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I: INTRODUCTION

The California coast is a region of beauty and natural splendor, blessed with an abundance of rich and varied resources. The coast supports a diversity of plant communities and tens of thousands of species of insects and other invertebrates, amphibians, reptiles, fish, birds, and mammals, including numerous rare and endangered species. From the redwood forests and rocky shores of the north to the wide, sandy beaches of the south, California’s 1,100-mile-long coast contains a number of distinct habitats.

Since the times of its earliest settlers California’s coastal resources have provided a means of survival. The first Native Americans fished the coastal streams, collected shellfish, gathered acorns, and hunted land mammals and marine mammals, not having a large affect on the balance of the environment. Starting in the late 1700s with the arrival of the Spanish, settlers have exploited California’s coastal resources, logging hundreds of thousands of acres of redwood forest for timber, decimating seal and sea otter populations for fur and whales for oil, damming streams for irrigation and hydroelectric power, and diking, dredging, and filling wetlands for agricultural and urban development, in turn destroying the habitats of plants, birds, fish, and other organisms.

Since the 1850s, 90 percent of the state’s coastal wetlands have been destroyed, and almost every major coastal river has been dammed, depriving coastal estuaries of their sources of fresh water and beaches of their supply of sediments and sand. The decrease in sediment results in there not being enough sand to absorb the breaking waves and leads to increased erosion.

Increased erosion results in the need for more seawalls to protect cliff-side homes, but seawalls


extend out onto the sand, leaving less of the beach to be enjoyed by the public. In addition, along portions of the densely populated Southern California coast, intensive urban development has resulted in a nearly continuous wall of private homes, preventing public access to state tidelands, as well as obstructing views. In addition to the natural resources that are at stake, there are also a number of cultural resources on the California coast that are in danger, including: economic resources, recreation, and architectural style.

California is home to many National Landmarks (or National Register Properties), 2,128 to be exact, and approximately 270 (or about 12.7%) of those are in the coastal zone. In coastal California, for every grand building on the scale of Hearst Castle, for example, there are thousands of ordinary buildings that express the architectural style of California in a subtler way. The coast has been a focus for new development since the first European colonists established missions at seaside cities. Patterns of settlement have resulted in both visually eclectic communities and those with more uniform appearances and preserving those humbler buildings is vital to preserving the character of these coastal communities. The Spanish settlers introduced small, durable structures of adobe, a readily available material, and their missions recalled the more elaborate churches of colonial Mexico.\(^3\) As coastal towns prospered, new settlers undertook more ambitious building designs including those in the Greek Revival, Gothic Revival, Italianate, Romanesque Revival, Queen Anne, Stick-Eastlake, and Colonial Revival styles. The turn of the century brought a wave of interest in California’s Spanish heritage and the Mission Revival style is demonstrative of that.\(^4\) At the same time, bungalows began to be built reflecting the Craftsman esthetic, as well as simple beach cottages. From the 1930s onward, a number of


\(^4\) Ibid.
other styles emerged including: Moderne, International, the California Ranch House, the stucco box, and Post-Modern.

As land value and development pressure along the coast continue to rise, it is necessary to find more efficient ways to protect these unique architectural resources. Currently, there are federal, state, and local organizations and tools that can aid in historic preservation. At the federal level, there is the National Park Service’s National Register of Historic Places. Anyone can nominate a property for the National Register, but the property must meet the National Park Service’s criteria, which involves being architecturally or historically significant at the national level, so many properties of mere local significance would not be eligible for this type of designation. A similar system exists at the state level, through the California State Historic Preservation Office, but as with the National Register, properties can only be designated if they meet criteria to be considered significant at the state level. Once again this leaves locally significant resources unaccounted for. Most cities and counties have a local landmarks commission or historic resources board with their own forms of designation, but often these commissions and designations prove ineffective—an issue that will be explored further in relation to each case study. One way in which these local preservation tools can be strengthened is through use of the California Coastal Act.

The question that will be explored in this thesis is: How can local preservation policy be strengthened through integration or connection to the Local Coastal Programs that are developed under the California Coastal Act? In 1972, the California Coastal Commission was established via Proposition 20. Proposition 20 was established in response to activist groups who wanted more public access along the California coast. The passage of Proposition 20 gave the Coastal Commission authority over the distribution of coastal development permits for four years,
however in 1976 the California Coastal Act was passed and the Commission was given this authority indefinitely. Under the Coastal Act, the Commission is tasked with the protection of coastal resources including: shoreline public access and recreation, terrestrial and marine habitat, visual resources, landform alteration, agricultural lands, commercial fisheries, industrial uses, water quality, offshore oil and gas development, transportation, and development design, among other things. While the Coastal Commission does state that one of its goals is the “orderly, long-range conservation, use, and management of coastal cultural resources,” the only cultural resources that are actually mentioned in the Coastal Act are archaeological sites.

Under the Coastal Act, coastal cities and counties are asked to develop Local Coastal Programs (LCPs) that are to be in line with the goals of the Coastal Act and approved by the Coastal Commission. After the Coastal Commission approves LCPs, a local agency is made responsible for issuing coastal development permits. Due to the large size and diversity of resources on the California Coast, it is necessary to have a policy that allows local issues to be addressed, hence the importance of these LCPs. Certain cities and counties have used their LCP as an opportunity to address local preservation issues. In Appendix A, a chart organizing all 126 LCPs can be found. The chart also states whether or not the LCP mentions historic preservation. The level of the LCP’s address of historic preservation has been measured low or high—low meaning that preservation is mentioned, but only by way of stating that historic resources should be preserved or only in regards to properties that are already designated landmarks, and high meaning that comprehensive standards and guidelines for preservation are provided. As can be seen by the chart, many LCPs mention historic preservation, but very few offer any real forms of protection.

---

Beginning in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, the protection of natural and cultural resources was addressed under a single policy, such as during the creation of the National Parks and in the Antiquities Act, but these policies were not really applicable on a local level or in terms of protecting private property. Since then, nature and culture have largely been addressed separately. Issues such as that concerning seawalls that was previously mentioned, show that issues of natural and cultural resource preservation on the coast are intricately intertwined. The Coastal Act lends an opportunity for this connection to be thoroughly examined and used as a tool for communities to address specific preservation issues. This thesis will show, through an examination of the Coastal Act and LCPs from both Marin and Sonoma counties, that include a comprehensive plan for preservation, how historic preservation can be addressed through LCPs as well as will recommend ways for how other communities can use their LCPs to address the preservation of both natural and cultural issues as one.

**Methodology**

The first step that was taken in order to complete this thesis was an analysis of the Coastal Act. As previously stated, the Coastal Act only really addresses historic preservation in regards to archaeological sites, but upon thorough investigation of the Coastal Act it becomes apparent that historic preservation is in line with many of the larger goals of the Coastal Act. For example, the Coastal Act protects water quality, community character, and views to the ocean. Historic preservation can help to achieve all of those goals, which is something that will be explored through the case studies and recommendations sections of this thesis.

This relationship between historic preservation and the goals of the Coastal Act led into an exploration of historic preservation issues that could potentially be mitigated through the use of a LCP. Two of the most prominent issues on the California coast are demolition of historic
structures and the lack of funds that preservationists have to work with. Coastal property is highly valued and is always under threat of development. Developers want to maximize the amount of money that can be made from parcels of land; so high-rise office and condominium buildings are built in order to achieve this. Oftentimes, small historic structures are torn down to make way for these projects. In addition, preservation is a field that always seems to be underfunded. This not only results in a loss of historic structures, but it prevents local governments from making improvements to their preservation programs. The Coastal Act could be used to alleviate these problems in ways that will be explored later in this thesis.

While not all communities capitalize on the opportunity to protect their historic resources through LCPs, some do. Through an examination of the LCPs of Marin and Sonoma counties, that do include historic preservation, it becomes evident that cities and counties do so in a number of different ways. Some incorporate already existing historic preservation ordinances into their LCPs when they were being created, while others create specific preservation provisions alongside with the LCP. This has resulted in each locality experiencing unique difficulties in terms of the implementation and success of their LCP. In order to get a better idea of what these difficulties are as well as a better look at specific local preservation issues, interviews with various members of the California Coastal Commission and representatives from organization in the case study areas were conducted.

**Why is this important?**

Approximately 12.7% of California’s National Register properties are located in the coastal zone, an area that is extremely small compared to the rest of the state, and these are only buildings of national significance. It is, therefore, highly likely that many more buildings exist within the coastal zone that are significant to the local population or perhaps even buildings of
national or state significance that have been overlooked. As previously stated, the California coast is under constant threat of development and preservationists often lose the fight against developers. Not only does this often result in the loss of historic structures, but it is detrimental to community character. For this reason, stronger preservation policy must be put in place along the coast. It is important to address not only the ways in which local historic preservation policy can be strengthened through LCPs, but also the ways in which preservation can help achieve the larger goals of the Coastal Act. If this can be done effectively, preservation becomes a way of protecting all of California’s coastal resources, rather than just a building or group of buildings.
II: POLICIES PROTECTING BOTH NATURAL AND CULTURAL RESOURCES

INTRODUCTION

Coastal communities in California are unique places because contained within them are a vast variety of intertwining resources, both natural and cultural, that all need to be protected. These resources include: shoreline access and recreational opportunities, sensitive habitats, including nearshore waters, wetlands, habitat for rare and endangered species, farmlands, natural landforms, water quality, commercial fisheries, special communities, archaeological resources, historic resources, scenic landscapes and views of the sea, and urban boundaries. While there have been policies enacted in the past that have protected both natural and cultural resources, few, if any, have had an impact at the local level. The California coast is 1,300 miles long; because of its large size and the diversity of resources included within it, it is necessary to have a policy in place that can be utilized by localities to address local issues. Beginning in the late 19th century policies were enacted that addressed the protection of both natural and cultural issues. While these policies were created to address a very specific set of issues, they were not really applicable on a local level. Such policies include the Antiquities Act, the National Park Organic Act, and the World Heritage Convention.

