

MARIN COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

RESOLUTION NO. \_\_\_\_\_

A RESOLUTION TO DENY THE REQUEST TO AMEND THE *STRAWBERRY COMMUNITY PLAN AMENDMENTS 1982* ASSOCIATED WITH THE NORTH COAST LAND HOLDINGS LLC COMMUNITY PLAN AMENDMENT, MASTER PLAN, VESTING TENTATIVE MAP, DESIGN REVIEW, MASTER USE PERMIT, AND TREE REMOVAL PERMIT APPLICATION (P1490) 201 SEMINARY DRIVE, MILL VALLEY (ASSESSOR’S PARCEL NOS:043-261-25, 043-261-26, 043-262-03, 043-262-06, 043-401-05, 043-401-10, 043-401-16, 043-402-03, and 043-402-06)

\*\*\*\*\*

SECTION I: FINDINGS

WHEREAS, the applicant, North Coast Land Holdings LLC, has submitted a request to amend the *Strawberry Community Plan Amendments 1982* as follows (language proposed for insertion shown as underlined, language proposed for deletion shown as ~~strike through~~):

A. On Page 2, under “II. Goals”, Item B. “Housing Balance”, modify the last sentence as follows:

“Where physical constraints or opportunities dictate another housing type (i.e., attached units) the Community goals is to ensure that unit size and project amenities are designed to provide the opportunity for and encourage occupancy by families with children. In this manner then the Community wishes to ensure a housing balance that will continue to provide for families....”

B. On Page 2, under “II. Goals”, Item C. “Transportation”, modify the sixth sentence as follows:

“Owners of the large undeveloped properties in the Strawberry area (DeSilva Island, Watertank Hill, ~~Golden Gate Baptists Theological Seminary~~ and Strawberry Split Point) will be required to contribute on a proportional basis to the funding necessary to construct requirement improvements...”.

C. On Page 6, under “III Development Guidelines” modify as follows:

“C. Former Golden Gate Baptist Theological Seminary site-(See Map 4)

Description	
A.P. #	<del>43-261-03, 05, 20 &amp; 22</del> <u>043-261-25; 043-261-26; 043-262-03; 043-262-06; 043-401-10; 043-401-16; 043-402-03; 043-402-06</u>
Area	<del>125.19</del> <u>123.35</u> acres of land, <del>22.25</del> acres of land underwater.
Existing zoning/density	<del>RMP 2.42.47; MF2 (1-4 units/acre)</del>
Existing development	211 residential dwelling <del>for students and faculty</del> <u>available to the public</u> . Various buildings utilized for educational <del>and religious</del> purposes.

D. On Page 7, under “LAND USE” modify as follows:

“LAND USE-A ~~combination of student/faculty housing, educational and religious uses and activities~~ college/university use with a student population of approximately 1,000 ~~were~~ was granted for this property by Use Permit in 1953 overlaid on the site’s base zoning of RMP 2.47. Extensive facilities including housing, administrative and education buildings were built subsequently. However, since the Use Permit was issued the plans of the Seminary and the character of the community the zoning applied to the property have changed. Any further development of ~~all of the Seminary~~ property must be established in a Master Plan because it is now subject to a Planned District classification. In general, it is recommended that ~~Seminary religious,~~ educational buildings, and uses and ~~student~~ housing be located on the central portion of the property. The areas located at the periphery of the ~~Seminary~~ property would be appropriate for a ~~limited number of~~ single-family detached residences ~~which would not be part of the Seminary’s student and faculty housing~~. Development in these areas should be planned and designed to blend into the existing community.

The development potential of the ~~Seminary~~ property was discussed with the Citizen’s Advisory Committee, the property owners and their representatives, and reviewed in the field by walking the property. The exact development of the property will be established in the more detailed review of a Master Plan application. ~~However, the following development was determined to be the maximum desirable development based on the projected traffic impact and the context of the property within the community.~~ The following was originally determined to be the

maximum desirable development based on the projected traffic impact and the context of the property within the community.

- (1) 24 single-family detached residences located on the periphery of the Seminary property.
- (2) 36 attached units.
- (3) 90-100 ~~student~~ housing units
- (4) Some additional development related to the educational ~~and religious~~ use of the Seminary property itself. However, the only such development specifically discussed as part of this Community Plan Amendment was a chapel. Other potential development includes a student union building and additional classrooms (as shown in the 1955 Use Permit) and a gymnasium (new Use). Any such development should be located adjacent to the existing campus development. The extent of additions to the campus should be determined in a Master Plan which evaluates such development in the context of all development on the property.

