March 8, 2016

Marin County Board of Supervisors
3501 Civic Center Drive
San Rafael, CA 94903

SUBJECT: Update of the 1978 Black Point Community Plan and the Draft Black Point/Green Point Communities Plan.

Dear Supervisors,

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends your Board consider the recommendation of the Marin County Planning Commission to adopt the Draft Black Point/Green Point Communities Plan (Draft Plan)(Attachment 1). As explained in the following report, your Board may also wish to consider alternatives to the Draft Plan recommended by the Planning Commission, based on input that has arisen through the public review process, including but not limited to: a) adopting the Draft Plan for the Black Point neighborhood only while retaining the current community plan for the Green Point neighborhood, with appropriate revisions; and b) retaining specific policies the Planning Commission has recommended be removed from the Draft Plan regulating home size and setbacks.

SUMMARY:

The 1978 Black Point Community Plan (1978 Plan) is among one of the earliest community plans adopted by your Board. The effort to update the Plan began in April 2013 with the formation of an Advisory Committee comprised of five community representatives tasked to provide guidance on the scope, public outreach, community engagement, and policy development for the update of the 1978 Plan.

The community plan area, historically known as Black Point, includes both the Black Point and Green Point neighborhoods. Based on community feedback and in recognition that the Black Point community has since evolved into two distinct neighborhoods, the Black Point Community Plan has been renamed the “Black Point /Green Point Communities Plan” as part of the Planning Commission’s recommendation. The Draft Plan is a planning document which provides information and sets forth goals, policies, and guidelines related to issues relevant to the unincorporated neighborhoods of Black Point and Green Point.

Many issues addressed in the 1978 Plan are still relevant today. These include maintaining the community’s existing zoning, retaining the rural character of roadways, and continuing to rely on septic systems as the primary means of waste disposal. The Draft Plan continues to maintain the area’s semi-rural identity and
preserve the natural attributes and features that contribute towards its unique community character and quality of life. Specific topic areas addressed in the Draft Plan include natural resources, environmental hazards, land use, community character, transportation, public facilities and services, parks and recreation, and public safety. These topics are addressed in the “Organization of the Community Plan” section below.

Following three community-wide public workshops, a public workshop with both the Planning Commission and Advisory Committee, and over 29 Advisory Committee meetings, the Marin County Planning Commission unanimously voted to recommend your Board approve the Draft Plan in July 2015 (Attachment 3). This process is described in more detail in the “Background” section below.

Two principal issues have come to the forefront of the update process. One stems from a desire on the part of some Green Point residents to be recognized separately from the Black Point neighborhood and have a separate community plan, while the other relates to the Planning Commission recommendation to remove specific policies that tighten the existing regulations on home size and placement. In part, however, the issue of neighborhood representation appears to be driving the movement to separate the community plan, which has resulted in much neighborhood discord.

Despite the extensive efforts to engage and inform residents and stakeholders in the community, some residents in the Green Point neighborhood have asserted the update process was flawed and the resulting Draft Plan is not representative of the issues or values important to the Green Point community. Furthermore, they have indicated a separate community plan is justified for Green Point to address the community’s unique values and assets and request deletion of the Green Point neighborhood from the Draft Plan, as described in the attached letter (Attachment 5). Because this issue gained momentum after the Planning Commission concluded its hearings on the Draft Plan, the Commission did not consider the proposition of allowing separate plans for the Green Point and Black Point neighborhoods. Rather, the Planning Commission focused on the issue of community identity and how the Draft Plan should represent the two neighborhoods.

The Advisory Committee endorsed a new policy limiting new homes and additions to no more than 10% of the median floor area of the surrounding homes when a project triggers Design Review in accordance with the existing zoning regulations. These types of projects could only be approved if the County found the project complies with a list of specific findings aimed at preserving the building scale and visual resources of the project area. (These findings are generally consistent with the County’s existing Design Review standards.) The Planning Commission has recommended this new Design Review policy be removed from the Draft Plan.

