



MEMORANDUM

TO: Sabrina Cardoza, Deputy Zoning Administrator
FROM: Megan Alton, Senior Planner
DATE: June 25, 2026
RE: Morning Phase LLC Coastal Development Permit and Coastal Variance

The purpose of this memorandum is to recommend that additional conditions of project approval and associated findings be considered for incorporation into the recommended resolution before the Deputy Zoning Administrator (DZA). In addition, public correspondence regarding the project received since the staff report and resolution were published has been included as an attachment to this memorandum. Concerns contained in the public correspondence include slope instability, roadway access, construction impacts and private easements.

The applicant has included a preliminary construction management plan for the project. The Department of Public Works (DPW) recommends that a condition of approval be included in the resolution for the project that requires the applicant to further coordinate with and receive approval from DPW of a construction management plan prior to issuance of a project Building Permit. The construction management plan will be required, at a minimum, to include the following: traffic control measures, access and hauling routes, emergency access routes, consideration of other roadway work on Cliff Road and any associated roadway repair.

To further ensure access is maintained for those residents who utilize Cliff Road and to ensure that Cliff Road in the area of the project site is maintained, staff request that the following language be added to Section K – Transportation, and that additional Conditions of Approval be added to Section 3 of the recommended resolution.

On page 5, replace the second paragraph in Section K with the following:

The right-of-way for Cliff Road is approximately 30 feet wide with the paved portion of the right-of-way being approximately 10 feet wide. A recent landslide upslope of the project site has made a portion of Cliff Road impassable. A coordinated effort of local residence (Bollinas Highlands PRD Committee) has begun the process of making the necessary repairs to Cliff Road associated with the landslide. To ensure access is maintained on Cliff Road conditions of approval have been added that require geotechnical oversight by a licensed geotechnical engineer, roadway protection, and construction management. Such measures will reduce potential damage to Cliff Road and the associated right-of-way and will ensure access on Cliff Road is maintained for access as necessary.

On page 8, add a new heading in Section 3 and include the following language:

Department of Public Works- Land Development Division

4. PRIOR TO THE ISSUANCE OF GRADING OR BUILDING PERMITS:

- A. Due to the documented roadway distress and landslide activity in the vicinity, the narrow one-way private access road serving the site, and the proposed construction of an ADU, retaining walls, excavation, and associated site improvements adjacent to the roadway, the following requirements shall apply:

(1) Geotechnical Engineer of Record

Prior to issuance of grading or building permits, the applicant shall retain a California-licensed Geotechnical Engineer of Record responsible for construction-phase observation, monitoring, and recommendations associated with all site development activities.

The Geotechnical Engineer shall prepare a Construction Observation and Monitoring Plan for review and approval by the Community Development Agency and Department of Public Works. The plan shall address site-specific geologic and geotechnical conditions, including roadway stability, slope stability, excavation sequencing, retaining wall construction, drainage control, construction loading, construction access, and protection of adjacent properties and infrastructure.

The Geotechnical Engineer shall remain actively involved throughout construction and shall conduct observations at all critical phases of work, including but not limited to:

- a. Site clearing and grubbing.
- b. Excavation and grading operations.
- c. Foundation and footing excavation.
- d. Installation of piles, piers, caissons, or other deep foundation elements, if proposed.
- e. Retaining wall excavation, construction, drainage installation, and backfill.
- f. Utility trenching and utility installation.
- g. Drainage improvements.
- h. Slope stabilization measures.
- i. Final grading and site stabilization.

The Geotechnical Engineer shall have authority to recommend modifications to construction sequencing, require additional stabilization measures, restrict construction loading, limit equipment access, suspend work, or implement other corrective measures necessary to protect public safety, roadway stability, slope stability, and adjacent properties.

Written observation reports documenting site visits, observations, recommendations, and corrective actions shall be maintained and provided to the County upon request.

(2) Construction Management Plan

The applicant shall submit a Construction Management Plan for review and approval by the Department of Public Works.