THE ANTIQUITIES ACT

In the late 19th century the abandoned and ruined dwellings of prehistoric man in the American West had begun to attract the serious attention of the scientific community. This public interest led to proposals for the preservation of American Indian archaeological sites and eventually led to Congress providing for the protection and repair of Casa Grande through an appropriation act. This act, approved in 1889, not only appropriated $2,000 to enable the Secretary of the Interior to repair and protect Casa Grande, it also authorized the President to
reserve the land on which the ruin was situated from settlement and sale. In 1892, President Benjamin Harrison signed at executive order establishing Casa Grande as the first formal national archaeological reservation in U.S. history.

Rising public interest in the history and art of the southwestern Indians in the 1890s was also accompanied by an increased demand for authentic prehistoric objects. The desires and needs of growing numbers of collectors and dealers, exhibitors and curators, teachers and students created a demand for original objects from cliff dwellings and pueblo ruins of the Southwest. Most of these ruins were situated on public land or Indian reservations, where there was no system of protection and no permit was needed to dig. This resulted in a rush on prehistoric ruins of the Southwest that went on, largely unchecked, until about 1904.

Until the Antiquities Act was passed in 1906, the chief asset available to the Federal Government for protecting antiquities on public land was the power to withdraw specific tracts from sale or entry for a temporary period. As the problem of protection grew and as complaints were made in steadily increasing numbers, this power was exercised more and more frequently. Many groups formed in effort to save specific sites such as Frijoles Canyon, Mesa Verde, and

---


8. Ibid.


10. Ibid.
Chaco Canyon, and the effect of these groups in saving these sites was considerable, but those who wished to apply scientific management to public lands desired more.

President Theodore Roosevelt, Gifford Pinchot and their followers envisioned the basic policies and the management programs for western lands and waters would emanate from scientists and engineers rather than from legislators and politicians. They also believed that the authority to protect should go further than antiquities and include permanent protection of scenic and scientific resources on public lands as well.\(^{11}\) Interesting discoveries were constantly being made of caves, craters, mineral springs, unusual geological formations, and other scientific features that appeared to merit special protection. Various bills were introduced in Congress to set aside these areas as public reservations, to be permanently protected for the public benefit. These proposals usually called for establishing the area or object as a national park, but this took time and many proposals remained pending before Congress.\(^{12}\) Due to this, there remained the push for general legislation to authorize the President to establish prehistoric and scientific resources on public lands as national parks.

All of this lead to the passage of the Antiquities Act in 1906, which began with a major provision that:

> The President of the United States may from time to time set apart and reserve for use as public parks on reservation, in the same manner now provided by law for forestry reservation, any public lands upon which are monuments, cliff-dwellings, cemeteries, graves, mounds, forts, or any other work of prehistoric, primitive, or aboriginal man, and also any natural formation of scientific or scenic value of interest, or natural wonder or curiosity together with such additional area of land surrounding or adjoining or adjoining the same, as he may deem necessary for the proper preservation and subsequent investigation of said prehistoric work or remains.\(^{13}\)

\(^{11}\) Ibid.

\(^{12}\) Ibid.
This is the first link between historic and natural areas in the history of federal preservation legislation.\textsuperscript{14} It also introduced the word “monuments” into the language of conservation in the United States.\textsuperscript{15} In addition, the Antiquities Act put in place penalties for anyone who destroyed those objects or sites protected under the bill and stated that permission for the examination of these objects or sites may be granted by the Secretaries of the Interior, Agriculture, and War, to institutions which they deem properly qualified. The Antiquities Act provided a foundation of public policy from which more specific public attention to and preservation of historic places and structures, cultural landscapes, and other cultural resources developed during the course of the 20\textsuperscript{th} century.

Since the Antiquities Act was passed, most National Monuments became parts of National Parks. Only four individual National Monuments remain in California and only one is cultural site that is in the coastal zone: Cabrillo National Monument in San Diego, California. There is the California Coastal National Monument, which was designated by Bill Clinton in 2000 to protect the nearshore ocean zone that begins just offshore and ends at the boundary between the continental shelf and the continental slope, but since this zone is mostly under water, it includes only natural resources. The Antiquities is not really capable of being utilized to address local issues because monuments are designated by the President of Congress and are then declared federal lands.


\textsuperscript{14} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{15} Ibid.
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE ORGANIC ACT

In 1872, Yellowstone was established as the first National Park. By 1916 the Department of the Interior was responsible for 14 national parks and 21 national monuments, but had no organization to manage them. The most important debate that led to the creation of the National Park Service was that over damming the Hetch Hetchy Valley. Between 1908 and 1913, the growing city of San Francisco proposed building a dam in the Hetch Hetchy Valley to provide a steady water supply. The Hetch Hetchy Valley was within Yosemite National Park, however, and protected by the federal government. It was therefore up to Congress to decide the fate of the valley. National opinion divided over the question of whether San Francisco should have the right to dam the valley, or if the land should be preserved from development. At the heart of the debate was the conflict between conservationists, who held that the environment should be used in a conscientious manner to benefit society, and preservationists, who believed that nature should be protected, saved from human interference. Siding with conservationists, San Francisco citizens argued that the reservoir was necessary for the health of their city. In 1913, Congress permitted the dam.

Hetch Hetchy highlighted the institutional weakness of the park movement. Among those recognizing the problem was Stephen Mather, a wealthy Chicago businessman. Mather complained to the Secretary of the Interior about the parks’ mismanagement and was then invited


to Washington to serve as the Secretary’s assistant for park matters. Mather and his principal aide, Horace Albright, advocated for a national parks bureau by emphasizing the economic value of parks as tourist destinations. In August of 1916, President Woodrow Wilson approved the legislation creating the National Park Service within the Department of the Interior. The act made the bureau responsible for national parks and monuments and in managing these areas, the Park Service was directed “to conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations.”

Here, not only were the National Parks created as places to preserve both natural and historic objects, but a special body was created to oversee their protection. However, this had little direct effect on California’s coastal zone. California has the most National Parks out of any state with nine, but only one is in the coastal zone—Channel Islands National Park, where half of the park’s area is under water.

THE WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION

The idea of creating an international movement for protecting heritage emerged after World War I. The 1972 Convention concerning the Protection of World Cultural and Natural Heritage developed from the merging of two separate movements: the first focusing on the preservation of cultural sites, and the other dealing with the conservation of nature. The event that aroused particular international concern was the decision to build the Aswan High Dam in


20. Ibid.
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Egypt, which would have flooded the valley containing the Abu Simbel temples, a treasure of ancient Egyptian civilization. In 1959, after an appeal from the government of Egypt and Sudan, UNESCO launched an international safeguarding campaign. The Abu Simbel and Philae temples were dismantled, moved to dry ground and reassembled. Following this campaign, UNESCO initiated, with the help of the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS), the preparation of a draft convention on the protection of cultural heritage.

The idea of combining conservation of cultural sites with those of nature comes from the United States. A White House Conference in Washington, D.C., in 1965 called for a “World Heritage Trust” that would stimulate international cooperation to protect “the world’s superb natural and scenic areas and historic sites for the present and the future of the entire world citizenry.” In 1968, the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) developed similar proposals for its members. These proposals were presented to the 1972 United Nations conference on Human Environment in Stockholm. Eventually, a single text was agreed upon by all parties concerned. The Convention concerning the protection of World Cultural and Natural Heritage was adopted by the General Conference of UNESCO on November 16, 1972.

The Convention defines the kinds of natural or cultural sites that can be considered for inscription on the World Heritage List. Cultural heritage includes: monuments (architectural works, works of monumental sculpture and painting, elements or structures of an archaeological nature, inscriptions, cave dwellings and combinations of features), groups of buildings, and sites

23. Ibid.

24. Ibid.

25. Ibid.
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(works of man or the combined works of nature and man, and areas including archaeological sites), which are of outstanding universal value from the historical, aesthetic, ethnological or anthropological point of view. Natural heritage includes: Natural features consisting of physical and biological formations or groups of such formations, geological and physiographical formations and precisely delineated areas which constitute the habitat of threatened species of animals and plants, natural sites or precisely delineated natural areas of outstanding universal value from the point of view of science, conservation or natural beauty. By regarding heritage as both cultural and natural, the Convention serves as a reminder of the ways in which people interact with nature, and of the fundamental need to preserve the balance between the two. Only two World Heritage Sites exist in California—Yosemite National Park and Redwood National and State Parks. Due to the face that the World Heritage Convention only applies to sites that are of international significance, it can also not really be used to solve local preservation issues.

THE CALIFORNIA COASTAL ACT

How was the Coastal Act Created?

Throughout the 1950s and 60s many events occurred that raised public awareness of harm to the environment caused by man and led to the modern environmental movement. This rise of public awareness led to a period in which various policies relating to the protection of both the natural and the built environment were passed. Various events of different nature led to


28. Ibid.

this heightened awareness. The Santa Barbara Oil Spill of 1969, in which 200,000 gallons of oil leaked into the Pacific Ocean over 11 straight days, the proposed construction of a string of nuclear power plants at Bodega Bay, Moss Landing, Malibu, Point Arena and Diablo Canyon, the potential expansion of state route one through various parts of California (many wanted it to maintain its historic two-lane scenic configuration), and the development of Sea Ranch in Sonoma County were all factors that led to increased activism.