BACKGROUND:

In early 2013, some 35 years after its original adoption, the Black Point Community Plan was selected as a priority for an updated community plan due to the age of the existing plan as well as the level of interest demonstrated by the community, consistent with guidelines in the Community Plan Update Strategy adopted by your Board in 2012. Preparation of the Plan involved extensive community input, including:
• Over 29 meetings with the Advisory Committee to provide guidance on the scope, public outreach, community engagement, and development of draft policies. All Advisory Committee meetings were publicly noticed throughout the planning area and open to the public; and

• Three community-wide public workshops were conducted on March 2015, June 2014, and August 2013 to engage residents, encourage the sharing of information and ideas, and to obtain input and feedback on various issues. The workshops were fairly well attended by residents of both the Black Point and Green Point neighborhoods. In addition, a public workshop with the Planning Commission and the Advisory Committee was held on January 26, 2015 to solicit feedback on the scope of key issues proposed in the Draft Plan. Finally, the Planning Commission recommended adoption of the Draft Plan at a formal public hearing on July 27, 2015.

Several tools were used to reach out, inform, and engage residents about the update process. Every property owner in the community plan area was notified by mail for each public workshop and hearing (mailed notices tend to be the most effective and reliable method of making initial contact with residents). Attempts were also made to reach potential renters by addressing notices to "resident" where the property owner's mailing address was different than the situs address (an indicator the property may be rented). Announcements and news releases were also regularly distributed through the project's County GovDelivery email subscription service, which currently includes up to 370 subscribers, and posted on the project website at www.maricounty.org/blackpoint. Media was also disseminated via Patch and Nextdoor, and residents were also offered opportunities to participate through several online topic forums through Open Marin and Survey Monkey.

Advisory Committee members assisted with public outreach by placing sandwich boards with meeting information at key points throughout both the Black Point and Green Point neighborhoods. Messages were also shared through the Black Point Improvement Club's (BPIC) email distribution list, and staff presented on the status of the community plan update at two of BPIC's regular meetings.

The approach taken to update the community plan has been open, transparent, inclusive, and responsive to stakeholder needs. A significant amount of time and staff resources has gone into the process, not to mention countless volunteer hours, time and dedication from the Advisory Committee, in addition to contributions from staff from Marin County Parks, Department of Public Works, and Novato Fire Department through attendance at community workshops, Advisory Committee meetings, staff meetings, and review and input of draft documents.

ORGANIZATION OF THE COMMUNITY PLAN
The Draft Plan is grounded in the policies of the Marin Countywide Plan, and parallels its structure being organized into seven chapters, as summarized below:

1. Introduction

The introduction outlines the community plan preparation process, explains the relationship between community plans and the Countywide Plan, and lays out the goals of the Plan.
2. **Background**

Chapter 2 summarizes background material including the community's location in the county with respect to the Countywide Plan's environmental corridors and describes some of the external entities which influence the community, such as the City of Novato, Caltrans, and the Sonoma Marin Area Rail Transit (SMART) system. The chapter also provides demographic background and historical information.

3. **Natural Resources**

The Natural Resources chapter gives an overview of some of the key policies and programs contained in the Countywide Plan as they apply to the Plan area to protect, restore, and enhance watersheds, natural habitats, and sensitive species in Marin. In particular, it describes why the protection of wildlife habitat and movement corridors is important to the community, and provides information on Sudden Oak Death.

4. **Environmental Hazards**

The Environmental Hazards chapter focuses on fire risk, earthquakes, flooding, and sea level rise. The threat of fire is significant due to the area's vegetation, topography, and climate. Narrow roads, lack of access, and development patterns also exacerbate the problem. The Draft Plan includes a map of evacuation routes, one of the first community plans to provide such information, as well as a number of "Options for Consideration" or ideas that residents may want to further explore to enhance fire protection and emergency preparedness in the community. Background information and maps describing how the area's topography and geology play a role in ground shaking and liquefaction susceptibility from earthquakes is also provided. Flooding is also a concern, and the Draft Plan provides an overview of ongoing efforts by the Flood Control District, working in conjunction with the Marin County Watershed Program, to minimize flooding in the community and undertake projects that integrate both flood protection and environmental restoration. Finally, this chapter acknowledges community concerns regarding sea level rise and lays out conceptual guidance supporting work presently getting underway to determine specific impacts and appropriate adaptation strategies for the community.

5. **Community Character and Land Use**

Chapter 5 addresses the topics of land use and zoning, home size, setbacks, legal nonconforming lots, light pollution (night skies), and affordable housing. Information is provided describing the area's existing and planned development, in addition to a more focused discussion on appropriate uses for the Village Center neighborhood. The chapter describes existing tools used to protect community character, including the Design Review process and the County's Single-family Residential Design Guidelines. The Draft Plan includes a new policy to encourage specific land use types in the Village Center area and recommends minimizing light pollution to protect the night sky.