The plan shall address:

- (1) Construction vehicle access routes and turnaround locations.

- (2) Maximum gross vehicular weight for construction vehicles traversing Cliff Avenue, as recommended by the project Geotechnical Engineer.
- (3) Delivery schedules and procedures.
- (4) Construction worker parking locations.
- (5) Equipment staging areas.
- (6) Material storage areas.
- (7) Emergency vehicle access.
- (8) Temporary traffic control measures.
- (9) Roadway protection measures.
- (10) Communication procedures for residents and emergency responders.

The plan shall provide for flaggers, traffic control personnel, signage, and other traffic management measures as necessary to safely accommodate construction activities on the narrow one-way access road.

Emergency access shall be maintained at all times.

Construction vehicle size, weight, frequency, and hours of operation may be restricted as determined necessary by the County and/or the Geotechnical Engineer of Record.

(3) Roadway Stability and Protection

The applicant shall be responsible for protecting the private access road from damage associated with construction activities.

The applicant shall document existing roadway conditions along the full construction vehicle access route from Brighton Avenue to the project site, including pavement condition, edge conditions, drainage features, retaining structures, and any visible settlement, cracking, sloughing, or instability. Documentation shall be provided to DPW as video footage collected less than six weeks from the date of the building permit issuance. If the start of construction is delayed beyond permit issuance by more than two months, an updated video shall be provided. Prior to final inspection, an updated video shall be provided to DPW.

The Geotechnical Engineer shall evaluate the effects of construction activities, construction traffic, equipment loading, excavation, retaining wall construction, drainage improvements, and temporary stockpiling on roadway stability.

If roadway distress, settlement, cracking, sloughing, erosion, loss of support, or other adverse impacts are observed during construction, work shall immediately cease in the affected area until the Geotechnical Engineer evaluates the condition and provides written recommendations acceptable to the County.

Any roadway damage resulting from project construction beyond normal wear and tear shall be repaired by the applicant at the applicant's sole expense.

(4) Geotechnical Certification of Improvements Adjacent to the Roadway

The Geotechnical Engineer of Record shall provide written recommendations confirming that the location and design of all proposed structures, retaining walls, foundations, excavation limits, drainage improvements, and associated site improvements have been evaluated relative to the private roadway and will not

adversely affect roadway stability, lateral support, drainage patterns, maintenance access, or long-term roadway performance.

5. PRIOR TO FINAL OCCUPANCY OR FINAL PERMIT APPROVAL:

A. Final Geotechnical Certification

The Geotechnical Engineer of Record shall submit a signed and stamped certification letter confirming that:

- (1) Construction was completed in substantial conformance with approved geotechnical recommendations.
- (2) The ADU, retaining walls, foundations, drainage improvements, and associated site work were constructed in accordance with approved plans and field recommendations.
- (3) No known and unresolved geotechnical, roadway stability, or slope stability concerns remain.

ATTACHMENTS:

1. Public Comment from Oona Ratcliff, June 15, 2026
2. Public Comment from Oona Ratcliff, June 15, 2026
3. Public Comment from Bruce Bowser & Marie Louise de Swart, June 16, 2026
4. Public Comment from Dana Taylor on behalf of the Bolinas Highlands PDR Committee
5. Public Comment from Stephen Ratcliffe, June 16, 2026
6. Public Comment from Patricia Raven, Charles Raven, and Nancy Zacher, June 17, 2026
7. Public Comment from Sean Moffat, June 21, 2026
8. Public Comment from Bolinas Highlands PDR Committee, June 23, 2026

Subject: Concern Regarding Easement Compliance – 40 Cliff Road Project

To County of Marin Planning Staff and Decision Makers,

I am writing to raise a concern regarding the proposed development at 40 Cliff Road and its relationship to the existing Encroachment Easement Agreement affecting the neighboring property at 87 Brighton Avenue.

