units to suggested qualifying sites or other qualifying sites within Traffic Impact Areas shown on **Exhibit 5.0-16**. The number of HOD units shall be a density bonus and shall be an alternative to any density bonus authorized by State law; project sponsors may elect to proceed pursuant to either the HOD density bonus or State law density bonus. Housing Overlay units within identified Traffic Screenlines may be allocated to suggested HOD sites listed in Exhibit 5.0-15 if the HOD project meets the following standards:

- a) Developer is encouraged to undertake a community based planning process.
- b) Developer is encouraged to maintain ownership interest in the project.
- c) High-quality building and site design that fits with the surrounding neighborhood and incorporates attractive and usable common/open space areas must be utilized, consistent with design guidelines.
- d) Affordability levels to be consistent with the County's inclusionary requirements.

For rental developments

- a.) At least 49% of the units should be deed restricted and occupied by households whose incomes are 60% or less of area median income, adjusted for family size.

For ownership developments:

- a.) at least 60% of the units should be deed restricted and occupied by households whose incomes are 80% or less of area median income adjusted for family size,
- b.) OR at least 49% of the units should be deed restricted and occupied by households whose incomes are 60% or less of area median income, adjusted for family size.
- e) Affordable ownership and rental units shall be deed restricted in perpetuity or for a period of not less than 55 years to ensure a stock of affordable ownership and rental units.
- f) Housing densities of at least 25 units per acre on the portion of the site developed for housing.
- g) Projects that qualify for the designation and meet the affordability requirements may be entitled to development standard adjustments, such as parking, floor area ratio, height and fee reductions and other considerations.
- h) The inclusion of workforce housing, especially for very low- and low-income households and for special needs housing, will be strongly encouraged at the time of commercial or other expansion and major remodeling proposals.
- i) Additional "units" of senior housing on an HOD site may be permitted if: (1) the additional "units" are affordable to below market households; and (2) projected peak-hour traffic impacts of the proposed affordable senior housing fall within the

maximum peak-hour traffic generated by the permissible development on the site based on a traffic study to verify reduced trips and reduced parking.

- j) Parking requirements may be adjusted on a case-by-case basis for senior and affordable housing using criteria established in the URBEMIS model to encourage transit oriented development. Trip reduction credits may be obtained through utilization of the following mitigation measures locating development close to transit, or in a location where the jobs-housing balance will be optimized; commitments from the developer to implement demand management programs including parking pricing and leased parking for market rate units; use of tandem parking, off-site parking, among other measures to permanently reduce parking need. Reduction of parking requirements are subject to discretionary approval and may require a parking study to verify reduced parking demand.
- k) Potential impacts are mitigated to the maximum extent feasible.
- l) Occupancy or resident preferences for HOD projects should be analyzed for appropriateness in each project, taking into consideration applicable traffic impacts, jobs/housing balance opportunities, and fair housing laws.

Application can be made by a property owner to the County for the designation of a new HOD site which meets all of the criteria identified in Policy **CD-2.3**. In such cases, the review authority may designate an additional HOD site and reallocate units “assigned to” HOD sites within the same Traffic Impact Area within the ~~758~~ 658 total HOD units. Funding shall be pursued to prepare Master Plans and related environmental review documents to facilitate development on HOD sites.

The County’s inclusionary housing ordinance (Marin County Code Chapter 22.22) shall be amended to exempt from inclusionary housing requirements any project developed with an HOD density bonus.

Recommendation

Accept revisions to HOD (Policy **CD-2.3** and **CD-2.d**) as reflected above.

ITEM 5: LOS

Discussion

On April 30th the Planning Commission requested staff bring back Program TR-1.e to restrict densities where LOS was exceeded with modifications to the proposed exceptions. The proposed modifications are reflected in the revised policy below.

TR-1.e Uphold Vehicle Level of Service Standards. Uphold peak-hour vehicle Level of Service standard (LOS) D or better for urban and suburban arterials and LOS E or better for freeways and rural expressways. Only the Congestion Management Program specified roadway

and highway segments operating at a lower LOS than the standard in 1991 are “grandfathered” and may continue to operate at the lower LOS standard until such time as the roads are improved or the traffic load or demand is altered or diverted. An improvement plan should be developed on Highway 101 and the grandfathered roadway segments to address existing deficiencies through transportation demand management, transit, and infrastructure improvements where non-infrastructure alternatives are not feasible. New development shall be restricted to the low end of the applicable residential density/commercial floor area ratio range where the LOS standards will be exceeded at any intersection or road segment or worsened on any grandfathered segment. Densities higher than the low end of the applicable residential density/commercial floor area ratio may be considered for the following:

- Development that qualifies as Housing Overlay Projects in accordance with Policy **CD-2.3**, *Establish a Housing Overlay Designation*, and Program **CD-2.d**, *Implement the Housing Overlay Designation*
- Mixed use projects developed in accordance with Policy **CD-8.7**.
- Minor improvements or renovation of existing neighborhood serving retail uses provided the total square footage is not increased and community serving uses are retained.
- Second units developed pursuant to state law.
- New affordable housing projects that do not exceed 50 units affordable to very low and low income households.
- Projects within a Public Facilities designation

All projects shall be conditioned to include feasible mitigation measures for project-related traffic impacts.