E. Beginning in the third full paragraph on Page 7 and continuing through Page 8, modify as follows:

The following discussion sets out specific guidelines for the development potential of the portion of the property surrounding the Seminary campus area in consideration of a Master Plan. The areas discussed are identified by numbers on Map 4. The guidelines include a range of development that may be appropriate. Not all of them can be exercised and be consistent with the maximum development identified for this property. Any Master Plan application should be evaluated against these guidelines and the other provisions of the Strawberry Community Plan. The maintenance or improvement of existing service levels at the Seminary/101/Frontage Road interchange should be a prime determinate of the development that is permitted at this location.

F. Page 8 under the item entitled “(Area 2)” modify as follows:

(Area 2) Platt Court Existing ~~Faculty~~ Units-Existing uses should remain; however if the Seminary landowner desires to redevelop this area, approximately three (3) single family detached dwelling units could be located in this area.

G. Page 8 under the item entitled “(Area 6)” modify as follows:

(Area 6) Any expansion of the campus or ~~student~~ housing should be developed in this area. Hilltop adjacent to Chapel Drive is a prominent visual landmark with the Community and should remain undeveloped, if possible. However, if development of this site is to occur, it should be limited to either structures for Seminary campus activities or allocated for housing. ~~No housing should be placed on this site.~~ Structures should be designed

H. Page 9 under the item entitled “(Area 7)” modify as follows:

(Area 7) Reed Boulevard-Two single family detached dwelling units should be located on Seminary the property with frontage on Reed Boulevard

- I. Page 9 under the item entitled “(Area 8)”, second paragraph, modify as follows:

If the seminary landowner desires to develop attached dwelling units as apartments or to be sold as condominiums, such units could be located off of Chapel Drive at the top of the slope above Seminary Drive south of the Athletic Field and Gilbert Drive. Apartments or cCondominiums in this location could be compatible with the existing multiple development south of Seminary Drive next to Richardson Bay, and yet would be visually separated from the single family detached dwelling located on the Point. A maximum of 36 units might be located in this area.

- J. Page 9 under the item entitled “Location of Development” modify the first sentence as follows:

Location of Development-The shoreline area adjacent to Brickyard Park should remain undeveloped because it can provide public view of and access to the Bay. The Forested Knoll (~~Area 6~~) above Seminary Drive should remain undeveloped because it is a prominent visual landmark in the Community. Other portions of the property may be developed as outline previously.

- K. Page 10 under the item entitled “Design Guidelines”, modify the third and fourth paragraphs as follows:

~~Student h~~Housing proposed for knoll adjacent to Shuck Drive should be sited to minimize grading for structures and parking areas. The site plan should be designed so that direct views of ~~student~~ units from existing dwellings, especially those on Milland and Ricardo Drives, are screened. A landscape plan providing a “green belt” buffer of landscaping between ~~student~~ housing and existing dwelling should be incorporated into the site plan. ~~Student h~~Housing should be sited so as to provide at a minimum the same distances between new structures as currently exists between existing structures.

The review of any proposed master plan for the Seminary property should include a discussion of the existing and potential public uses of and activities at the campus. Currently, the Community is not fully informed of the existing campus public activity programs. It would be beneficial if the Seminary landowner and Community could establish a formal understanding of the recreational opportunities and educational activities available. Possibly the Strawberry Recreation District could assist the Seminary landowner in establishing and publicizing these public uses and activities.

**WHEREAS**, on March 2, 2026 and March 30, 2026, the Marin County Planning Commission held duly noticed public hearings to take public testimony and consider the project. At the conclusion of the March 30, 2026, the Marin County Planning Commission recommended

denial of the applicant's Community Plan Amendment request to the Marin County Board of Supervisors.

**WHEREAS**, on June 9, 2026 the Marin County Board of Supervisors held a duly noticed public hearing to take public testimony and consider the project.

**WHEREAS**, the policies and programs contained in the Marin Countywide Plan (CWP) guide the conservation and development of Marin County. As an element of the CWP, the Strawberry Community Plan is intended to provide a community specific vision for the development of the Strawberry Peninsula by identifying community goals, identifying major issues within the community plan area, specifying the amount, density, and location of development, and providing recommendations and restrictions for such development.