My understanding is that the project plans submitted to the County include the existing easement agreement entered into in 2010 between Annette Haw (then owner of 40 Cliff Road) and Ashley Ratcliffe (owner of 87 Brighton Avenue).

Paragraph 4 of that agreement (“Limitations of Grantees Use”) provides, in part:

“No other structures shall be constructed in the easement area, nor shall The Encroachment be extended or expanded in any direction, beyond its current envelope, including in height. In addition, if The Encroachment is ever demolished or if the structure on the dominant tenement to which it is affixed is ever replaced with a new structure, such new structure will not encroach into the easement area.”

The intent expressed in this provision appears clear: the existing encroachment was accepted as a limited existing condition and was not intended to permit future expansion or replacement that continues or extends encroachment into the easement area.

Based on review of the submitted master plans, the proposed configuration appears to continue showing a main house structure extending into the easement area. This is not something we agree to and is inconsistent, in our understanding, with the stated limitations and estate intentions reflected in the recorded easement agreement.

Accordingly, we respectfully request that the county clarify:

- Whether the proposed project relies upon continuation, expansion, reconstruction, or replacement of any structure located within the easement area;
- Whether the submitted plans are consistent with the limitations in the existing easement agreement;
- Whether approval of the project assumes rights not presently granted under the easement; and
- Whether confirmation from the affected property interests is required before approval.

We respectfully request that these easement issues be resolved and documented before any discretionary approvals are issued.

Thank you for your consideration and careful review of this matter.

Sincerely,

Oona Ratcliffe

Trustee, Ashley Ratcliffe Trust/ 87 Brighton Avenue

Subject: Request for Additional Review – 40 Cliff Road Development Application

To County of Marin Planning Staff and Decision Makers:

I am writing regarding the proposed development at 40 Cliff Road in Bolinas and respectfully request additional review and clarification before approval decisions are made.

My comments are not intended to oppose development generally, but to request that the County fully evaluate several site-specific issues that appear to be incompletely addressed in the current development application, especially given recent conditions on Cliff Road and surrounding hillside instability.

1. Cliff Road Access, Roadway Easement and Construction Impacts

I request clarification regarding the following:

- The legal width and functional extent of any roadway easement;
- Whether the shoulder areas proposed to remain available for parking are located within roadway access;
- Whether PG&E access requirements overlap with parking or roadway circulation given the new electric platform proximity to road;
- Whether retaining walls, utility infrastructure, or construction staging affect roadway and access rights.

Additionally, I request evaluation of the following construction-phase impacts, including:

- Heavy vehicle loading;
- Haul traffic;
- Excavation export;
- Concrete deliveries;
- Drilling equipment;
- Temporary road occupancy;
- Conflicts with current and planned road repair and other construction in the immediate area.

2. Geologic Conditions and Expanded Slope Review

I understand 40 Cliff conducted a supplemental geotechnical review in consideration of the January 2026 slope failure, 230 ft north and upslope of 40 Cliff Road. This survey

concluded that impacts of the hillside failure were isolated. The assumption stating the landslide as was a singular event need to be more extensively evaluated. Several additional failures have occurred, particularly in the years since 2022 when the first geotechnical survey was conducted for 40 Cliff Road. This was not an isolated incident and geotechnical assumptions made previously may no longer be current. Drainage paths in the area may have changed and factor-of-safety calculations may need revision. Analysis of regional instability needs to be taken into consideration, including particularly, a consideration whether all retaining walls planned have been designed for global slope stability.

I request additional review of:

- Cumulative slope failures in the immediate area;
- All additional slope movement and landslide events not reflected in the current geotechnical scope;
- Changing drainage or groundwater conditions;
- Roadway edge instability;
- And whether prior assumptions remain valid under current conditions.

And suggest that the following are provided:

- Roadway structural assessment;
- Haul route analysis and road bearing capacity;
- Construction traffic load study;
- Pavement condition survey;
- Or conflict analysis with slope-repair operations.