Public access to California’s beaches was becoming a significant issue at this time and the idea that with the development of the Sea Ranch ten of the most beautiful and publicly accessible miles of the northern coastline would become private was intolerable to many in Sonoma County and to powerful environmental organizations like the Sierra Club. Activists formed an organization called Californians Organized to Acquire Access to State Tidelands (COAST) and in 1968 the organization, with the help of Peter Douglas, who worked for Assemblyman Alan Sieroty (D-Los Angeles), put an initiative on the county ballot to cut public access trails through almost every mile of The Sea Ranch. The initiative failed but it gave rise to a statewide movement called the Coastal Initiative, which put a similar initiative covering the entire California coast on the statewide ballot in 1972.

Beginning in the administrations of Governors Pat Brown and Ronald Reagan, there were advisory commissions on coastline resources, but little came out of their efforts. Beginning 1968, through the efforts of Assemblyman Alan Sieroty and others, a number of coastline bills were introduced, but none were passed. According to an article in the Los Angeles Times, “A legislative pattern was established—conservationists pushing a strong Sieroty bill, other bills emerging by other legislators, powerful lobbyists opposing the legislation and death in a Senate

Conservationists started talking seriously about an initiative (which became known as the Coastal Initiative) in 1971, with a hard-core group of about 20 deciding to qualify an initiative if the Sieroty bill of that year seemed doomed to fail again. In May of 1972, the Senate Natural Resources Committee killed the year’s Sieroty bill and pro-initiative forces swung into action with the announcement that the Sierra Club was actively helping with its organization and 60,000 members. The all-volunteer effort cost about $40,000 and the initiative was qualified in June with 403,815 signatures, while only 325,504 were needed. The initiative was backed by a number of supporters in addition to the Sierra club, the nation’s largest conservationist group. Major backers included the League of Women Voters, the American Institute of Planners, the California Parent-Teachers Association, the National Audubon Society, the National Council of Senior Citizens and a large assortment of outdoors and sportsmen’s clubs. Those in opposition to the bill were land developers, oil companies, power companies, some local governments (who were afraid of losing their permitting power), building trades and unions, construction firms and various chambers of commerce. Some of the largest contributors against the initiative as of October 1972 were Standard Oil Company of California, Pacific Gas and Electric Company, and Southern Pacific Land Company.


32. Ibid.

33. Ibid.

34. Ibid.

The California Coastal Conservation Initiative, or Proposition 20, called for the creation of regional coastal commissions, backed by one statewide commission, that would plan for the use of coastal lands with emphasis on public access and would give the commissions the power to issue or deny building permits in the coastal zone—this of course would place regulation on those who wanted to exploit the land for business. For a while, passage of Proposition 20 was uncertain as opponents of the bill reported receiving $435,493 in endorsements, while those for the Proposition had reported receipts of only $10,562. However, Proposition 20 passed easily, designating the coastal zone (typically 1,000 yards from the coast (see Appendix B for map)), creating the Coastal Commission, and giving the Commission authority over coastal development permits for four years. In 1973, a suit was filed by the Council on Environment, Employment Economy and Development, the Building Industry Association, and the AFL-CIO Building Trade Councils of Los Angeles and Orange counties attacking the constitutional basis of the act. The plaintiffs claimed that:

The imposition of controls on property by initiative and the conduct of coastal commission permit hearings violate the right of property owners to constitutional due process...In addition opponents of the act contended that it constitutes an unlawful delegation of legislative power to an administrative agency; that it interferes with ‘home rules’ by local government; that it confiscates property without just compensation, and that it encroaches on the public’s 14th Amendment rights to travel and take up residence.37

36. Ibid.

The opposition failed, however, and the judge upheld what Proposition 20 put in place. In 1976, the California Coastal Act was passed and gave the California Coastal Commission indefinite authority over issuing coastal development permits.

What Do the Coastal Act and Coastal Commission Do?

The Coastal Commission’s mandate is to protect and enhance the resources of the coastal zone mapped by the State Legislature. Coastal Commission membership is made up of twelve voting members, appointed equally by the Governor, the Senate Rules Committee, and the Speaker of the Assembly. Half of the voting commissioners are locally elected officials and half are representatives of the public at large. The Coastal commission also has four non-voting members representing the Resources Agency, the Business, Transportation and Housing Agency, the Trade Commerce Agency and the State Lands Commission.

The Coastal Act includes specific policies that address issues such as shoreline public access and recreation, lower cost visitor accommodations, terrestrial and marine habitat protection, visual resources, landform alteration, agricultural lands, commercial fisheries, industrial uses, water quality, offshore oil and gas development, transportation, development design, power plants, ports, and public works. While the Coastal Commission cites the Coastal Act as a “plan for the orderly, long-range conservation, use, and management of the natural, scenic, cultural, recreation, and manmade resources of the coastal zone,” the protection of natural and cultural resources are addressed quite differently.

---


There is a whole chapter in the Coastal Act dedicated to discussing, in detail, the protection of the marine environment. Subsections include: biological productivity, diking, filling and dredging, commercial fishing, and construction altering the natural shoreline. In addition, subsections in other chapters that relate to the protection of natural resources include: environmentally sensitive habitat areas, agricultural lands, productivity of soils and timberlands, and scenic and visual qualities. Within these sections specific actions to be taken in order to protect natural resources are spelled out.

In terms of cultural resources, very little is mentioned. Only one section under Article Five, titled “Land Resources,” is specifically dedicated to cultural resources. This section has to do with archaeological and paleontological resources, which are identified within the Coastal Act as sensitive coastal resource areas, and the only direction it offers is, “Where development would adversely impact archaeological or paleontological resources as identified by the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), reasonable mitigation measures shall be required.” While archaeological sites are protected, the SHPO relies on environmental impact reports to identify whether or not there are significant archaeological resources present on a project site and the SHPO reviews or comments on very few of these documents, so it is possible that some of these archaeological resources are overlooked. On a recent project in Huntington Beach, called Bolsa Chica, the SHPO was only alerted by a community group about the presence of archaeological resources. An attempt at more communication between the SHPO and the Coastal Commission

40. Ibid.
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is being forged because of this project. The Coastal Act also states that an inventory of coastal resources is to be compiled, consisting of manmade resources of cultural, historic, economic, and educational importance to the public. This inventory, called the California Coastal Resource Guide, was released on 1987 by the Coastal Commission and gives a brief overview of the resources found in each coastal county, but does not go into great detail in terms of each county’s architectural resources. While the SHPO was not consulted when the Coastal Resource Guide was being created, the California Historical Society was.

The State Legislature found that “to achieve maximum responsiveness to local conditions, accountability, and public accessibility, it is necessary to rely heavily on local government and local land use planning procedures and enforcement.” Therefore, implementation of Coastal Act policies is accomplished primarily through the preparation of a Local Coastal Program (LCP) by the local government’s planning agency with feedback from the community and other affected government agencies through public hearings, which is required by the Coastal Act. The LCP is then reviewed and approved by the Coastal Commission. An LCP typically consists of a Land Use Plan and an Implementation Plan. The Land Use Plan indicates the kinds, location, and intensity of land uses, the applicable resource protection and development policies, and, where necessary, a listing of implementing actions. The Implementation Plan consists of the zoning ordinances, zoning district maps, and other legal

43. Ibid.


instruments necessary to implement the land use plan. Any amendments to the certified LCP require review and approval by the Coastal Commission before becoming effective.

After certification of an LCP, coastal development permit authority and implementation of the LCP is transferred to the appropriate local government, typically the local planning agency. The Coastal Commission retains original permit jurisdiction over certain specified lands, such as submerged lands, tidelands, and public trust lands, and has the authority to appeal development approved by local government in specified geographic areas and for major public works projects and major energy facilities.\(^\text{46}\) In authorizing coastal development permits, the local government must make the finding that the development conforms to the certified LCP. Furthermore, after certification of the LCP, City actions on applications for Coastal Act authority to conduct certain types of development and development within certain geographic areas are appealable to the Coastal Commission. Many of the 76 coastal counties and cities have divided their coastal zones into separate geographic segments, resulting in about 128 separate LCPs.\(^\text{47}\) As of 2011, approximately 72% or the LCP segments had been effectively certified, representing about 85% of the geographic area of the coastal zone, and local governments are issuing coastal permits in these areas.\(^\text{48}\) The only major metropolitan area that does not have an LCP is the San Francisco Bay area, where the San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission oversees development.


\(^{47}\) Ibid.

\(^{48}\) Ibid.
CONCLUSION

Since the beginning of the 20th century, policies protecting both natural and cultural resources have been enacted. However, none of these policies could really be utilized by local governments to address their own specific set of issues besides the LCPs. Due to the dynamics at play on the California coast, it is necessary to have a policy where decision-making is in the hands of local governments. While tension and disagreements between stakeholders will occur, through LCPs the Coastal Act lends an opportunity for cities and counties to address local issues and to broaden the conception of coastal resources to include historic resources.
III: CASE STUDIES

INTRODUCTION

In the following chapter, an analysis of three Local Coastal Programs will take place. Two of the LCPs address historic preservation in a comprehensive way, but each does so somewhat differently, conforming to the needs of the individual county. The third addresses historic preservation, but in a way in which the protection provided by the Coastal Act is misinterpreted. Through this analysis, it will become evident that it is not only possible to use the LCP as a way to address local preservation, but that it can be done in an efficient way by focusing on multiple issues at once and by using forms of preservation that already exist within communities, and also that the stipulations of the Coastal Act have been misinterpreted and need to be changed.

