



**SHORELINE DEVELOPMENT  
A PORTION OF  
THE MASTER PLAN  
FOR  
PARKS AND RECREATION  
VENTURA COUNTY  
CALIFORNIA**

MASTER PLAN OF SHORELINE DEVELOPMENT

Letter of Transmittal

May 2, 1955

Ventura County Planning Commission,  
Ventura, California.

Enclosed herewith is preliminary draft of the amended "Master Plan of Shoreline Development of Ventura County" together with maps and drawings which delineate and locate various items of this Master Plan. This plan and the maps and drawings are subject to change or correction as indicated by public hearings and as directed by the Planning Commission and by the Board of Supervisors.

This "Master Plan of Shoreline Development" is an amendment and extension of the Master Plan for Shoreline Development adopted in 1941 and amended in 1946. The need for such amendment and extension is explained in the introduction to the plan. This amended Shoreline Development Plan was prepared by Tom D. Cooke, Planning Consultant, under the direction of L. J. Borstelmann, Planning Director. The delineation and map work was mainly done by Jan Fosselius, Assistant Planner, and the typing and text preparation by members of the staff of the Ventura County Planning Commission.

We believe this to be a good plan for expediting and guiding the future development of the shoreline of Ventura County and the area immediately adjacent to that shoreline; that such a plan is needed as the basis for an official statement of policy regarding such development and to enable the public to appreciate the shoreline situation and its potentialities.

Part VI of this plan contains a list of projects included in the plan, together with an estimate of value of each project. As the passage of time will almost certainly change these values, the cost in time and effort to obtain an exact appraisal does not appear to be justified now. The main reason for including estimated values is to establish a basis of comparison of various projects, and the values assigned have been carefully considered and developed in accordance with information readily available at this time.

This plan is comprehensive, but is also general and long-range. The details of design and precise development of individual projects are arrangements to be left for future decision. The plan provides a basis for co-ordination and proper relation between various projects. Summary of the elements of this plan and the maps have been presented and explained to the Planning Commissions of the Cities of Ventura, Oxnard, and Port Hueneme and other interested persons.

It is recommended that the Planning Commission approve this preliminary draft and authorize the holding of public hearings as required by law.

  
L. J. BORSTELMANN,  
Planning Director

## SHORELINE DEVELOPMENT MASTER PLAN

### INDEX AND OUTLINE

Letter of transmittal

Introduction

Why Amend the Present Plan?

- Part I. The Plan Now in Effect.  
Status; Provisions; Operation under the Plan;  
Development at San Buenaventura Beach Park
- Part II. New Items of Significance in Shoreline Development.  
Harbor proposals; House building; Interest in  
Oxnard Beaches; Carrillo Beach; Highways
- Part III. Highways Affecting or Affected by the Shoreline Plan.
- Part IV. Development Factors in Ventura County (Since 1941)  
Accessibility; Industry; Water; Flood Control  
& Conservation; Need for Planned Urbanization;  
Population Increase.
- Part V. A. Features of the plan for Shoreline Development.  
B. Form of the Plan: Maps; Table; Text.  
C. Legal effect of Priority Schedule; meaning of  
priorities.  
D. Inventory and Priority Table.
- Part VI. Projects included in the Plan -
  - A. Map: West Section (Rincon)  
Description of projects
  - B. Map: Center Section (Santa Clara)  
Description of projects
  - C. Map: East Section (Mugu)  
Description of projects
- Part VII. Significance of the Master Plan of Shoreline  
Development
  - A. General nature; policy statement; flexibility  
amendment
  - B. A Recreation Facilities Plan

C. A Highway Plan

D. A Land Use Plan (Recreation is one Land Use)

- 1.- Seven Categories of Land Use: Discussion of each
- 2.- Applies to other areas besides those designated for acquisition.
- 3.- Extended Discussion of open uses.
- 4.- Summary of Land Uses.

Part VIII. Summary of Significance.