Also, the engineer's conclusion that proposed project terraced retaining walls on drilled piers along the east property line will serve to stabilize the roadway needs further substantiation. If roadway stabilization is being relied upon and claimed as hazard mitigation, I request the following supporting materials:

- Roadway cross sections;
- Wall design assumptions;
- Groundwater assumptions;
- Temporary excavation sequencing;
- Global slope evaluation;
- And explanation and joint assessment of how roadway repair interacts with wall installation.

Without these documents it is not possible to independently evaluate the claim that this project will provide stability to the road or greater hillside.

3. Emergency Access and Public Safety

Given the constrained road conditions and the reliance on local emergency response resources in Bolinas, I respectfully request confirmation that emergency access has been fully evaluated.

This should include:

- Fire apparatus access and maneuverability;
- Vehicle staging;
- Emergency access during construction;
- Conflicts between road repair activities, beach construction activities and construction traffic;
- Roadway obstruction risks from utility access or parking;
- And evacuation and emergency operations under degraded road conditions.

It should be noted additionally that large scale retaining wall work is planned for public beach at end of Brighton Avenue, directly impacting the export/import road pathway for 40 Cliff Road, and involving concrete trucks, large equipment, substantial parking demands resulting in significant congestion in the area.

Summary Requested additional information

Before final approvals, I respectfully request consideration of:

- Recorded easement documentation and confirmation of project compliance;
- Roadway access and circulation analysis;
- Construction traffic and loading review;
- Expanded geotechnical review reflecting cumulative nearby failures;
- Clarification of parking legality and functionality;
- Emergency access verification, especially in relation to fire and evacuation/ambulance.

Thank you for your careful consideration and for your efforts ensuring that review reflects current and developing site conditions and long-term public safety.

Sincerely,

Oona Ratcliffe

Megan Alton

From: Bruce Bowser <bcbna@sonic.net>
Sent: Tuesday, June 16, 2026 5:16 PM
To: Megan Alton
Cc: oona ratcliffe; Marlie de Swart
Subject: Comments 40 Cliff Road, Bolinas

You don't often get email from bcbna@sonic.net. [Learn why this is important](#)

June 16, 2026

Megan Alton

Senior Planner

County of Marin

Community Development Agency

With regards to the project: 40 Cliff Road – Bolinas Highlands – Bolinas, CA 94924 Project ID: P5981 APN: 193-114-02

Dear Ms. Alton,

As neighbors one property from the proposed construction, Bruce Bowser and Marlie de Swart take sincere interest in the further build out of this tiny lot, wedged between a narrow one-way road on a downslope lot in landslide prone terrain. We have lived at our residence since 1992, we are full-time residents and have witnessed extreme weather events, saturated winters with multiple neighboring landslides. We have reviewed the architectural drawings and feel this project pushes the limits for acceptable use of lot lines in an Historic residential neighborhood.

The project if approved will affect our lives in the extreme. With massive vehicles passing feet from our rear property line and 30 ft from our 100-year-old house and teetering 30 ft above our bedroom floor. No other Brighton property has an elaborately engineered retaining wall like that proposed at 40 Cliff. Rain runoff down Cliff Road every winter requires us to sandbag our rear gate to prevent water and sediment from filling our rear garden.

Noise, dust, exhaust, congestion and not enough parking for contractors and laborers, will be extremely impactful to a neighborhood already seeing some of the highest tourist visitation in West Marin. One associated operation for the 40 Cliff site preparation involves a utility pole replacement just feet from our and the Ratcliffe property. The PG&E work will impact our fencing and landscaping along Cliff Rd. My curiosity asks why or how these elaborate proposed electrical upgrades benefit the property. Why erect platforms in a right of way shoehorned into this busy roadside site?

On June 25th we will attend the DZA Hearing to speak up with a few neighbors who find this project unacceptable and ill placed.

Thank you for your consideration of comments.