6. **Transportation**

Chapter 6 address transportation and related concerns with roads - including road maintenance, paper streets, speed enforcement, and parking - as well as public transportation, bicycle and pedestrian access, and equestrian trails. The area's roads are developed to rural standards and lack improvements such as shoulders,
sidewalks, curbs and gutters. Road maintenance is an issue since many of the roads in the planning area are not County-maintained. The community's many paper streets are seen as assets as they serve as pedestrian and equestrian pathways, provide connections to open space and recreation areas, provide emergency access, and serve as wildlife habitat and movement corridors.

7. Public Facilities and Services

Chapter 7 focuses on water supply, wastewater management, and annexations and spheres of influence. Background information on the North Marin Water District, which provides water service to the community, is included. In addition, the Draft Plan describes how the community's use of septic systems for wastewater management has helped retain the area's rural character by limiting more intensive development. Information on wastewater services provided by the County, as well as links to other resources, is also provided. Finally, contextual information describing the role of Marin's Local Agency Formation Commission, as well as the City of Novato's Urban Growth Boundary and Sphere of Influence, is also included.

8. Parks and Recreation

Chapter 8 describes how parks and open space preserves are planned, managed and funded in Marin County and provides an overview of the various parks and recreation amenities in and around the community. This chapter also identifies a number of suggestions from the community for consideration as part of future park planning efforts, including improved public access and trail linkages, parking improvements, and potential areas that may be purchased for permanent protection.

9. Public Safety

A small number of recent home break-ins and thefts within the community have created concerns with regards to public safety. This chapter provides a brief overview of neighborhood safety and law enforcement resources and provides a number of potential strategies residents may utilize to reduce the risk of crime in their neighborhood.

SUMMARY OF PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION

As summarize below, the Planning Commission considered a number of key issues at the July 2015 public hearing concerning community identity, land use in the Village Center area, home size, and setbacks.


The name of the community plan and how it represents the Black Point and Green Point neighborhoods within the planning area have given rise to divergent points of view. The name of the 1978 Black Point Community Plan reflects the community's historical identity and residents' sense of place at the time of its writing. The Black Point name goes back to the 1850's when the area was initially known as an important shipping point for livestock and lumber. Over time, the area has evolved from a rural countryside of a few farms, ranches and small hunting cabins for weekend summer residents into the semi-rural, residential bedroom community of today. While the 1978 Plan identifies the planning area as one community, it recognizes the distinctions
between these two geographic areas and calls them "Old" and "New" Black Point, where "New" Black Point refers to Green Point.

While Black Point and Green Point have been treated as one community in a community plan context, their differences make them unique. Because the Black Point area was settled first, its homes tend to be older than those in Green Point. Black Point homes are generally smaller since the majority of parcels are less than one acre in size. In contrast, the majority of Green Point parcels are larger than one acre, which means the homes are generally larger. Most roads in Black Point are privately owned and not County-maintained, while the majority of roads in Green Point are publicly owned and maintained. Access into Black Point is limited to one road (Grandview Avenue) while Green Point has several access points. The two areas are also zoned differently, which means different development regulations and standards apply to development proposals.

Feedback from participants at community workshops and Advisory Committee meetings has generally supported the concept of identifying the major areas within the larger community as the Black Point and Green Point community. On the other hand, not all residents agree, reasoning the name should remain unchanged and that Black Point is a community that includes the neighborhoods of Green Point, Black Point, the Village Center, the Gridiron, Atherton Oaks and Atherton Avenue, among others.

The Advisory Committee majority recommended maintaining the original Black Point Community Plan name. The Planning Commission did not support the Advisory Committee recommendation, instead recommending the document be renamed the Black Point/Green Point Communities Plan.

2. Village Center Land Use.

The Village Center neighborhood is a small commercial area along Harbor Drive in Black Point. The zoning for the Village Center is VCR, Village Commercial/Residential, which is intended to maintain the established historical character of village commercial areas; promote village commercial self-sufficiency; foster opportunities for village commercial growth; maintain a balance between resident-serving and non-resident-serving commercial uses; protect, without undue controls, established residential, commercial, and light industrial uses; and maintain community scale.