## SHORELINE DEVELOPMENT MASTER PLAN

### INTRODUCTION

#### Why Amend the Plan Adopted in 1946.

1. The concept of a Master Plan to direct the development of that narrow strip of land constituting Ventura County's Shoreline is not new by any means. A plan was originally adopted in 1941, and it was amended in 1946 only to the extent of reducing projects for acquisition in first priority to only two stretches of then privately owned beach. By this action the plan became only a directive to the State Park Commission designating these two beach properties for early acquisition by the State. It may be presumed that there was an intention to call for an amendment of the plan as soon as acquisition of these two beach projects was completed or acquisition of other beach projects contemplated.
2. In the years since 1946, however, many changes - of policy, other developments, availability of funds, and opinion, both public and private and on the local as well as State level - have combined to restore the concept of the original plan. But considerably greater emphasis on the County-wide and State-wide effects now becomes apparent, as the possible development of that narrow shoreline strip comes under scrutiny from various viewpoints. Several aspects that were presented in the 1941 and 1946 plans, but which lost emphasis in the preoccupation with priorities, have now come to the fore, along with several specific proposals and physical developments not then contemplated.
3. Foremost among these considerations is the place that Ventura County occupies in regard to its accessibility by highway, from various sections of the State. Brought to a focus by current construction of, and plans for freeways, the value of Ventura County beaches to people of the State as a whole almost suddenly takes on a new and greater importance.
4. The beginning of a wave of metropolitan urban growth in the Oxnard-Ventura area carries its own warning that action to preserve the beaches of the County must be rapid if it is to be successful.

4. continued.

Two specific proposals for small boat harbors introduce new elements into the problem. An oil drilling development has preempted one section of beach front land, and construction of houses has blocked the view of other sections of the Coast Highway.

5. The Beach Erosion Board has made a study of erosion in this section of the coast and presented several specific proposals to prevent or repair erosion damage at two locations.
6. With all of these factors bearing upon it, the plan as amended in 1946 is now, not wrong, but merely - and clearly - inadequate.
7. Development along the shoreline is a basic factor in regional economics and land planning in Ventura County. Improvements on the shoreline affecting highways, and highway improvements have a profound effect on the beaches. Fixing of land uses along the shore, whether by zoning processes or by default, affect the immediate hinterland, and the establishment of recreation facilities on the beach will affect living and traffic patterns many miles inland.
8. The plan now presented is thought of therefore, not merely as a schedule for acquisition of public beaches, but as a true Master Plan combining features of a Highway Plan, a Land Use Plan and a Recreation Plan.

## PART I

### The Plan Now in Effect

1. On December 16, 1941, the Ventura County Board of Supervisors adopted a Shoreline Development plan as a portion of the Master Plan for Parks and Recreation. This plan classified forty-two miles of beach properties (generally extending from the high tide line to the nearest road or railroad) into public and private holdings, along with a tabulation of the physical condition and predominant probable use of each parcel, such as bathing, fishing or harbor. Sixty-seven parcels so classified, included fourteen then in public ownership, with a combined length of 6.5 miles, but more than half a mile of this was included in the Port Hueneme Naval Reservation and Harbor use and was not available to the general public, so that about 5.9 miles were actually considered for public recreational use.
2. The 53 pieces of privately owned property were set into three priority classes representing urgency of acquisition for public use, and a fourth class to remain in private ownership. Recommended acquisition in First Priority amounted to about four miles of beach.

No cost or valuation figures were given.

Five major development locations were designated:

1. Pierpont Bay, already largely in public ownership.
2. Port Hueneme
3. Rincon
4. Laguna Mugu
5. Santa Clara River

### 3. The 1946 Amendment

On March 19, 1946, the Board of Supervisors of Ventura County adopted the amendment that had been prepared by the Planning Commission. This is the form of the plan now in force. The purpose of the amendment was "to remove all priority acquisitions as established on December 16, 1941,

3. continued

and to substitute therefore a priority acquisition schedule restricted to the areas designated as San Buenaventura Beach Park, Rincon Beach Park and Silver Strand Beach Park, as shown".

4. This amendment limited prospective participation by the State Park Commission to acquisition in the first two of the above named locations, and established the third, the county-owned Silver Strand Beach Park, as property that could be used as local contribution to match state purchases, as set up in the following tables extracted from the 1946 report.