With respect,

Bruce Bowser & Marie Louise de Swart

89 Brighton Avenue

Bolinas, CA 94924-0598

Tel: 415 - 868 - 2459

Megan Alton

From: Dana Taylor <dana@oak-mesa.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 16, 2026 8:01 PM
To: Megan Alton
Cc: Kristina Harrigan; Andy Rothman; Jill Moore; Geoffrey Evans; Sara Bettini
Subject: 40 Cliff Road, Bolinas- Development Concerns for Hearing, June 25th

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Dear Ms. Alton,

We are writing on behalf of the Bolinas Highlands Permanent Road Division (the “PRD”), the group of property owners working with the County to fund and oversee the repair of Cliff Road. Cliff Road is currently shut down due to a landslide 200 feet uphill from this proposed development. Cliff road adjacent to the proposed development shows deep cracks in the 9’ wide asphalt. It is in a fragile, vulnerable condition, and we are concerned about the impact that the proposed construction at 40 Cliff Road (the “Property”) could have on its stability.

Cliff Road serves as the sole access route for approximately 45 properties in the Bolinas Highlands (Bolinas Little Mesa) community. It is a private road, which means that any damage to it — from construction activity, equipment, or excavation — would have to be repaired entirely at the expense of the property owners, with no support available from the County or the State. Cliff Road washed out in recent storms due to a loss of lateral soil support beneath the pavement, and the road remains closed as we work through the County PRD process to fund permanent repairs. Repairs are not expected to start until next summer, at minimum. Any further disturbance to the soil supporting the road, even temporary or incidental, could risk renewed collapse or accelerate deterioration in ways that would be very costly and difficult for our community to address.

It is with this concern for the road’s structural integrity — not merely inconvenience — that we ask the County to take a close look at several aspects of the proposed Plans for 40 Cliff Road before they move forward.

Our Concerns

1. ACTUAL TOPOGRAPHY

The Plans do not appear to reflect the true topography at the Property’s edge. The photographs at page A1.02 (figures 1 and 2) do not show that the existing fence sits immediately adjacent to the Cliff Road asphalt, with a steep drop-off 3 feet from road edge, (see p. A5.0).

We have attached more accurate photographs (see #1, 2 and 3 attached) showing this topography in relation to the road edge. Given the steepness of this drop-off beyond the green fence in these photographs, we are concerned that any structure or activity planned for the narrow strip between the fence and the Property’s east-facing wall is not physically feasible without disturbing the slope that supports Cliff road.

2. ROAD ENCROACHMENT

The Property lines shown in the application materials appear to encroach onto Cliff Road itself — by as much as 50% in some areas (see pp. A1.10 and A1.20). Cliff Road is the only access

route for the Little Mesa/Bolinas Highlands properties including for fire apparatus. This encroachment narrows the road at exactly the point where full width and clearance matter most for emergency access.

3. DEDICATED PARKING

The Plans describe two existing parking spaces (8' x 20') on Cliff Road as though they belong to the Property. Based on our review of page A1.10, these spaces sit outside both the Property boundary and the existing fence line, on what has long been road right-of-way used by the entire community. We don't believe these can fairly be counted as dedicated parking for the Property, and we'd ask the County to look closely at this characterization, since it affects how much additional area the project will need to find elsewhere along the road.

4. CONSTRUCTION PLANS

The Plans show several construction-related features — a dumpster, a temporary parking area, a vehicle clean-out station, a job site office, and a porta-potty (see p. A1.30) — that appear to extend onto Cliff Road or the slope immediately beside it. Given the grade at this part of the Property (pp. A1.10 and Site Section A1), these features would either need to sit on the road pavement itself or be cantilevered on pilings into the slope. Either approach concerns us, as both would place additional stress on the road and hillside supporting it.