The Village Center could accommodate a limited amount of additional residential and nonresidential development or redevelopment. However, the community's small population and relative proximity to nearby commercial and retail centers in the Novato area may limit the types of businesses and future growth potential. Constraints include lack of parking and reliance on septic. Despite these limitations, survey results and feedback from community workshops indicated a strong community desire to accommodate some future development, provided that it respects the area's history, be local serving, sensitive to the small scale nature of the existing properties, minimize traffic impacts, and consider the area's unique natural and scenic values.

The Advisory Committee recommended including a new policy—Policy CC-4 The Village Center Zoning – to provide guidance on the types of land use that
the community encourages for this area. The Planning Commission supported the Advisory Committee’s recommendation for Policy CC-4.

3. **Home Size.**

The issue of home size was raised as a potential threat to the planning area’s identity and semi-rural community character, especially in the Black Point neighborhood as potentially larger new development mixes in with the smaller, older, and more traditional homes. Two options for addressing home size were presented to the Planning Commission for consideration:

**Option 1: No Change.** Maintain the existing process where discretionary projects, such as Design Review applications, are evaluated for consistency with various policies, regulations, and guidelines administered by the County, such as the Marin Countywide Plan, community plans, and the Single-Family Residential Design Guidelines (SFRDG) as well as specific “findings” that apply to each different type of planning permit. Projects in Black Point that comply with the A-2 district development standards would continue to be processed through building permits unless the project triggers Design Review or another discretionary review procedure (e.g., variance).

**Option 2: Advisory Committee Recommendation Based on Median FAR.** Establish a new process that restricts new homes and remodels that are subject to Design Review from exceeding the median floor area ratio of surrounding homes (within 600 feet of the project site) by at least 10%, unless the development project is consistent with the following criteria, as determined by Design Review approval¹:

1. Maintains adequate setbacks from property lines and surrounding development;
2. Is located on a parcel which is large enough to accommodate the floor area while maintaining consistency with the surrounding built environment with respect to height, mass and bulk;
3. Is adequately screened by existing and proposed vegetation, or the topography of the property or of surrounding properties; and
4. Would not significantly limit or reduce sun and light exposure to adjacent properties.

The Advisory Committee recommended the new home size regulation for Option 2. The Planning Commission did not support the Advisory Commission recommendation and endorsed maintaining the status quo in Option 1. While the intent of Option 2 is to protect community character and consistency in home size, it did not appear to garner widespread support among the community. Staff also raised a concern about whether home size data from the Assessor’s office is precise enough to be well suited to consistently applying a specific numeric, bright line standard such as the 10 percent median home size threshold in Option 2. Consequently, staff reasoned it may be challenging to realistically implement this option without questions about data accuracy needing resolution.

¹ Option 2 would be implemented through the discretionary review process.
4. **Setbacks.**

Setbacks in Black Point and Green Point are considered an important feature of community character. The community includes a diversity of lot sizes, home sizes, architectural styles, and dates of construction. The relationship of residences and their respective setbacks vary throughout the planning area, in part because many of the residences—particularly those in Black Point—are older and were constructed prior to the initiation of comprehensive design standards.

Minimum setbacks are required in the A2 zoning district, which covers most of the Black Point area. The A2 zoning district standards are as follows: 25 feet front yard, 6 feet side yard, and 20% of lot depth/25 feet maximum rear yard. Exceptions to the setback standards are allowed for parking structures on steep slopes of 20 percent or steeper. Setback standards may also be waived for new residences on vacant, substandard lots, common in the Gridiron area of Black Point.

The predominant zoning in the Green Point area is ARP-2, a planned district zoning where setbacks are determined on a project-specific basis through the Design Review process. In addition to the Development Code, guidance on setbacks is provided in the Single-family Residential Design Guidelines (SFRDG). The SFRDG contain written and design recommendations for Design Review and other projects subject to discretionary review. For example, new development and remodel/additions should not be disharmonious with the existing street patterns. In hillside areas with average slopes of 25 percent or more, varied and staggered front setbacks are encouraged to reduce the monotony of repetitive setbacks and for consistency with the hillside character. Projects subject to Design Review are evaluated on a case-by-case basis, taking into account site-specific factors such as lot size, bulk and mass, topography, vegetation, and the visibility of the proposed development.