It is important to note here one of the major problems that was encountered when doing research for this thesis. Attempts were made to interview employees of local government and local historic preservation organization to obtain more information about LCPs that is not readily available, but this proved to be a difficult task. There was very little response from those who were contacted and so the views expressed in this section are from a very small sample of interviewees. However, this does shed light on the need for local government officials to be more accessible and responsive. One of the problems with the regulation of the coastal zone in general is that there is not enough communication between local governments, preservation organizations, and the public.
MARIN COUNTY

Historic Resources and Preservation Issues in Marin

Marin County is located in the North San Francisco Bay Area, across the Golden Gate Bridge from San Francisco County (see Appendix B for relevant maps). According to a 2012 statistic, approximately 12.2% of Marin’s 111,603 housing units were built before 1939.\textsuperscript{49} The rural areas in West Marin are defined by historic ranches and small towns. Historic residential and commercial architectural styles in the county are typically Greek Revival, Queen Anne, Italianate, and Bungalow (see Appendix C for images of Marin’s historic resources). In recent years, Marin County has seen a loss of its historical resources due to demolition and substantial alterations to historic structures.\textsuperscript{50} In rural areas this has occurred where large private family compounds replaced historic ranches, while in the more urban areas this has occurred in historic subdivisions where smaller historic homes have been replaced or substantially altered.\textsuperscript{51} In addition, as stated by a member of the Marin County Community Development Agency, “Although Marin County’s coastal communities reflect a long-standing commitment to maintain the characteristics that draw residents and visitors to them, changing economics and land development practices could threaten community character.”\textsuperscript{52} A member of the Marin County
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Board of Supervisors explained this further stating that, “the greatest challenge that our historic buildings face is the ever-increasing affluence of Marin residents. Many buildings are being purchased and razed. Over time, this will bring conflict with existing historic community character, if not specific structures.”

**Who are the key preservation players?**

While there are a number of historical organizations and societies within Marin that are dedicated to protecting cultural heritage, most of these are dedicated to areas outside the coastal zone and there is no county landmarks commission. The Marin History Museum (formerly the Marin County Historical Society), which was founded in 1935, is one organization that aids with historic preservation throughout Marin. While the Museum is housed in a historic gatehouse, the organization is consulted mostly for historical information, rather than specific technical advice related to preservation. The organization was formed for “educational, recreation, and social purposes; specifically to promote the study and research into the history of Marin County and to perpetuate the relics, records and authentic references to the early discoveries, settlement, and organization of Marin County.”

Within the coastal zone, preservation of historic structures takes place mainly through the LCP, the details of which will be discussed later in this paper. The main player involved in enforcing policies set forth by the LCP is the Marin County Community Development Agency. The Community Development Agency joins together what are commonly known as the


53. Steven Kinsey, member of the Marin County Board of Supervisors and California Coastal Commission representative, email message to author, March 24, 2014.

Planning, Building, and Environmental Health departments. The Agency works together “to protect Marin’s natural and built environment, and the public’s health and safety with a mission of sustainability.”\textsuperscript{55} While the Community Development Agency plays a large part, the desire to maintain local community character that is reflected in the LCP is due in part to the resident participation that took place during the LCP’s creation.\textsuperscript{56} Residents of Marin value the character of their communities and have a strong desire to preserve it.\textsuperscript{57}

A Short History of the Marin LCP

Marin’s original LCP was prepared by the Marin County Comprehensive Planning Department in 1979 in response to passage of the California Coastal Act and the LCP land use plan, which was developed in two geographic parts, took effect in 1982. Unit 1 contains plans for the southern portion of the coastal zone and Unit 2 contains plans for the northern part of the coastal zone, including agricultural policies for the coastal zone as a whole. Following the completion of Unit 1 and Unit 2 plans and their approval by the Coastal Commission, the County prepared zoning and implementation provisions for its entire coastal zone area. Upon final approval by the Coastal Commission, the County took over responsibility for reviewing coastal permits.

While historic preservation has been included in Marin’s LCP since its beginning, amendments to the document continue to be made. Between 1982 and 2008 some fifteen amendments to the original LCP were adopted. These amendments include some of very limited
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scope, such as those that simply modified the potential allowable use of a particular lot, as well as others with broader effects, like changing land use policies throughout the County’s coastal zone or incorporating smaller community plans into the LCP. In the early 2000s, the Planning Commission and the staff of the Community Development Agency re-initiated efforts to revise the County’s LCP. It was decided that since a new countywide plan had just been adopted, it was also an appropriate time to update the LCP. The purpose of this revision has been to gather comments from residents of the County’s coastal communities, members of the public, and Coastal Commission staff regarding the existing Unit 1 and Unit 2 LCPs. The LCP revision process also provided an opportunity to see how changed conditions since 1982, such as sea level rise, global warming, and sustainability, might be addressed by the plan. The LCP framework document released by the Marin County Community Development Agency states that:

> Those who have commented on the LCP revision have noted that, in many respects, the LCP originally certified by the Coastal Commission in 1982 has served the County and its coastal resources very well. Amendments to the LCP...therefore, are intended to be primarily incremental in nature, while maintaining the plan’s strong emphasis on protecting Marin County’s outstanding coastal resources, agricultural activities, the natural environment, distinctive communities, and opportunities for public recreation.
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Although no amendments have been made in terms of protecting historic resources, the constant review of Marin’s LCP shows how dedicated and vigilant residents and the local government are when it comes to protecting coastal resources.

**How does Marin’s LCP work in accordance with the Coastal Act?**

There are two primary ways through which Marin uses the LCP as an avenue to approach the protection of historical resources. The first is through Section 30253 of the Coastal Act, which states in part that new development “shall protect special communities and neighborhoods that, because of their unique characteristics, are popular visitor destination points for recreational uses.”63 As one member of the Marin County Community Development Agency puts it, “Marin County’s coastal villages draw visitors because of their special characteristics, beautiful natural surroundings, and close proximity to the coast…the character of Marin County’s coastal villages is an important factor in their desirability as places to live.”64 Marin’s mission under the LCP, which is to protect coastal resources, works in parallel with the Countywide Plan, which states that maintaining a community’s historical character contributes to economic vitality by making the community more attractive to visitors and that preserved historic buildings are assets to a community over time, not only because the services provided within, but because of the unique contribution of their architecture to the look and feel of a community.65
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historic architecture an important part of what attracts visitors and therefore uses Section 30253 of the Coastal Act as an avenue for its protection.

While not all of Marin’s historical resources act as popular visitor destinations, they all contribute to the unique cultural and visual character of the Marin coastal zone. Section 30251 of the Coastal Act protects scenic and visual qualities. While the specifics of these qualities are left to interpretation, the Act states that, “Permitted development shall be sited and designed…to be visually compatible with the character of surrounding areas, and, where feasible, to restore and enhance visual quality in visually degraded areas.”66 In accordance with this, Marin’s LCP states that its coastal communities are “historically important and aesthetically unique” and are therefore important visual qualities requiring protection under the Coastal Act.67

**What provisions has Marin set forth in the LCP to protect historic resources?**

In order to protect historic resources, Marin has included specific procedures that must be adhered to when projects affecting historic resources in the coastal area are undergone. Both Unit 1 and Unit 2 of the Marin LCP address historic structures in the same way. The first way in which historic structures are protected is:

Demolition of any structure built prior to 1930 shall require a Coastal Project Permit…Issuance of a coastal project permit for the demolition of any pre-1930 structure may provide for such demolition to be delayed for a period not to exceed six months. During this period, the property owner or local historic group or society may attempt to find a purchaser or alternate location for the structure. This six-month period may be waived by the Planning Director or appropriate body upon a finding that the structure is not significant to community character or to visitor appeal or cannot be rehabilitated.68


While this provision, to some extent, protects historic structures from demolition, a member of the Marin County Community Development Agency stated that, “There have been few if any applications to demolish historic [pre-1930] structures in Marin’s coastal zone. More common are proposals to renovate (and in some cases enlarge) these types of structures for new uses.” 69 In order to protect historic buildings from inappropriate alterations the LCP states that:

Alterations or additions to any structure built prior to 1930 shall require a coastal project permit; except that, maintenance or repair to restore any pre-1930 structure to its original architectural character shall be exempt from the requirement…Altering or additions to any pre-1930 structure shall retain the scale and original architectural features of the structure, especially for the front façade. 70

In order to facilitate more sensitive alterations and additions, all Coastal Project Permits for projects involving pre-1930 buildings are reviewed in accordance with the “Design Guidelines for Construction in Historic Areas and for Pre-1930 Structures” and the “Historic Review Checklist.” 71 The “Design Guidelines,” which are provided in the LCP, address issues such as repetitions or roof shapes, consistency of building heights and setbacks, directional expression of front elevations, the preservation and replications of historic details, appropriate placement of additions, and more. The “Historic Review Checklist” was established to provide an initial determination of compatibility of new construction, alterations and additions.

Aside from protecting individual buildings, Marin County’s LCP also designates “historic areas.” Community input and a historic survey were conducted as part of the coastal
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plan, which led to the creation of these historic areas. Criteria used in defining historic areas were visual access and coherent grouping as well as architectural and historic composition and groups of non-conforming structures that disrupt the historic quality of an area were excluded.\(^72\)

If necessary, historic area boundaries can be revised through the public review process. New construction, and additions to or demolition of existing structures in historic areas will require a coastal permit and all coastal permits must be in accordance with the “Design Guidelines” and “Historic Review Checklist.”\(^73\)

**How do these provisions play out when a project involving a historic building is proposed?**

Much like other cities that exercise design review, the process generally starts with the permit application. When a permit is applied for, an applicant must submit information about materials, colors, and details as well as design plans. Design plans generally consist of: project information, a site plan, floor plans, building elevations and cross sections, roof plans, landscape plans, and a historical study.\(^74\) After the application is submitted, it is reviewed by the Community Development Agency who either makes a decision or recommendations.