Recommendation

Accept TR-1.e as modified above.

ITEM 6: Mixed Use

Discussion

On April 30, 2007 the Planning Commission directed Staff to bring back the Mixed Use policy and land use designations with modifications including:

- Clarification that the permissible FAR includes any housing developed on a mixed use site;
- Capping the total allowable units in mixed use projects to 1,036;
- The additional residential units allowed by the mixed use designation are an alternative to the state density bonus. Development may utilize one but not both of these bonuses. The

maximum number of 1036 can not be exceeded without a plan amendment accompanied by environmental review. The maximum densities apply whether the bonus utilized is the state bonus or the bonus allowed by this policy.

CD-8.7 Establish Commercial/Mixed Use Land Use Categories and Intensities.

Commercial/mixed use land use categories are established to provide for a mix of retail, office, and industrial uses as well as moderate to high density mixed-use residential development in a manner compatible with public facilities, natural resource protection, environmental quality, and high standards of urban design. Mixed-use developments that incorporate residential units on commercial properties are encouraged to provide on-site housing for employees and contribute to affordable housing. Mixed use projects shall not exceed the maximum permissible Floor Area Ratio for each site except for affordable units located in areas with acceptable vehicle levels of service pursuant to Policy TR-1.e. Up to 1,036 units may be approved for mixed use development subject to a discretionary approval process. The additional units contemplated by this policy are an alternative to the state density bonus. Development may utilize one but not both of these bonuses.

The following criteria shall apply to any mixed-use development:

1. For parcels larger than 2 acres in size, no more than 50% of the total amount of new floor area may be developed for commercial uses provided an equal square footage of new housing is developed. For parcels 2 acres and less in size, no more than 75% of the total amount of new floor area may be developed for new commercial uses provided an area equal to 25% of the new commercial floor area shall be developed for new housing. Compliance with the above provisions shall be subject to the requirements of the County's jobs/housing linkage and inclusionary housing ordinance (Marin County Code Chapter 22.22).
2. Projected peak-hour traffic impacts of the proposed mixed-use development are no greater than that for the maximum commercial development permissible on the site under the specific land use category;
3. Priority shall be given to the retention and continuation of existing neighborhood serving retail uses in any redevelopment of existing commercial sites; and
4. The site design fits with the surrounding neighborhood and incorporates design elements such as podium parking, usable common/open space areas, and vertical mix of uses, where applicable.

The following categories shall be established for commercial land uses: (Footnote: Note that the zoning designations listed in each category below are examples of consistent zoning and are not

the only possible consistent zoning designations. A complete list of permitted and conditional uses and the development standards can be found in the Development Code. Educational, charitable, and philanthropic institutions such as schools, libraries, community centers, museums, hospitals, childcare centers, and places of worship may be permitted in any commercial area.)

General Commercial/Mixed Use. The General Commercial mixed-use land use category is established to allow for a wide variety of commercial uses including retail and service businesses, professional offices, and restaurants, as well as moderate to high density mixed-use residential development. The Development Code includes permitted and conditional uses and development standards consistent with this designation. The Land Use Policy Maps provide floor area ratio (FAR) standards for this designation. Residential development located in a mixed-use development within this designation shall be included in the permissible amount of development under these FARs.

Consistent Zoning: C P
C1 - H
H - 1
RMP - .1 to RMP - 30

Office Commercial/Mixed Use. The Office Commercial land use category is established to encourage a mixture of professional, administrative, and medical office uses, as well as medium to high density mixed-use or residential development where appropriate. Employee and resident-serving retail and service businesses may also be permitted within this category. The Development Code includes permitted and conditional uses and development standards consistent with this designation. The Land Use Policy Maps provide for commercial floor area ratio (FAR) standards for this designation. Residential development located in a mixed-use development within this designation shall be included in the permissible amount of development under these FARs.

Consistent Zoning: A - P
O - P
RMP - .1 to RMP - 30

Neighborhood Commercial/Mixed Use. The Neighborhood Commercial land use category is established to encourage smaller-scale retail and neighborhood-serving office and service uses and mixed-use development oriented toward pedestrians and located in close proximity to residential neighborhoods. The Development Code includes permitted and conditional uses and development standards consistent with this designation. The Land Use Policy Maps provide for floor area ratio (FAR) standards for this designation. Residential development located in a mixed-use development within this designation shall be included in the permissible amount of development under these FARs.