The 1982 amendments to the Strawberry Community Plan were the result of a plan review undertaken by the Strawberry Community Plan Review Citizen's Advisory Committee, planning and transportation consultants, and Marin County planning staff. The amendments provided updated goals related to community amenities, housing balance, and transportation, development guidelines for the four remaining large undeveloped parcels in the community plan area, including the Golden Gate Theological Baptist Seminary site, and additional community plan policies.

The community plan amendments proposed by the applicant consist of several items, ranging from clarifications and updating site information so it is current (e.g., revising Assessor Parcel Numbers, including the Countywide Plan Land Use Designation, deleting references to the previous property owner, etc), removing language regarding on-site student housing requirements, the nature of future housing on Chapel Hill, and the religious nature of the on-site educational institution.

The applicant has requested amendments to the Strawberry Community Plan and proposed a housing development project with an associated subdivision for condominium purposes. While these two basic components of the application are related, their thresholds for approval are different. While development applications are reviewed on a routine basis, amendment of a community plan, such as the Strawberry Community Plan, is not routine for the County. The community plan is an element of the Marin Countywide Plan, the County's General Plan, and the Board of Supervisors can only approve an amendment to a community plan through legislative action. General Plans are regarded as the "constitution for development" in California, and hold a unique position in a local jurisdiction's land use policy and regulatory framework. Therefore, the threshold for approving an amendment to a community plan should be higher than any other type of land use action. The proposed amendments to the Strawberry Community Plan do not meet this elevated threshold. Moreover, the amendments are not necessary to approve the housing project.

Since the applicant's initial 2015 community plan amendment proposal and up through those amendments currently before the County, the amendments have not been supported by the community. At the 2017 and 2020 Strawberry Design Review Board (SDRB) hearings on the

previous and current proposals and following extensive community testimony, the SDRB echoed the sentiment of the community in that “...(3) even with the proposed amendments...(the project)...is inconsistent with the Strawberry Community Plan...”.

The community has consistently expressed concerns with the transportation effects associated with the project. The project EIR analyzed the transportation effects and the EIR states that “...a firm dedication of a substantial share of the housing units to...” campus-affiliated residents as well as other measures would, “...reduce vehicle trips...” associated with the project. The applicant has requested an amendment to the *Amendments to the Strawberry Community Plan, 1982* to remove the requirement to provide 90-100 student housing units on the site. Further, the applicant proposes to apply one of the two concessions afforded the project under State Density Bonus Law to the student housing requirement contained in the Community Plan.

The applicant proposes to remove community plan text prohibiting housing on the hilltop adjacent to Chapel Drive as the Community Plan states the area, “...is a prominent visual landmark with the Community and should remain undeveloped, if possible...”. While the project includes housing in this area, the applicant has requested a waiver of this community plan policy under the State density bonus law.

As detailed in the background section of the accompanying staff report, with the expiration of the 1984 Master Plan in 2017, residents of the site no longer require affiliation with the on-site educational institution. Therefore, an amendment of the Community Plan is not necessary to allow residents, either affiliated or not affiliated with the school, to live on site. Further, because the proposed project is afforded protections and rights under State housing laws, the density proscribed in the Community Plan is superseded by the density afforded by the Countywide Plan land use designation. Therefore, the density proposed by the applicant does not require an amendment to the Community Plan.

Approval of a community plan amendment is not necessary to authorize the proposed development consistent with State law. Further, approval of the housing development project through other Board actions would nevertheless comply with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) as set forth in the resolution recommending adoption of the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the project.

Given the facts presented above, the Board of Supervisors denies the proposed community plan amendment.

## **SECTION II: ACTION**

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Marin County Board of Supervisors denies the applicant’s “Proposed Community Plan Amendments” to the *Amendments to the Strawberry Community Plan, 1982*.

**SECTION III: VOTE**

DENIED at a regular meeting of the MARIN COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS held on this 9th day of JUNE 2026 by the following vote:

AYES: SUPERVISORS

NOES: SUPERVISORS

ABSENT: SUPERVISORS

---

ERIC LUCAN, PRESIDENT  
MARIN COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Attest:

---

CLERK