5. CLIFF ROAD TRENCHING

The Plans indicate that PG&E would trench along Cliff Road, from the Property's northeast corner to the adjoining property's southeast corner where there is another high power pole. We did not see any provision in the materials for maintaining road access during this work, or for ensuring that trenching does not further destabilize the road. Given the road's current condition, we would very much like to understand what precautions are planned here.

6. INCOMPLETE GEOTECH REPORTS

The geotechnical reports submitted with the application do not appear to address how the construction process itself — demolition, vegetation removal, pier drilling, retaining wall excavation — could affect the stability of Cliff Road. **This is our most significant concern.**

The recent collapse of Cliff Road +/- 200 feet was caused by the loss of soil support beneath the pavement following heavy rainfall; we now understand firsthand how sensitive this slope is to disturbance. The Plans call for the main house to be placed on new drilled-pier foundations bearing in bedrock (per Murray Engineering's 2022 report), which is exactly the kind of work that could disturb the soil supporting the road above. Neither the Murray report nor the Plans appear to call for any retaining structure between the road pavement and the top of the slope before this work begins, and we believe this gap deserves careful attention before any permit is issued.

CONCLUSION

Our hope in raising these points is simple: Cliff Road is fragile right now, it is the only way in or out for 45 households, and any further damage would fall entirely on the shoulders of the property owners and likely delay the work our community is already undertaking.

We would welcome the opportunity to work with the County and the applicant to address these concerns before construction begins, so that the project and the road's stability can both be protected.

It's up to the County to condition any permits on clarification of liability for any damage to the road caused by the development.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Bolinas Highlands PRD Committee

- Kristina Harrigan, 41 Cresente Ave, Bolinas
- Andy Rothman, 22 Cresente Ave, Bolinas
- Sara Betini, 50 Cresente Ave, Bolinas
- Jill Moore, 64 Altura, Bolinas
- Geoff Evans, 42 Cresente, Bolinas



40 Cliff, road conditions.jpeg

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/1qG9xFuDU1uGuTpaGW4V5SRavRN8tPhS2/view?usp=sharing>



road edges at 40 Cliff.jpeg

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/1k6XD8YK1KyldSCA34obfnLjdGCupDmDg/view?usp=sharing>



Stairs down from road easement parking .MOV

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/1XuYBAU5hP-IZpFSpvThljsq7xcnc9aHt/view?usp=sharing>

From: [Ratcliffe, Stephen](#)
To: [Megan Alton](#)
Subject: 40 Cliff Road Bolinas
Date: Tuesday, June 16, 2026 2:00:49 PM

You don't often get email from s.ratcliffe@northeastern.edu. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Megan,

I am writing you in regard to the June 25 hearing on the proposed project at 40 Cliff Road in Bolinas, which as I understand includes a remodel of the existing structure on that property.

I am managing the property at 87 Brighton Avenue Bolinas now owned by my daughter Oona Ratcliffe (who presently lives in Brooklyn), which she inherited from her mother Ashley Ratcliffe (who owned that property from 1975 until her death in 2024). During that time, in 2009 to be exact, her mother granted to Wayne Frick (then owner of 40 Cliff Road property) the following:

"[a] temporary easement for the existing encroachment [of his house] as long as the easement states that the encroachment cannot be extended in any direction or dimension, and that in the event of a new building were to replace the existing or an extensive remodel take place the easement would cease to exist." [letter dated July 10, 2009]

Following her mother's wishes recorded here, my daughter has denied permission to allow any further easement for the proposed "extensive remodel" of the 40 Cliff Road property.

Sincerely,
Stephen Ratcliffe

220 Overlook Drive
Bolinas, CA, 94924
P.O. Box 714

From: [Charles Raven](#)
To: [Megan Alton](#)
Subject: 40 Cliff Road Project
Date: Wednesday, June 17, 2026 4:07:54 PM

You don't often get email from chraven1@yahoo.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Marin County Commissioners,

We are the owners of 83 Brighton Avenue in Bolinas. Our property is located directly below 40 Cliff Road. Their present structure, which they plan to renovate, shares a common wall with our cottage.