---


One example of how this design review element has been effective is in the case of the Marshall Tavern, which is located in the Tomales Bay area of Marin County. The Marshall Tavern was built in 1873 and originally served as a soda shop and hardware store, with an addition built around 1910. The owners of the old Marshall Tavern intended to convert the structure into a bed-and-breakfast, which would involve remodeling the building into a six-bedroom residence for use as a five-bedroom inn and a manager’s unit. The plan also provided for eight parking spaces and numerous improvements, including repair and reinforcement of the structure, installation of additional bayside windows, installation of solar panels and skylights, interior remodeling and construction of exterior decks.

In 2010, the Marin County Community Development Agency approved the proposed project—with a report noting that there would be no adverse environmental or visual impacts (also meaning that they would have to adhere to Design Guidelines because the Tavern was built before 1930). However the project triggered oversight by the Coastal Commission whose concerns involved the removal of pilings and a 24-hour public easement. The Coastal Commission eventually approved the permit, but their final report did not omit the fact that the historic character of the Tavern should be retained. The report recognizes the importance that Marin’s LCP places on retaining the character of historic resources, but takes this even further stating that: “...to ensure the proposed restoration will restore the Tavern to its historic
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appearance, as intended, Special Condition 1(a) requires the restoration be consistency with the Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation and Reconstruction. As conditioned, the project can be found consistent with the visual resource and community character policies of the Coastal Act.”

While this appeal was not concerned with the preservation of the building, it brought more attention to the building’s historic value and reaffirmed the fact that its historic character should be retained. While historic structures are not specifically mentioned in the Coastal Act, retaining historic character remained important in the Coastal Commission’s final decision because it was a part of the Marin County LCP, which shows that the Coastal Commission will support historic preservation.

This is not to say that design review is something unique that is implemented only by Marin County—it is a common preservation tool utilized by many local governments. However, design review usually stands alone as its own policy. In San Antonio, Texas, for example, as in many other cities, design review applies only to individually designated landmarks or within designated historic districts. While the design guidelines are part of the city development code, applications are reviewed only by the city Office of Historic Preservation or the Design Review Commission, rather than the larger planning commission that regulates most other development.

Marin’s system is unique because, in the way that design review is a part of the Local Coastal Program, it allows historic preservation to be part of a larger policy and the bigger environmental picture.


Is Marin’s system effective?

There is a wide belief throughout Marin County that the LCP has served its purpose of protecting Marin’s unique coastal resources, both natural and cultural alike. One member of the Marin County Board of Supervisors stated that in his 17 years on the Board, “there has not been a single appeal related to demolition of a historic structure or incompatible development adjacent to historic development…there have been contested designs, however no appeal has progressed beyond the Planning Commission.” He went on to say that he does “not see any policy gaps in the LCP related to historic preservation.” On the other hand, it seems that there is a desire for more expertise in regard to historic preservation. In the Marin Countywide Plan, the most recent version of which was adopted in 2007, one of the stated goals is to establish a landmarks commission, but one has yet to be established. The reasons for this are financial. “Since 2007, there has been a significant fiscal challenge causing the Marin County government to reduce its workforce and curtail activities. There have been very limited new initiatives undertaken.” Due to these financial limitations, the most likely way in which a landmarks commission and its larger purpose will be undertaken will be through a form of partnership between the County and
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a non-governmental entity, like the Marin County Historical Society.\textsuperscript{84} In other words, because the county government does not have the funds to establish a separate landmarks commission, the duties that would be delegated to that commission will most likely be assumed by a pre-existing non-governmental organization. However, the Marin County Historical Society has also struggled financially and organizationally. In 2013, the non-profit undertook a strategic planning process to re-focus and to develop a financially sustainable business plan.

SONOMA COUNTY

Historic Resources and Preservation Issues in Sonoma

Sonoma County is located north of San Francisco, on the north side of San Pablo Bay, between Napa and Marin counties (see Appendix B for relevant maps). Sonoma County has a rich and diverse history, which translates into the architecture of the area. The earliest historic structures in Sonoma are the adobe ones that were built, largely between 1840 and 1846, when California was still under Mexican rule. In the years following, increasing American military presence and the Gold Rush brought more settlers to California. A variety of architectural styles mirroring the origins of settlers can be found including: Saltbox, Monterey colonial style, Queen Anne, Gothic, Greek revival and Italianate.\textsuperscript{85} Later styles such as Art Deco and Moderne are also represented (see Appendix C for images of Sonoma’s historic resources). As in many Coastal areas throughout California, historic structures, sites, and areas of special historic, architectural or aesthetic interest or value in Sonoma County have been and continue to be unnecessarily

\textsuperscript{84} Ibid.

destroyed or impaired.86 This includes inappropriate alterations or additions, and demolition. In addition, demolition by neglect is also becoming a growing problem for the county.87 While Marin County developed protective measures for historic structures in conjunction with their LCP, Sonoma County developed a separate historic preservation ordinance before the LCP was adopted and then incorporated that ordinance into the LCP.

A Brief History of Sonoma’s Historic Preservation Program

The historic preservation movement in Sonoma started in 1973 when the Board of Supervisors received requests by petition from 22 property owners in the Freestone area of the County who wanted to establish an historic district in Freestone and to designate certain buildings as Historic Structures.88 At that time, no such zoning classification existed in the County zoning code, but after several months of staff research, in the spring of 1974 a zoning classification for Historic Districts was developed. Upon passage of the Historic District (HD) zoning classification, Freestone residents immediately requested consideration as an Historic District. A Citizens’ Advisory Committee was therefore appointed by the Board of Supervisors, in accordance with the historic zoning ordinance. Initial goals and policies for historical and archaeological preservation were developed by the Historical and Cultural Resources Sub-Committee on Open Space, but these goals and policies were very general and Planning staff felt


that a more specific study was necessary to initiate a comprehensive historic preservation
program. This committee worked with Planning staff to suggest precise boundaries of the
district, to identify those buildings which might be designated as historic buildings, and to
recommend style standards for new construction in the area. The Planning staff later prepared a
study analyzing the Citizens’ Advisory Committee findings and after the study was reviewed by
all property owners of the proposed Historic District, public hearings were held by the Planning
Commission and Board of Supervisors officially designating Freestone as an Historic District.

It is interesting that this move towards historic preservation happened less than one year
after Proposition 20 was passed and led to the passage of the California Coastal Act. It seems
that the mindset of those protesting the development of Sea Ranch was not an isolated case, but
was something that resonated throughout the community and through to the protection of
different types of resources. At the time Freestone was designated a Historic District, 30
preservation ordinances had been adopted in California, however Sonoma was unique in its
beginnings because it was mostly likely the first county in California to designate a rural historic
district.

How does Historic District (HD) Zoning protect historic resources?

In Sonoma County, The HD zoning classification is a combining district zone, meaning
that it is a zoning designation applied in combination with whatever zoning class already exists
on the parcel(s). The HD designation does not change land use or directly affect lot splits. The
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title “HD Historic Combining District” is made to encompass both individual properties and
districts, stating that designation may be applied to both: “(a) An individual structure or an
integrated group of structures on a single lot or lots having a special historical, architectural or
aesthetic interest or value as a historic structure…and (b) An area having special historical,
architectural or aesthetic interest or value.”92 Individual properties are called county landmarks.
Any building deemed to be architecturally or historically significant by the County Landmarks
Commission may be designated as a county landmark at an owner’s request or by request of
chambers or commerce, historical societies, neighborhood improvement clubs, and other civic
organizations. Under HD zoning, county landmarks are protected for six months from
demolition. During this period hopes are that alternatives to demolition, such as relocation of the
structure, public or private purchase, or adaptive re-use may be arranged. Historic districts are
regulated somewhat differently. The zoning ordinance states that, “No zoning permit authorizing
alterations (including demolition) in the exterior or a structure within the boundaries of a historic
district and no zoning permits authorizing construction of a new building within the boundaries
of a historic district shall be granted unless approval has been granted by the county landmarks
commission.”93

**Who are the key preservation players?**

The County Landmarks Commission was created as part of Sonoma’s original historic
preservation plan in the 1970s. The Commission today consists of one resident from each
supervisory district, appointed by the Board of Supervisors. The Committee’s duties include
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conducting architectural design review for new construction and extensive remodeling of existing buildings within an historic district. In addition, the Commission has control over proposed demolition of dedicated county landmarks. Permits for demolition of landmark structures are reviewed by the Commission.

While the Landmarks Commission holds regulatory power over the county’s historic resources, there are various other organizations that aid in historic preservation throughout the area. Founded in 1969, the Sonoma League for Historic Preservation’s mission is to educate, promote interest in, and advocate for the preservation of historic buildings, neighborhoods, and landscapes in the City of Sonoma and Sonoma Valley. Their primary activities include building restoration and the maintenance of an archives and research center. The League also conducted research that was used in the creation of Sonoma’s historic preservation program. The Sonoma County Historical Society also conducted research used in the creation of the historic preservation program, but their focus is primarily on history and research and they do not deal with building restoration. The Western Sonoma County Historical Society is a non-profit organization that was founded in 1974 to save a three-acre farm remnant. Later, the Historical Society committed itself to preserving and maintaining the unique heritage of the West Sonoma County area, including Sebastopol and areas west thereof. In 1975, the Sonoma Land Trust was founded, as part of the historic preservation program, to investigate the possibilities for purchasing historic properties in the Sonoma Valley and in the City of Sonoma, but today the


organization deals primarily with the conservation of scenic, natural, agricultural and open land. There are various other organizations throughout the county that deal with historic preservation, but the aforementioned are those that deal with resources in the coastal zone.