The Advisory Committee supports retaining existing setback standards in the A2 zoning district, while seeking to add language to strengthen the concept that development should be compatible with the surrounding neighborhood. Since there are no specific setback standards in the ARP zoning district, the Committee agreed that standards similar to the A2 zoning district would be appropriate. To that end, the Advisory Committee recommended the following proposed policy:

**CC-3 Require Minimum Setbacks**

Development projects for the construction of new single family residences on vacant lots in the Black Point area should maintain setbacks consistent with the zoning standards or otherwise compatible with the surrounding neighborhood.

Development projects for the construction of new single family residences on vacant lots in the Green Point area should maintain setbacks consistent with the A2 zoning district standards, generally 25 foot front, 6 foot side, and a rear setback of 20% of lot depth/25 foot maximum for the main residence.
In both instances, setbacks may be modified for the preservation of environmental features, to address site constraints, or to accommodate required on-site parking.

Staff did not favor the proposed policy for several reasons. First, the Countywide Plan provides a comprehensive policy framework for guidance bolstered by the SFRDG. The SFRDG provide essential principles of development, particularly site planning, preservation of natural features, resource conservation, compatibility with neighboring development, location of buildings in relationship to pedestrian paths and streets, landscaping, general building form, massing and scale. Design Review is an extensively thorough process. More importantly, there have not been any recent projects where setbacks were raised as an issue, particularly in Green Point.

The Planning Commission did not support the Advisory Committee recommendation and did not endorse the proposed setback policy.

PUBLIC COMMENT

A number of letters have been submitted regarding the Draft Plan (Attachment 5). A summary of key concerns heard from both the GPAC and the Advisory Committee are discussed below, followed by a summary of other public comments.

Green Point Advisory Committee Concerns

Following the Planning Commission workshop in January 2015, a group of Green Point residents reached out to CDA staff and requested a meeting to discuss concerns with the update process. Staff subsequently met with this group on three occasions--February 18, 2015, September 10, 2015, and December 9, 2015--to hear their concerns and provided direction on how they could be conveyed to the Board of Supervisors for consideration along with the Planning Commission's recommendation and other public input. These representatives have since formed the Green Point Advisory Committee (GPAC) to represent Green Point. A summary of their key concerns from these meetings and two letters, both dated February 24, 2016 and included in Attachment 5, are as follows:

- Residents have not received adequate notice of public workshops and Advisory Committee meetings and, thus, those interested in participating have not been able to provide input and engage in the process and, therefore, do not have a stake in the outcome;
- Additional time is needed in order to read and comprehend the Draft Plan's implications;
- Green Point should be recognized as an independent community with its own standalone community plan that addresses its unique stature and needs; and
- Responsibility for providing the County with advisory review of development proposals located in Green Point should be given to a recognized, local neighborhood group composed of Green Point residents, rather than the existing practice of referring discretionary projects to the Black Point Improvement Club.
Representatives of the GPAC have stated the proposed Draft Black Point/Green Point Communities Plan is inadequate and request that the 1978 Plan continue to apply to their neighborhood until a new Green Point community plan is adopted, based on the following factors:

- Green Point has since evolved into its own unique and distinct community with its own identity since the 1978 Black Point Community Plan was initially adopted. The Draft Plan currently treats Black Point and Green Point as one community. However, it is important to recognize that Green Point is now a separate community from Black Point;

- While both Black Point and Green Point are predominately characterized by single-family detached housing, the size of lots and homes are in stark contrast. The Black Point area was settled first and many of its homes are small and more vintage in nature since they were initially built as summer vacation cottages for weekend residents. In contrast, the Green Point area was developed in the latter half of the century and features more contemporarily designed homes. Similarly, lots in Green Point are generally larger with the majority of lots greater than one acre in size while the majority of lots in Black Point are less than one acre in size;

- The two neighborhood areas are zoned differently with different review processes for development. The conventional A2 zoning in Black Point allows projects to be approved through building permits unless the project requires a special zoning approval. The ARP zoning in Green Point is a planned zoning district that requires approval of a discretionary Design Review application for new development before a building permit is issued, unless the project qualifies for a Design Review exemption. As a result, development proposals in Green Point are more likely to require discretionary review as compared to Black Point;

- Green Point has several horse ranches and farms with cows, sheep and chickens. There do not appear to be any similar ranches in Black Point;

- Most roads in Green Point are publicly owned and county maintained, while many of Black Point's roads were originally mapped without regard to topographic conditions and do not meet current County road standards and, thus, are not County-maintained; and

- Green Point has several access points while access into Black Point is limited to one road, Grandview Avenue.