Consistent Zoning: VCR
RMPC
VCR:B2

Recommendation

Accept Mixed Use Policy, **CD-8.7**, which requires a mixture of new residential and commercial uses and results in a reduction in the square footage of the permissible commercial development. as modified above

ITEM 7: Quarry Development

Discussion

On April 23, 2007 the Planning Commission accepted the methodology to get to total allowable residential and equivalent uses based on existing truck and other trips at the Quarry Since current quarry operations as well as the application for an amended quarry permit would only allow for 250 truck trips / day, 75 dwelling units were considered the equivalent level of residential traffic since a six-axle truck equates to approximately three personal vehicles, the equivalent residential use would be 750 vehicle trips or 75 housing units - or as determined by a site specific traffic analysis at the time of application.

PD-Reclamation Area [no change]

The PD-Reclamation Area land use category is intended for the ultimate reclamation of the San Rafael Rock Quarry and McNear's Brickyard site at the time the quarrying operations cease. As part of an updated reclamation plan, the ultimate reuse of the site will be identified, as will a time horizon as to when such reclamation would occur. While the Countywide Plan assumes that at such time as reclamation of the site occurs that it would be annexed to the City of San Rafael, if annexation should not take place, the Plan contemplates development under the County's jurisdiction. In general, uses would be primarily residential, a marina, and limited, supporting commercial, as reflected by the Peacock Gap Neighborhood Plan, adopted by the City of San Rafael and the County.

Recommendation

Maintain the land use designation for the Point San Pedro Rock Quarry as **PD – Reclamation Area** as proposed in the Draft 2005 CWP. Map 3.2 will be revised to exclude FAR and only reference 75 new housing units or a number determined to be equivalent to existing quarry-related traffic at the time an application is filed.

ITEM 8: Proposed Text re: Keeping Up with Science

Discussion

The Commission requested the following language be considered for addition to the Introduction section of the Countywide Plan to address the role of science in planning.

The Role of Science

Achieving and maintaining sustainability requires keeping up with science. At times, land use and other public policy decisions operate within an institutional framework that does not reflect current scientific information. This is understandable as cutting edge science is always on the move. For example, the multiple causes and effects of climate change, described below, are now well established and current land use decision-making needs to reflect the link between fossil fuel consumption and sea level rise.

Keeping up with science is an underlying principle of this Plan. Towards that end, employing evidence-based strategies combined with up to date scientific knowledge will provide sound guidelines for taking care of the land, our communities, and the generations that will follow us.

Recommendation

Accept the addition to the Introduction section of the Countywide Plan as proposed above.

ITEM 9: Revised language for Trail Maps

Discussion

Following the Commission's direction and advice from Counsel, the following language will replace the NOTE currently proposed on the Trail Maps on page XX of the revised Draft 2005 CWP in the Trails Section of the Natural Systems and Agriculture Element.

“NOTE: Proposed trail routes indicated shall not be considered specific trail alignments; such alignments may be obtained and developed pursuant to the trail implementation recommendations set forth in this Plan. This map is a planning document. Only those trails shown on the maps as existing trails are available for public use. In regard to proposed trails, the public has no right to enter private property without the owner's permission. If and when the public acquires or is granted an easement for trail purposes in any area where a trail is proposed, the public may use such area as specified in the easement.

For copies of maps about existing trails that are available for public use, contact Marin County Open Space District.”

Recommendation

Accept revisions to Trail Maps NOTE as proposed above.

New ISSUE – Santa Venetia Community Plan

Discussion

Staff recently met with members of the Santa Venetia Neighborhood Association. Because Santa Venetia is currently one of the only major communities in the unincorporated County that does not currently have a community plan, the community members have requested that a program be added to the Countywide Plan recognizing the need for a Santa Venetia Community Plan. There are currently policies and programs in the Community Development Section of the Plan (**CD-4.1 and CD-4.a**) to update existing community plans and focus on watershed planning. It therefore appears appropriate to add a program to consider preparing new community plans for neighborhoods such as Santa Venetia based on key community and watershed concerns.

Existing Policy: **CD-4.1 Update Community Plans.** Amend existing community plans as necessary to define how policies and programs of the Countywide Plan will be implemented. (See Map 3-3, Community Plan Areas, and Map Set 3-37, Land Use Policy Maps in the Planning Areas Section.)

Existing Program: **CD-4.a Update Community Plans with a Watershed-Protection Approach.** Revise existing community plans in accordance with an approved work program to maintain consistency with the land use plan and programs of the Countywide Plan. Emphasis should also be placed on the need to consider and protect the health of the watersheds when making site-specific land use decisions (see Map Set 3-37, Land Use Policy Maps in the Planning Areas Section). These updated community plans should also evaluate and refine the locations of the Ridge and Upland Greenbelt areas and address bicycle and pedestrian circulation as needed.

Proposed Program: **CD-4.e (new) Consider Additional Community Plans for Unincorporated Neighborhoods.** Propose development of additional community plans for unincorporated neighborhoods such as Santa Venetia and Muir Woods Park to be considered by the Board of Supervisors when reviewing Community Development Agency work program priorities.

Recommendation

Accept Program CD-4.e (new) as proposed above.

Respectfully Submitted,

Alex Hinds

Kris Krasnove

Attachments:

1. Tentative Decision Summary Tables February 26 through April 23.