**How is HD Zoning incorporated into the LCP?**

Sonoma’s LCP states that, “It is a goal of the Coastal Plan to protect Sonoma County’s historic resources as a reminder of past eras…Many of the activities of the 1700s and 1800s remain important today…Lessons of the past are echoes in several sections of the Coastal Plan.” As a way to protect historic coastal resources, the HD zoning ordinance was included as part of the Local Coastal Program when it was adopted by the County in 1981. The exact language in the LCP is as follows:

No zoning permit authorizing alterations (including demolition) in the exterior of a structure within the boundaries of a Historic District [where ‘Historic District’ means both individual properties and larger districts] and no zoning permits authorizing construction of a new building within the boundaries of a Historic District shall be granted unless approval has been granted by the County Landmarks Commission. In all cases where the request for a zoning permit involves demolition alone, however, the Landmarks Commission shall take action on such request within six months of the date of application for the permit.

As another part of the LCP, a comprehensive inventory of historic resources in the coastal zone was conducted. The purpose of the inventory was to identify resources so that they could be protected. Historic sites worthy of landmark status were rezoned to add the HD combining zone. Other individual sites were referred to the County Landmarks Commission for their recommendations on zoning permits. The inventory revealed that, at the time, a large number of

---
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historic sites remained on the coast of Sonoma County. 89 individual sites were identified, with 38 likely to be worthy of landmark status, and four potential historic districts were identified.  

**How do these provision play out when a project involving a historic resource is proposed?**

Generally, when project under HD zoning is proposed, the project applicant must file an Administrative Design Review (ADR) application and supporting documents with the Permit and Resource Management Department. Supporting documents include: a proposal statement, site plan, building plans, landscaping plans, lighting plans, materials and color samples, photographs of the site and surrounding area, and a location/vicinity map. The Landmarks Commission then reviews the design of the proposed project at a meeting and makes either a decision or a recommendation about the design. Currently, the Landmarks Commission has been reviewing a lot of projects for the mounting of signs on historic buildings. One particular instance was when a pet store applied for the addition of a large sign and a false parapet on which to mount it. The Commission approved the sign, but not the parapet stating that, “The parapet changes the architectural style of the building.”

While design review is most often triggered by the permit application process, sometimes it is triggered by citizen appeal. This was the case at on historic building in Sonoma that housed an ice cream shop. The owner of the ice cream shop was allowed, by the Historic Preservation Commission, to paint the door of her building a particularly bright shade of pink, but 12 residents made an appeal, asserting that the Commission did not follow its own guidelines and approved a
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paint job that violated historic and aesthetic values of the area. After further research by the Commission, the shop owner was allowed to keep her door the bright pink color.

**Has this been effective?**

While having the Historic Preservation Ordinance included as part of the LCP has been effective in protecting resources that are under HD zoning, a Sonoma Landmarks Commission employee stated that, “Ministerial projects, such as building permits, are not subject to design review if the parcel is not zoned HD…The weakness of the code language requiring design review for HD zoned land is that many, many historic resources are not zoned HD. There are currently fewer than 200 designated landmarks in the unincorporated area.” Basically, while designated historic resources are protected, undesignated historic resources are still under threat of demolition and/or unsympathetic alterations. However, the employee of the Landmarks Commission also stated that the county is currently updating its Development Code and the draft for the historic provisions attempts to subject more properties to review. As previously stated, demolition by neglect is also becoming a growing issue for Sonoma County. Recently, the Landmarks Commission approved the removal of historic hatchery buildings because their upkeep had been neglected for many years. While the buildings were deemed worthy of the National Register as early as 1993, they had deteriorated to the point that the owner faced a
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notice to abate hazardous conditions from the city’s Building Official. The County Planning Director has begun to develop guidelines to address this type of situation in the future, as there are other buildings being allowed to deteriorate.

HUNTINGTON BEACH

Historic Resources and Preservation Issues

Huntington Beach is part of Orange County and is bordered by Seal Beach on the northwest, by Costa Mesa on the east, Newport Beach on the southeast, Westminster on the north, and Fountain Valley on the northeast (see Appendix B for relevant maps). Structures in Huntington Beach are comprised of a variety of architectural styles including: Queen Anne, Eastlake, Colonial Revival, Neo-classical, Bungalow, Craftsman, Spanish Colonial Revival, and Ranch (see Appendix C for images of Huntington Beach’s historic resources). However, like in the two previous case studies, these historic resources are vulnerable to change that is happening throughout the city of Huntington Beach.

In 1985, the city conducted a historic survey of the downtown area and since then, of the three potential historic districts that were identified, two are no longer eligible for National Register designation as a result of demolitions and renovations. Furthermore, the commercial areas of the city are experiencing extremely development pressures to intensify their land uses.
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due to escalating land values. Much of the one-story beach cottage character has changed to larger three-story beach houses. The city of Huntington Beach also expresses that insufficient funds presently exist for the adequate preservation of significant historical resources. While the activities of the Huntington Beach Historical Society are predominantly funded through private donations and local volunteers, most of those funds support the operations and maintenance of the Newland House, which is a house museum and the oldest residence built in Huntington Beach. Another issue that exists regarding historic resources is the fact that a citywide inventory of historic resources has never been conducted. This would not only help identify all structures and sites critical to the overall historic character of the community, but would illuminate those properties that need immediate attention. Lastly, while the City has given local landmark designation to some historically significant structures, no standards, requirements or guidelines have been created to preserve or protect them.

Who are the key players?

Currently there are very few organizations that have a hand in preserving the historic resources in Huntington Beach’s coastal zone, or for that matter, the city as a whole. Within the city government exists the Historic Resources Board (HRB), an eleven member advisory body, whose responsibility is to encourage and promote public awareness of historic resources.108 The Board acts as an advisory body to City Council as well as a liaison to Council for local, state and federal groups and agencies whose interest involves historic issues. Established in 1987, the HRB provides guidance on issues of preservation of historic commercial and residential structures and sites, cooperating with the Planning Commission and the Community Services Commission to help give consideration to historic preservation in the planning for future

When the Historic and Cultural Resources Element of Huntington Beach’s General Plan was drafted in 1996, the HRB generated a list of local landmarks considered to be of significant importance to the local community, but as previously stated, no standards, requirements or guidelines exists to protect these resources. When generating this list, the significance of a structure or place was based upon its overall contribution to the community by either its historical, age, cultural, social, or visual function(s). The Huntington Beach Historical Society is another organization that is involved in preserving the historic architecture of Huntington Beach. While the Historical Society is concerned with stimulating interest in the historic resources of Huntington Beach and preserving its buildings, artifacts, documents and other objects of historical significance, as previously stated, the majority of their efforts and funds are directed towards the historic Newland House.

**Huntington Beach’s LCP**

Huntington Beach’s LCP exists as a chapter within the city’s General Plan and was initially certified by the Coastal Commission in 1985, but as amendments were made the LCP had to be re-certified. The current version was adopted by the City Council on November 15, 1999 and certified by the Coastal Commission on June 14, 2001. The purpose of the comprehensive updates that were undertaken in 1999 was to ensure consistency with the policies and format of the 1996 General Plan and to incorporate revisions of the Coastal Act to that

---
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In order to update the LCP, background information, technical analysis and public input obtained during the 1996 General Plan update was used as the primary background information for the LCP. Part of the process also involved the draft LCP being circulated for a 30-day public review and comment period, as well as review at public hearings before the Planning Commission who made recommendation to the City Council for final adoption. In order to better serve the coastal zone, Huntington Beach’s coastal zone was divided into five smaller sections so that more customized development and design standards could be developed. They are used in areas of the City where unique characteristics, features or issues exist and where a comprehensive approach to planning, design and development is desired.

While in the LCP, one of the City’s state goals is to, “Identify and protect, to the maximum extent feasible, significant archaeological, paleontological and historic resources in the Coastal Zone,” as with when the City designates local landmarks, there are no requirements or guidelines actually protecting them. Also in the LCP there is a statement that reads, “Coastal Act Policy requires that significant historical and archaeological resources of the Coastal Zone be identified and protected. The Coastal Act identifies such resources located within the Coastal Zone, and sets forth policies to ensure reasonable protection and or enhancement of such resources.” While the Coastal Act does state that effects to
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archaeological resources should be mitigated, it in no way specifically mentions historical resources, let alone sets forth policies to ensure their protection. It is clear that there is confusion about what the Coastal Act actually protects, but it is unclear how or why this provision passed as part of Huntington Beach’s LCP. The City seems to understand that there is potential to address the protection of historic resources through use of the Coastal Act, but has failed to capitalize on that potential. Perhaps it is because of the overall unawareness of what exactly “cultural resources” refers to in the context of the Coastal Act, which would explain why more cities and communities do not use their LCPs as a way to address historic resources. In order for Huntington Beach’s LCP to serve as an effective form of protection for historic resources, the City will have to develop some sort of guidelines, much like Sonoma and Marin have done, but tailored to their own preservation issues.

