

Item 5: Discussion of Amendments to the Local Coastal Plan

The Marin County Community Development Agency is proposing amendments to the Marin County Local Coastal Program (LCP) to address environmental hazards. The proposed amendments are to both the [Coastal Land Use Plan \(policies\)\[PDF\]](#) and to the [Coastal Zoning Code \(implementation plan\)\[PDF\]](#).

[Read](#) just an excerpt of the proposed hazard amendments instead of the full land use plan and coastal zoning code.

[Review](#) a guide that explains what the proposed amendments are and why they are important.

Please visit the [new project website](#) for more information at

<https://www.marincounty.gov/departments/cda/planning/long-range-planning-initiatives/local-coastal-program-environmental-hazard-amendments>.

Note: The County will be presenting at a Zoom meeting on **Dec. 3rd at 5pm hosted by Bolinas Civic Group** to present this issue to Bolinas and give the community an opportunity to ask questions and offer feedback. If more than 3 Board Members are interested in attending this meeting and participating in the discussion, I will suggest that this be a noticed special meeting of the BCPUD Board.

Below is a 1 page cheat sheet prepared by the Alliance of Coastal Marin Villages to help direct your attention as you consider these amendments.

Alliance Of Coastal Marin Villages

November 13, 2024

Backgrounder for Village Meetings with the Community Development Agency on proposed Hazards Amendments to the Local Coastal Program (LCP)

The ACMV has reviewed multiple drafts of amendments to Marin's Local Coastal Plan, with a focus on the Environmental Hazards (EH) section, since at least 2019. By unifying the concerns of the Coastal Zone villages in a "Top 10 List" of amendments we opposed as serious threats to our communities, we were successful in 2021 and 2022 in reaching agreement with Supervisor Rodoni and convincing the Community Development Agency (CDA) to drop the proposed EH section entirely. CDA is now returning in 2024-25 with a new round of draft EH amendments.

ACMV's LCP committee met Monday evening and carefully reviewed the entire draft. Generally, we were very pleased that the preponderance of our earlier "Top 10" concerns had been resolved in this new draft, and that only a few sections remain potentially problematic, included those mentioned below. CDA agreed to a sit-down in December with our committee, at or by which time we will cover those issues as well as other significant

issues affecting specific coastal areas. We will bring along any other concerns we heard from ACMV representatives arising from your individual village meetings.

There were three major issues that potentially “violated” our original Top 10 agreement and should be highlighted to all ACMV representatives and their village associations:

1. **Wildfire Safety.** In the original Top 10 List we, as well as several of our fire departments, strongly opposed severe restrictions and mandatory permits for clearing brush for defensible space. We believe this section has now been rewritten sensibly at the policy level. What remains to be seen is whether any actual development code changes arising from this policy obstruct our ability to keep our homes fire safe and compliant with Fire Safe Marin.
2. **Raising Homes for Flood Safety.** We were very pleased to see language we originally proposed allowing older homes threatened by sea level rise to raise their foundations above flood levels without having to obtain variances or spend extra time and money fixing nonconformities. However, we believe this section unfairly benefits only homeowners on the coast; we will argue that this right should also be given to homeowners in any flood hazard zone, including in upland villages along streams posing flood risk.
3. **Forced Removal of Homes.** We strongly opposed earlier drafts that required homeowners to pay to remove their homes while still potentially habitable. The worst of this language is gone, but two poorly constructed subsections would require removal of homes at homeowners’ expense either if a future LCP proposed removal, without any legal process or right to appeal; or if roads or “utilities” serving the home are “degraded” – which we read as possibly as simple as a roadway falling into poor repair, or an interruption of wastewater treatment systems due to seawater intrusion. It also commits the County to a policy of *not* assisting in bringing such roads and utilities back into repair. The language specifically calls out Calle de Arroyo in Stinson Beach, but the same could apply to county-maintained roads across many if not most of our villages.