Proposed State Beach Parks (1946 Plan)

1. San Buenaventura	17,016 ft.	382 Acres	\$1,587,850
2. Rincon	6,000	15	177,000
3. Silver Strand	<u>5,134</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>129,500</u>
	28,150 ft.	403 Acres	\$1,894,350

Financing

First Priority, State Acquisition		Matching Lands	
1. San Buenaventura	\$795,250	City of Ventura	\$792,600
2. Rincon	<u>150,000</u> \$945,250	County of Ventura	<u>156,500</u> \$949,100

5. The item of \$792,600, entered as "City of Ventura" above actually referred to beach properties within the City of San Buenaventura, some of which were owned by Ventura County at that time.\* The figures were set up in this way to demonstrate the matching of adjoining properties in case of San Buenaventura Beach Park. Subsequently, in order to make it possible for one jurisdiction to negotiate with the State, the County did transfer this property to the City. Consequently when it passed to the State, to become part of the State Park, it appears as a matching contribution of the City of San Buenaventura only.

\* The 1941 Report shows the County as owning 5300'-122A - in Pierpont Bay, under option to city - no values given.

6. This version of the Master Plan was accepted and adopted by the State Park Commission on May 17, 1946.

Operations According to the Plan.

7. The State Park Commission has accepted property held by the City of San Buenaventura within the site of San Buenaventura Beach Park, valued at \$476,750.00, and has practically completed acquisition of the balance of the site, at an expenditure of \$85,743.00 (up to Jan. 1, 1955), although a large number of parcels are still tied up in condemnation proceedings in court.
8. Total acquisition cost has amounted to \$562,493, with a balance of \$391,007 of matching funds credited to the City of San Buenaventura. Lands still under condemnation are appraised at about \$13,000.00; but awards to be made by the court could exceed this figure considerably. In any case a fairly large credit should remain, which can be used for matching beach purchases by the State at other locations, not necessarily within the city limits.
9. Thus the State Park at this point is now a reality; the Division of Beaches and Parks is operating and policing it; several new toilet buildings have been built; a new bridge has been built across San Jon Creek; Beach Road has been realigned to join Pierpont Blvd. at the southerly end of the park; a good pavement has been completed, together with two parking spaces on the beach side of the road. In the larger portion of the park, southerly of San Jon Rd., little improvement could be undertaken as yet, because the State does not yet have title to portions of the property. The major development of the park is therefore yet to come.
10. In the meantime, partial development outlined above has proceeded as follows, according to a letter to the City Manager from the Division of Beaches and Parks dated May 3, 1954:

10. continued

Development

1950 - 51	\$ 185,872
1951 - 52	31,985
1952 - 53	10,901
1952 - 53 (Proposed)	960 Road and Pier Repair
1953 - 54 (Proposed)	25,100 Roads, Utility Bldg., Septic Tanks, Guard Rail.
Total to date	<u>\$ 254,818</u>

Maintenance

Salaries & Wages	\$ 23,109.26
Operating Expenses	<u>7,471.48</u>
Gross Maintenance	\$ 30,580.74 per year
Less Concession	<u>2,678.87</u>
Net Maintenance	\$ 27,901.87 per year

11. A very recent proposal to route a Freeway through the park property has required the Division of Beaches and Parks to Prepare a new design plan for further development of the park. This plan, on file with the Ventura County Planning Commission is strictly preliminary and subject to major or basic revision. Since the Freeway right-of-way would take a substantial portion of the park area, the Division is considering some additional acquisition to bring the park area up to somewhat nearer its present area. This can be done without any amendment of the present (1946) Master Plan, since the present park boundaries do not include all of the land set up for the project in the Master Plan.

12. On the other two First Priority items in the 1946 plan, nothing has been done. The Rincon Beach section, adjoining County Park No. 3, remains in private ownership, and is still clear of buildings. The State Division of Beaches and Parks has made no move to acquire it.