CONCLUSION

Marin and Sonoma are examples of counties that have taken the opportunity to address local issues and to broaden the conception of coastal resources to include historic resources that is given by the Coastal Act. Though the way in which the Marin and Sonoma LCPs came to incorporate historic preservation was very different, both seem to be addressing the subject in a way that suits each individual county. On the other hand, there is always room for improvement and each county has identified ways in which an approach to historic preservation can be more efficient. While Marin County seeks the expertise that is presented through a local landmarks commission, like in Sonoma, Sonoma County seeks to expand protection to undesignated historic structures, such that is offered by Marin’s pre-1930 measure. Huntington Beach seems to

have missed the mark all together. While the City recognizes the potential of the LCP to protect historic resources, they have relied on the Coastal Act for protection, rather than develop a full set of requirements on their own. In order to fix these shortcomings, each community needs to reevaluate their LCPs and embrace the relatedness of historic preservation and the larger goals of the Coastal Act.
IV: RECOMMENDATIONS

THE SYSTEM AS A WHOLE

From this examination of the Coastal Act and LCPs it is clear that there is confusion about what exactly is meant by “cultural resources” and what exactly the Coastal Act protects. This explains the misinterpretation present in Huntington Beach’s LCP and the fact the many cities mention historic preservation in their LCPs, but offer no guidelines or requirements for protecting historic resources. In light of these observations, it seems that a change in the Coastal Act needs to be made. Even if real provisions for the protection of historic resources are not added, historic architecture should at least be identified within the Coastal Act as an important cultural resource that should be protected, much like the way archaeological resources are addressed. At least then, local governments would be made aware of the potential for historic preservation to be addressed through LCPs.

Another step that can be taken in order to help with misinterpretation is more communication within statewide and local bodies. This includes: the Coastal Commission, the SHPO, local governments, and preservation and environmental organizations. Not only should there be more communication between the Coastal Commission and the SHPO regarding the presence and treatment of historic resources, but the SHPO should be made aware of the potential to address historic preservation through LCPs. Perhaps then the SHPO could create a pamphlet of sorts including this information, then the pamphlet could be distributed to local governments and environmental and preservation organizations who could communicate the information to the public. Ideally this would result in LCPs being amended to include historic preservation guidelines.
MARIN

Since it is unlikely that the Marin local government will have the funds to form a Landmarks Commission any time soon, it is best for another organization to assume the responsibility of regulating the protection of historic structures. Rather than having an organization that has no involvement with coastal resources, like the Marin County Historical Society, which is also suffering financially, it makes more sense to delegate these responsibilities to an organization that already has familiarity with coastal resources and their context. A good example of one such organization is the West Marin Environmental Action Committee. This organization was founded in 1971 by a group of citizens “who wanted both to protect the region from immediate threats and to foster a wider understanding of its unique qualities.” While the Environmental Action Committee is currently concerned mostly with the environment, the organization is familiar with the entire character of the Marin coast and because historic preservation and protection of the natural environment are related, the Environmental Action Committee should be able to adequately advocate and make decisions about the preservation of historic resources.

SONOMA

While protection of historic resources is put in place by the adoption of Sonoma’s historic preservation ordinance into the LCP, this protection extends only to designated properties. As previously stated, the Landmarks Commission is aware of this weakness and is making an effort to fix it in the upcoming review of the LCP. In order to do this efficiently, the importance of historic resources to community character and the relationship between historic preservation and protection of natural resources and how historic preservation is in line with the larger goals of the

Coastal Act should be thoroughly examined and explained in the LCP. If this is done effectively historic preservation will become an all-inclusive initiative extending to more than just designated landmarks, rather than just a mission to save a single building or group of buildings. Through the following examples, the interrelatedness of historic preservation and the goals of the Coastal Act will be discussed further.

SAN DIEGO

**Historic Resources and the Preservation Problem**

In a small community of San Diego called Ocean Beach, a group of bungalow cottages built between 1887 and 1931 exists. As American entrepreneurs made seaside towns on the east coast popular destinations for the leisure class, the trend continued in California, but on a smaller and more rustic scale. Ocean Beach was ideally situated to become the beach resort for San Diego as its growth had been spurred by the national boom of the 1880s and the new local prosperity brought by the railroad, agriculture, and real estate development. Soon, this small beach community became built up with these bungalow cottages, which served as small vacation beach-use shelters and inexpensive second homes.¹¹⁷ Ocean Beach was one of the first beach communities to emerge in San Diego and these cottage bungalows represent, not only a unique architectural style, but also some of the only survivors of their type as most of San Diego’s other beach communities have been subjected to modern development. During the 1970s many of the cottages were demolished and presently, there are very few vacant lots in the area with residential potential, so cottages are continuing to disappear.¹¹⁸ These cottages have been

---


¹¹⁸ Ibid.
recognized as historically significant, as a few of them have already been designated by the city, but there is no documentation of them. Since these cottages are continuing to disappear and fall into disrepair, it is vital that they be documented. At least if the buildings themselves cannot be preserved, a record of the architectural type and its significance can be preserved.

**What type of protection is already in place?**

A few of these cottage bungalows are protected by what is called an “Emerging Historical District” designation. The Ocean Beach Cottage Emerging Historical District was established with only a context statement and period of significance to establish the significance of the district, as well as a few properties which fell within that context period of significance. A complete intensive survey was never completed and therefore all eligible contributing properties are not known. Owners of properties which fall within the context statement and period of significance may bring their properties forward for designation as contributors to the district. Only those properties identified and designated as contributors are currently regulated. The regulation that a property is subjected to when it is designated is, however, not very restrictive. Owners are still allowed to add on to their houses—only the façade must remain in its original condition.\(^{119}\)

**Problems with the Program and How the LCP Could Help**

According to the San Diego Historical Resources Board Procedure on Establishing Historic Districts, “Because the Ocean Beach Cottage district does not have a full intensive survey, is based on a context statement and period of significance, and is limited to those properties that fall within the context and period that are volunteered by the property owner for

---

\(^{119}\) Robert Patrick “Pat” James, President of Ocean Beach Historical Society Board, phone conversation with the author, September 11, 2013.
designation, conversion of this district to a standard geographic district is not feasible.”¹²⁰ In addition, this existing program was gutted a few years ago because of the city’s budget crisis—the City began to charge more application fees and designation became less attractive.¹²¹

Due to the state of the current program under which these cottages are currently protected, the most urgent action that needs to be taken is thorough documentation of this resource. The state of California has a grant program that is dedicated to supporting local governments in developing new or updating existing Local Coastal Programs, consistent with the California Coastal Act. If Ocean Beach made historic preservation a part of its LCP they could access funds that would help complete the documentation of this unique resource. Protecting these bungalows is also in line with other goals of the Coastal Act besides protecting community character. The Coastal Act states that, “Permitted development shall be sited and designed to protect views to and along the ocean and scenic coastal areas.”¹²² Since these cottages are typically one-story structures, preserving them also helps to achieve this goal of the Coastal Act.

SAN PEDRO

**Historic Resources and the Preservation Problem**

The San Pedro coastal zone contains many historic architectural styles that are small in scale. These styles include: Ranch, bungalow, Spanish Colonial Revival, Queen Anne, American


¹²¹. Robert Patrick “Pat” James, President of Ocean Beach Historical Society Board, phone conversation with the author, September 11, 2013.

However, in recent years, many of these low-scale buildings have been replaced by high-rise condominium projects that do not conform to the character of the community and the number of these projects is continuing to increase.\textsuperscript{124}

Two things that the Coastal Act protects are community character and water quality. An argument can be formed for historic preservation and against building these new high-rise condominiums that supports both of those goals set by the Coastal Act. High-rise buildings disrupt the character of a primarily low-rise community because they are out of scale and style with the surrounding area. This also disrupts a neighborhood’s sense of place. While these positive effects of historic preservation may seem obvious, the positive effects that historic preservation has on water quality are less obvious.

**How is this an environmental issue?**

Modern structures are made up of impervious surfaces—hardened surfaces that do not allow water to pass through. When rain falls on these surfaces, it flows faster and in greater amounts than it would have under pre- or early-development conditions significantly increasing runoff and decreasing infiltration and evapotranspiration.\textsuperscript{125} New construction also increases the use of hazardous materials and, therefore, their potential to be carried into the ocean as runoff. Polluted stormwater runoff is the number one source of contamination to California’s waters, as

\begin{itemize}
\end{itemize}
well as causes land disturbance that leads to increased erosion and sedimentation, which is already a problem on the California coast.\textsuperscript{126} When it rains, water flows over streets, lawns, and parking lots, carrying a toxic combination of copper, lead, zinc and other heavy metals, oils and car fluids, bacteria, viruses and other harmful materials to coastal waters.

\textbf{Why is historic preservation better for the environment?}

Conservation, reuse and renewal of historic buildings is much more in line with sustainability, which in recent years has become a major goal of the Coastal Act. The preservation of historic structures uses materials, like wood, that absorb more stormwater and therefore decreases the potential amount of runoff and the chances for hazardous materials to be carried into the ocean. Further benefits that result from the adaptation and reuse of historic structures include: reductions in energy consumption and operating costs, preservation of the embodied energy of existing materials, elimination of waste associated with demolition, reinvestment in existing communities and infrastructure, and reductions in greenhouse gas emissions associated with new construction.\textsuperscript{127}

When these cause and effect relationship are thoroughly examined, the connections between the preservation of nature and culture on the coast become more evident. In this case, historic preservation is not just about saving a building—preservation of historic resources protects community character while also protecting water quality. Due to this interrelated dynamic of nature and culture it is appropriate to have one policy in place that protects both, like


the California Coastal Act. However, like in the case of San Pedro, historic resources often get overlooked and are not included in communities’ LCPs. If San Pedro included a more thorough examination of historic resources and how their preservation serves other goals of the Coastal Act, a broader argument for preservation could be formed, hopefully resulting in more protection.

PROBLEMS WITH INEFFECTIVE PROVISIONS

Unfortunately, sometimes when cities do use the LCP to address local preservation issues, it is not always effective. This has been the case in Long Beach. In their LCP, which was adopted in 1980, it specifically states that one of the first priorities is “to preserve existing housing so as to discourage the disruption of the present architectural and historical character of the neighborhood.”128 However, “mansionization,” which is when older, potentially historic homes are demolished to build bigger, better ones, is still an issue in the area.129 While preserving historic houses is listed as a priority, it seems that there is very little preventing this policy from being overlooked or ignored. After reviewing the LCPs of various different cities and communities, it has become evident that LCPs are reviewed quite infrequently. Under the Coastal Act a requirement that LCPs be reviewed every five years was put in place. This requirement needs to be more strictly upheld, not only so that LCPs can be adapted to changing circumstances, but also so that provisions that have not been effective can be reevaluated.