Advisory Committee Concerns

At their meeting on July 16, 2015, the Advisory Committee unanimously endorsed the Draft Black Point – Green Point Community Plan, including support for new policy language regulating home size for the entire community, in addition to requiring setbacks in certain planned district zoned areas in Green Point. The Committee was split, however, on the name of the Draft Plan, preferring to retain the original “Black Point Community Plan” title. Since the Planning Commission did not endorse the Advisory Committee’s recommendations on home size, setbacks, and document name, the Advisory Committee has indicated withdrawal of their endorsement of the Draft Plan and, instead, provides conditional endorsement as described in their attached letter, dated February 24, 2016, and included in Attachment 5. The Committee’s endorsement is based on the following conditions:
1. Retaining the original Black Point Community Plan name;
2. Maintaining Black Point as one united community under the guidance of one community plan;
3. Retaining Option 2, the home size restriction in the final plan; and
4. Establishing setback standards for the ARP zoning district.

Other Comments

A number of letters have been received in support of a separate community plan for Green Point to allow Green Point equal status as Black Point. Many letters also support the formation of a local Green Point neighborhood group, for the purpose of advisory review of development proposals, since Green Point is both geographically and demographically different from Black Point.

On the other hand, a similar number of letters appear to support the Advisory Committee’s recommendation as well as the Draft Plan, and indicate a separate community plan is unnecessary since the existing plan has served the community well since 1978. Several other letters indicate the withdrawal of signatures to a petition supporting a separate Green Point plan, which was circulated by the GPAC, stating the petition was misleading. Staff notes that no petition has been received by the Community Development Agency as of the release of this report.

All public comments received on the community plan to date are posted under the “Comment Letters” tab on the Black Point/Green Point Communities Plan web page (www.marincounty.org/blackpoint).

SUGGESTED MODIFICATIONS

A number of proposed modifications are needed to clarify and refine information in the Draft Plan. These are shown in underline format, as follows:

1. Background
   a. Add to the “List of Historical Events” on page 18:
      “2016  Formation of the Green Point Advisory Committees”
   b. Revise text in the Planning Context section on page 10 to clarify that the ridges north of Atherton Avenue were omitted from the Ridge and Upland Greenbelt, as follows:

      "Due to the bay plain’s natural constraints, and to protect the bay plain as a scenic vista and community separator, a policy decision was made in the 1978 Black Point Community Plan to allow more intensive development along the more stable hillsides, thus omitting the hillside areas north of Atherton Avenue from the Ridge and Upland Greenbelt (RUG). The RUG is a Countywide Plan overlay designation intended to protect wooded hillsides for their value as both a buffer between communities and as an important ecological zone of a watershed. The area’s scenic value is discussed in more depth in Chapter 3: Natural Resources."
2. Community Character and Land Use
   
a. Information on the Open Area zoning district and the Secondary Floodway combining district were omitted from the Existing Zoning section on page 54 as follows:

   **OA (Open Area).** The OA zoning district is intended for areas committed to open space uses, as well as environmental preservation. The OA zoning district is consistent with the Open Space and the Agriculture and Conservation land use categories of the Marin Countywide Plan.

   **F2 (Secondary Floodway).** The Secondary Floodway combining district is intended to insure that life and property will be protected within secondary floodways and to prevent increased flooding due to random and uncontrolled development which will impede the capacity of secondary floodplains to receive overflow flood waters.

   b. Revise language in Option 2, the Advisory Committee recommendation to regulate home size, to combine criteria items (3) and (4) where the development would be screened by either existing and proposed vegetation or topography of the property or of surrounding properties, as follows:

   ...

   - Maintains adequate setbacks from property lines and surrounding development;
   - Is located on a parcel which is large enough to accommodate the floor area while maintaining consistency with the surrounding built environment with respect to height, mass and bulk;
   - Is adequately screened by existing and proposed vegetation, or by the topography of the property or of surrounding properties; and
   - Would not significantly limit or reduce sun and light exposure to adjacent properties.

3. Public Safety

   Delete the "Community Meeting Sign" image on page 100.

ERRATA

A number of minor and technical corrections have been made to the Draft Plan since the Planning Commission recommended adoption on July 27, 2015. These are provided for your review and consideration in Attachment 6.