We are concerned that there may be a potential slide caused by the temporary road that is to be built. This road will be used to deliver materials and equipment. It will transverse the slope on very unstable soil.

Since the Dean construction began at the top of the Little Mesa bluff located above Brighton Avenue homes, there have been two slides. The first slide went all the way down the hill. It crossed two sections of Cliff Road and stopped in the backyard of 77 Brighton Avenue. 77 Brighton is located two houses away from our house. The second slide did hit our neighbor's home located four houses from 83 Brighton. Luckily, no one was injured. These slides have occurred in the last 1 and 1/2 years.

We would like to see the sewer line changed if possible. We currently share a sewer line with 40 Cliff. Their sewer line connects with our line and runs through our property. Is it possible for a new sewer line be connected on Cliff Road. Their present home is located about 10 feet from Cliff Road.

We share the concerns of The Bolinas Highlands PRD Committee and other Brighton Avenue residents.

Thank you for your considerations.

Sincerely,

Patricia Raven

Charles Raven

Nancy Zacher

Megan Alton

From: sean.c.moffat@gmail.com
Sent: Sunday, June 21, 2026 11:27 PM
To: Megan Alton
Subject: Morning Phase LLC Coastal Development Permit and Coastal Variance - Project ID P5981

You don't often get email from sean.c.moffat@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Hi Ms. Alton.

The project is located at 40 Cliff Road. I reside at 60 Crescente Ave in Bolinas and my neighbors and I are dependent upon Cliff for travel down the hill to Brighton. As you may be aware, we had a slide this winter which still prevents the use of Cliff Road. We are developing plans to address this.

I am a "live and let live" kind of guy and usually don't comment on planning issues. In this case I have a few concerns:

1. Cliff road appears to be one of the boundaries for this property. It also appears that 40 Cliff does not have access to Brighton. Given that, I think that parking within the property lines should be included in the plan and such parking should allow for parked cars to be 6 feet or more from the center of Cliff Road.
2. Portions of Cliff Road appear to be sinking toward downhill. The property drops off quickly from Cliff Road at 40 Cliff. If further building on the property is to go forward, I think here should be a retaining wall to protect Cliff Road (and at least one parking space, if that is included in the plan).
3. Any set back variance from Cliff Road should not impede our ability to repair and maintain Cliff Road. For example, building too close to Cliff Road could make it impossible to reinforce the road.
4. I note that the plans include a fire pit. Please no. The "Little Mesa" (aka: Bolinas Highlands) is very vulnerable to fire given the dry vegetation (outside the rainy season), the steep grade up the hill, and the strong prevailing winds that blow up hill. Cinders from a fire pit could easily set the area a blaze. Fires are forbidden on the beach at Bolinas for similar reasons and I think a fire pit presents a greater risk.

Thank you for your consideration.

Regards,

-Sean
Sean Moffat
sean.c.moffat@gmail.com
415.999.0636 (cell/text)
60 Crescente Ave

From: [Bolinash Highlands](#)
To: [BOS](#); [Planning](#); [Dennis Rodoni](#); [Hugh Davis](#); [Megan Alton](#); [Sackett, Mary](#); [ELucan@marincounty.org](#); [brian.crawford@marincounty.gov](#); [Stephanie MoultonPeters](#); [Brian Colbert](#)
Cc: [Kristina Harrigan](#); [Jill Moore](#); [Andy Rothman](#); [Fred](#); [Sara Bettini](#); [Geoffrey Evans](#)
Subject: URGENT: Please Pause New Construction Approvals in Bolinas Highlands/Little Mesa Pending Active Road Assessment
Date: Tuesday, June 23, 2026 6:51:20 PM

You don't often get email from admin@bolinashighlands.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Supervisor Rodoni and all members of the Board of Supervisors, the Marin County Community Development Agency, and the Marin County Planning Board.