V: CONCLUSION

While the connection between nature and culture seemed obvious to those developing policies in the late 19th and early 20th century, this relationship seems to have become less and less apparent in modern society. The Antiquities Act, the National Park Service Organic Act, and the World Heritage Convention were all developed in response to issues that dealt with both natural and cultural resources and seem to work within those contexts, but none of those policies were applicable on a local level. Upon passage of the California Coastal Act and its introduction of Local Coastal Programs, a unique opportunity was given to California’s coastal cities and counties. Due to the fact that the Coastal Act uses somewhat vague language to describe the types of cultural resources it protects, coastal communities are able to use their LCPs as a way to address and mitigate local historic preservation issues.

While not all counties or cities have taken advantage of this opportunity, Marin and Sonoma have. Marin’s LCP developed provisions to protect historic resources in conjunction with its LCP and those provisions protect all structures in the coastal zone that were built before 1930. Sonoma, on the other hand, developed a preservation ordinance prior to creating their LCP and once the LCP was created adopted the ordinance as part of it. However, only designated county landmarks are protected under the ordinance. While these counties have made steps towards using their LCPs as a resource for protection, both can make improvements to their programs.

One of the problems with the way in which both of these counties address historic preservation is that they do not show the way in which historic preservation works in service to the larger goals of the Coastal Act. Marin, for example, does not have a county landmarks commission, but is in need of a body to oversee the protection of historic resources. One way to
fix this problem would be to put an organization that is already established in charge of historic resources. Ideally, this organization would already be familiar with the overall character of Marin’s coastal zone and would be able to view historic preservation as a part of the larger environmental picture. Sonoma has a landmarks commission in place, but would like to extend protection to resources other than those designated as county landmarks. One way in which they could form an argument for this is to stress the importance of historic architecture to community character, something that is protected by the Coastal Act. Various other ways that historic preservation works in line with the larger goals of the Coastal Act have become evident through an examination of other coastal historic preservation issues.

The ways in which historic preservation can be used to achieve many of the larger goals of the Coastal Act are hard to understand without thorough examination of the Coastal Act and coastal historic preservation issues. Historic preservation can help to retain community character, protect views to the ocean, and is less damaging to water quality, which are all goals of the Coastal Act. If coastal communities experiencing issues with preservation, like San Pedro and San Diego, alluded to these benefits, an argument for preservation could be formed and would hopefully result in preservation being viewed as integral to the natural environment. However, as previously stated, many counties and cities are unaware of the potential of the LCP or have misinterpreted it, like in Huntington Beach. In fact, not even the SHPO is aware of the potential protection offered by the Coastal Act. Therefore, it is necessary for local governments to be educated about the ways in which LCPs can be used to address local preservation issues and for there to be more communication between the Coastal Commission, the SHPO, and local organizations. If these recommendations are followed, a larger and more inclusive system to protect both natural and cultural resource will result.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LCP Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Segments</th>
<th>Year Effectively Certified</th>
<th>Addresses Historic Preservation?</th>
<th>How?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Del Norte County</td>
<td>County segment</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Harbor segment</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Not found</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lopez Creek segment</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Not found</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pt. St. George segment</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not found</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Crescent City</td>
<td>Crescent city segment</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>McNamara-Gillespie segment</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Not found</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humboldt County</td>
<td>Northcoast segment</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Not found</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trinidad Area segment</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Not found</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>McKinleyville segment</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Not found</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Humboldt Bay segment</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Not found</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eel River segment</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Not found</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Southcoast segment</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Not found</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Trinidad</td>
<td></td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Arcata</td>
<td></td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Eureka</td>
<td></td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Fortuna</td>
<td></td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mendocino County</td>
<td>County Balance segment</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Town segment</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pygmy Forest segment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Fort Bragg</td>
<td></td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Pt. Arena</td>
<td></td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma County</td>
<td></td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marin County</td>
<td>South Unit I</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North Unit II</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City/County of San Francisco</td>
<td>Olympic Club segment</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Daly City</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>City of Pacifica</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>City of Half Moon Bay</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>San Mateo County</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Santa Cruz County</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>City of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>City of Capitola</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>City of Watsonville</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monterey County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>North segment</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Del Monte Forest segment</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Carmel Area segment</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>City of Marina</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>City of Sand City</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>City of Seaside</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Monterey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Laguna Grande segment</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Del Monte Beach segment</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Harbor segment</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Cannery Row segment</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Skyline segment</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>City of Pacific Grove</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>City of Carmel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>San Luis Obispo County</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>City of Morro Bay</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>City of Pismo Beach</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>City of Grover Beach</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>County of Santa Barbara</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>City of Guadalupe</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Not found</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>City of Santa Barbara</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>City of Goleta</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Carpinteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>City segment</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Airport segment</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Segment Name</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Approved Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Ventura County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>City of Ventura</td>
<td></td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>City of Oxnard</td>
<td></td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>City of Port Hueneme</td>
<td></td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Not found</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>City of Malibu</td>
<td></td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Los Angeles County</td>
<td>Pacific Palisades segment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
<td>Venice segment</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
<td>Playa Vista segment</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
<td>Del Rey Lagoon segment</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not found</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
<td>Airport/Dunes segment</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not found</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
<td>San Pedro segment</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>City of Santa Monica</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>City of El Segundo</td>
<td></td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>City of Manhattan Beach</td>
<td></td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Not found</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>City of Hermosa Beach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>City of Redondo Beach</td>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>City of Torrance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not found</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>City of Palos Verdes Estates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>City of Rancho Palos Verdes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not found</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>City of Long Beach</td>
<td></td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>City of Avalon</td>
<td>Bolsa Chica segment</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Orange County</td>
<td>Santa Ana River segment</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not found</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
<td>Santa Ana Heights segment</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not found</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
<td>Newport Coast segment</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td></td>
<td>Emerald Bay segment</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
<td>Aliso Viejo segment</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Not found</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>City of Seal Beach</td>
<td></td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>City of Huntington Beach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not found</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>City of Cabrillo Beach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not found</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>City of Costa Mesa</td>
<td>Sunset Beach Annexation</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>City of Newport Beach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>City of Irvine</td>
<td></td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>Not found</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>City/Location</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>Certification Grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>City of Laguna Beach</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>City of Aliso Viejo</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Not found</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>City of Laguna Niguel</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>City of Dana Point</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>City of San Clemente</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>San Diego County</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>City of Oceanside</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>City of Carlsbad</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>Agua Hedionda segment</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Not found</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>Mello I segment</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>Mello II segment</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>West Batiquitos/Sammis segment</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>East Batiquitos/Hunt segment</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>Village Redevelopment Area segment</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Not found</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>City of Encinitas</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>City of Solana Beach</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>City of Del Mar</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>North City segment</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>La Jolla segment</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>Pacific Beach segment</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>Mission Beach segment</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>Mission Bay segment</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>Mission Bay segment</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>Ocean Beach segment</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>Centre City segment</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>Barrio Logan segment</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>Otay Mesa/Nestor segment</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>Tijuana River segment</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>Border Highlands segment</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>City of Coronado</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>City of National City</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>City of Chula Vista</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>Balance of City</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>South Bay Islands segment</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Not found</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>City of Imperial Beach</td>
<td></td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Marin County National Register Properties
Sonoma County National Register Properties
Huntington Beach National Register Properties and potential local landmarks
Marin Landmarks Key

1. Alexander-Acacia Bridge, Larkspur
2. Angel Island Immigration Station, Tiburon
3. Boyd House, San Raphael
4. Marin County Civic Center, San Raphael
5. Erskine B. McNear House, San Raphael
6. Outdoor Art Club, Mill Valley
7. San Raphael Improvement Club, San Raphael
8. Larkspur City Hall, contributing property to the Larkspur Downtown Historic District
9. Robert Dollar Estate, 1408 Mission Avenue, San Rafael
10. Fashion Shop and Steven Porcella House, Novato
11. Point Reyes Light Station, Point Reyes National Seashore
12. Green Brae Brick Yard, Larkspur
13. Tomales Presbyterian Church and Cemetery, Tomales
14. Brock Schreiber Boathouse and Beach, Inverness
15. Sausalito Women’s Club Sausalito
16. Dixie Schoolhouse, San Raphael
Sonoma Landmarks Key

1. Simon Pinschower House, Cloverdale
2. Watson School, Bodega, 1856
3. United States Post Office, Petaluma
4. Buena Vista Winery, Sonoma
5. Nicholas Carriger Estate, Sonoma
6. Fort Ross, Fort Ross
7. Free Public Library, Petaluma
8. The Gables, Santa Rosa
9. Guerneville Bridge, Guerneville
10. De Turk Round Barn, Santa Rosa
11. Cnopius House, Santa Rosa
12. Condominium 1, Sea Ranch
13. Gould-Shaw House, Cloverdale
14. Comstock House, Santa Rosa
15. Luther Burbank House and Garden, Santa Rosa
16. Hotel Chauvet, Glen Ellen
Huntington Beach Landmarks Key

National Register Properties
   1. Newland House
   2. Public Library on Triangle Park
   3. Huntington Beach Municipal Pier
   4. City Gym and Pool
   5. The Helme-Worthy Store and Residence

Potential Local Landmarks
   6. Shank House
   7. Griffith Apartments
   8. 415 6th Street
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