RECOMMENDATION

On behalf of the Planning Commission, staff recommends that your Board review the administrative record, conduct a public hearing, and approve the Draft Black Point/Green Point Communities Plan, based on the findings contained in the attached resolution (Attachment 2).
Your Board may also consider two alternatives to the Planning Commission recommendation in response to input received from the GPAC and the Advisory Committee as follows:

**Green Point Advisory Committee alternative.** This alternative considers separation of the 1978 Plan into two separate community plans: one for Black Point and one for Green Point. Given the Agency’s anticipated work load from the forthcoming performance plan, the most realistic opportunity to implement this alternative in the near term would be to simply revise the existing 1978 Plan for Green Point so that the existing policies pertinent to the Green Point community would remain in place. For Black Point, the Draft Plan could be revised to be adopted for the Black Point neighborhood.

As provided in the adopted Community Plan Update Strategy (Attachment 7), significant changes to the scope of a community planning process require approval of your Board. A separate, more comprehensive process to develop the two community plans, refine issues, and engage the communities would entail additional staff, time, and budget. Should your Board include this alternative in your decision, staff requests your Board provide direction regarding the future process and scope to complete the updated plans.

**Advisory Committee alternative.** Under this alternative, the Draft Plan would continue to represent both the Black Point and Green Point neighborhoods. In recognition that the two neighborhoods are uniquely different with regards to lot size, home size, and zoning, for example, and in light of resident support for additional guidance pertaining to home size and setbacks within the Black Point area, your Board may consider reinstating the Option 2 home size policy and a version of the setback policy to apply to the A2 zoning district within Black Point.

**FISCAL/STAFFING IMPACT:** None.

**REVIEWED BY:** *(These boxes must be checked)*

- [ ] Department of Finance  [x] N/A
- [ ] County Counsel  [x] N/A
- [ ] Human Resources  [x] N/A

Respectfully submitted,

**SUBMITTED BY:**

Kristin Drumm
Senior Planner

**REVIEWED BY:**

Brian C. Crawford
Director

Attachments:

1. Draft Black Point/Green Point Communities Plan
2. Resolution of the Board of Supervisors to Adopt the Black Point/Green Point Communities Plan
3. Resolution No. PC 15-0013 Recommending that the Board of Supervisors
   Adopt the Black Point/Green Point Communities Plan
4. Mailings Announcing Community Workshops
5. Letters and Email from the Public:
   b. Margo Forbes, February 26, 2016
   c. Michael Doane, February 26, 2016
   d. David Neal, February 26, 2016
   e. Martin Godinez, February 25, 2016
   g. Letitia Sanders, February 25, 2016
   h. Charles and Marie Bailey, February 25, 2016
   i. Michael Vogel, dated February 25, 2016
   j. Black Point Community Plan Advisory Committee, dated February 24, 2016
   k. Green Point Advisory Committee, dated February 24, 2016
   l. Green Point Advisory Committee, dated February 24, 2016
   m. Eric Polson, dated February 24, 2016
   n. Dennis R. Molloy, dated February 24, 2016
   o. Steve and Karen Schneider, dated February 24, 2016
   q. Glenn Harrington, dated February 24, 2016
   r. Cliff Clark, dated February 24, 2016
   s. Laura Jenkins, dated February 24, 2016
   t. Penelope Teicher, dated February 24, 2016
   u. Tymber Cavasin, dated February 24, 2016
   w. Susanna Mahoney, dated February 24, 2016
   x. Alan and Kathy Rothkop, dated February 23, 2016
   z. Roberta DiPrete, dated February 23, 2016
   bb. Anne Ruben, dated February 23, 2016
   dd. Phil Sheridan, dated February 23, 2016
   ee. Phil Sheridan, dated February 23, 2016
   ff. Noah and Cara Harris, dated February 23, 2016
   hh. Maninder and Josephine Sethi, dated February 23, 2016
   ii. Susan Crouse & Andrew McAghon, dated February 23, 2016
   jj. Linda Thompson, dated February 23, 2016
   mm. Ronald Apple, dated February 21, 2016
6. Errata
7. Community Plan Update Strategy

In order to save resources, paper copies of Attachment 1, the Draft Black Point/Green Point Communities Plan, are only provided to the Board of Supervisors. All documents are available for review in the Planning Division offices and the Draft Black Point/Green Point Communities Plan is also available online at www.marincounty.org/blackpoint.