We are residents of the Bolinas Highlands (Little Mesa) working to repair damage to our private road, and we are writing to ask for your direct intervention on a matter of urgent public safety.

Where Things Stand

Following the collapse of Cliff Road in January 2026 — which fell onto a neighbor's property below and caused significant damage — we have been working with the County to address the crisis.

A geotechnical assessment is currently underway. Once we receive this, we will follow up with a civil engineer's analysis of the scope and cost of repairs. We are grateful for this progress and for the County's engagement so far.

However, we are deeply troubled by what is happening in parallel: the Planning Commission continues to approve new construction projects in the Bolinas Highlands while this assessment is still active and underway.

This Makes No Sense — and It Is Dangerous

Our road is a former farm road, often no more than ten feet wide, running along the edge of a steep ridge. It was never designed to carry heavy construction vehicles. The road is under assault from two directions simultaneously: the cumulative impact of recent large-scale construction projects, and increasingly severe storm events that are pushing this aging infrastructure well beyond its limits. Together, these forces have created a situation the road simply cannot withstand without significant intervention.

Approving additional construction projects before the geotechnical and engineering assessments are complete — before we even know the full extent of the damage or what it will cost to fix — compounds an already fragile situation. Every additional heavy vehicle on that road is a risk we cannot afford.

To make matters worse, the road is private. There is no road association, and while we do maintain a limited repair trust account through the PRD process, its funds are only sufficient for minor, routine maintenance — nowhere near the scale of what is now required.

The cost of repairing the collapsed road section, plus stabilizing active fissures all along the roadway, and managing the ongoing damage from heavy construction traffic falls far beyond what that trust can cover. Individual residents are left holding the financial burden for damage

they did not cause.

Meanwhile, a makeshift solution — using our narrow Altura Ave., a one-way road, as a two-way with temporary traffic signals that does not always function reliably — is not a long-term answer.

We are also concerned about the imminent sea wall repair project at 100 Brighton ave at the Bolinas beach ramp on Brighton Avenue. This major project will bring a significant additional volume of construction traffic through our already overburdened road network, worsening congestion and road stress at the worst possible time. We urge the County to coordinate traffic management for that project with the existing crisis on our road before work begins on the seawall. Altura Avenue, the uphill section to access our homes has developed visible fissures that concern us greatly given what we have already seen happen on Cliff Road.

On June 25th there is a hearing scheduled about 40 Cliff road development. This property is 200 feet from the January landslide. Until this landslide is repaired and the road reopens, adding yet another major construction project a short distance from the landslide is deeply concerning.

What We Are Asking

We are not asking the County to stop all development. We are asking for a common-sense pause:

1. **Suspend approval of new construction projects** in the Bolinas Highlands until the geotechnical assessment and civil engineering report are complete and their findings have been formally reviewed by the Planning Commission.
2. **Require the Planning Commission to consider road impact** as a standard condition of approval for any future projects in this area — including haul route agreements, load restrictions, and property developers' contributions to road repair.
3. **Ensure that the findings of the current assessment** are formally entered into the record and considered in any pending or upcoming permit decisions.

It is contradictory for the County to simultaneously assess the damage caused by construction activity and approve new projects that will add to it. ***We respectfully ask that these two processes be brought into alignment.***

We welcome a site visit and are available to meet at your convenience. Please do not let the active road repair assessment become a reason to delay action — it is precisely the reason to act now.

Thank you for your continued attention to this matter.
Respectfully,

Bolinas Highlands Road Repair Group for the 'Little Mesa'
Bolinas, CA

Kristina & Jeffrey Harrigan, 41 Cresente Ave

Jill Moore, 64 Altura Ave

Sara & Rick Betini, 50 Cresente Ave.

Mark & Susie Buell, 63 Altura Ave

Geoff & Grace Evans, 42 Cresente Ave.

Fred & Nina Oliai, 72 Altura Ave.

Andy & Robin Rothman, 22 Cresente Ave.