13. Silver Strand Beach was owned by the County in 1946. There has been no change in its status. The beach has been greatly widened by accretion from littoral drift blocked by the westerly Port Hueneme jetty. From September 1953 to June 1954 about 2,000,000 cu. yds. of sand were dredged from this beach by the U. S. Army Engineers and pumped easterly of the harbor to restore eroded beaches at Ormond Beach and Mugu Naval Test Center. This work was reported by the office of the District Engineer as a report on Shore Protection, U. S. Naval Air Missile Test Center, and is related to a report by the same office on "Harbor at Port Hueneme Survey - Shore Protection" which recommended "biennial dredging of about 1,000,000 cubic yards to restore and maintain the downcoast shoreline".
14. In the meantime several other matters not directly deriving from the Master Plan of Shoreline Development have received attention.
15. The Beach Erosion Board reported, in July 1954, on a study of beach erosion and control from Carpinteria to Point Mugu. This study established that the littoral drift, southerly is "in the order of 250,000 cubic yards annually along the Rincon shore, and increases to about 1,000,000 cubic yards a year along the Oxnard Plain shore". Primary sources of sand are the mountains, the Ventura River and the Santa Clara River. The report recommends construction of three groins for beach stabilization at Ventura (shown on the present plan) at an estimated cost of \$221,000, with the United States contributing one third of the cost.
16. Supplementing this study also came the report proposing a new small boat harbor at Hollywood-by-the-Sea and the dredging mentioned in paragraph 13.
17. In the meantime the State Division of Highways has been acquiring a considerable length of beach frontage as right-of-way for highway widening. By this process public ownership of the shoreline has been increased by about 2 miles since 1946. This acquisition has little significance from the viewpoint of active beach recreation, however. The highway construction has left exceedingly narrow beach on this entire stretch; consequently the beach is not very good for swimming, and beach parking on the highway is limited and would constitute a traffic hazard if very many vehicles were parked. But the scenic value of the highway, with an uninterrupted view over the ocean, is permanently guaranteed.

18. Present Status.

The present status of the Master Plan, then is this:

1. The State has (nearly) completed acquisition of San Buenaventura State Park, using \$85,743, and development is going forward as rapidly as possible under difficulties.
2. Matching land given by the City of San Buenaventura amounted to \$476,750, leaving a matching credit of \$391,007.
3. County beaches formally offered for matching amount to:

Rincon Park No. 3	\$ 15,000
Rincon Park No. 4	12,000
Silver Strand	<u>129,000</u>
	\$ 156,000 (as of 1946)

making a total matching credit of \$547,007

4. On March 30, 1954, the State Park Commission notified Ventura County of its intention to cut Ventura County's allocation of \$945,250 by \$250,000, leaving a balance of \$609,507, (slightly more than the matching credits above).
5. Some two miles of shore frontage have been acquired by the State, other than for the State Park Commission.
6. The county has made no acquisitions.
7. Since 1941.
  - (a). The City of Oxnard has acquired Ormond Beach, a length of 6900 feet valued at \$324,000, but this property is held for sewage disposal rather than for recreational purposes.
  - (b). The United States has acquired the Muju Lagoon area, with a beach frontage of 34,000 feet, valued at at least \$2,195,900.\* This is now held for military uses.

\* See VI, 39-40, for an explanation of this valuation.

18. continued

7. continued

Thus the total increase in publicly owned length  
of shoreline since 1941 is:

State Park Purposes -	length negligible - upland valued at	\$ 85,743
State Highway Purposes -	10,560 ft. = 2.0 mi. at	578,600
Oxnard - Sewer Purposes -	6,900 ft. = 1.3 mi. at	324,000
U.S. Military Purposes -	<u>34,000 ft.</u> = <u>6.5 mi.</u> at	<u>2,195,900</u>
	51,460 ft. = 9.8 mi. at	\$3,184,243

## PART II

### New Items of Significance in Shoreline Development.

1. Some of the new factors that must now be considered have been briefly mentioned in establishing the present status of the Plan, above. Some of these items deserve fuller explanation, and other factors have also become significant in the meantime.
2. Proposed Pierpont Bay Harbor

The Ventura Port District was formed in May 1952. The district's principal action since that date has been the authorization of a preliminary report and plan, prepared by R. L. Patterson, Consulting Engineer, for a recreational, small-boat harbor at Pierpont Bay, Ventura.

This plan proposal includes some 643 acres extending from the present easterly boundary of San Buenaventura Beach State Park to the Santa Clara River, and extending inland to Vista del Mar, approximately 3400 feet. It provides for an inner harbor with capacity for 600 boats moored in slips, access roads, public beach, both surf and still water, and various ground facilities to provide service to boats. The details of the project are more fully described under the project heading, below. (VI - 25)

Up to this time the proposal has no backing nor official status other than the Port District's promulgation of the plan.

Nevertheless, it is a proposal, from an officially constituted authority, and it consequently has a large bearing on the Shoreline Plan. Its greatest significance at the moment is that it injects an entirely new element into the Plan.

3. New Small Boat Harbor at Hollywood-by-the-Sea.

The District Engineer of the U. S. Engineers, has proposed a new small boat harbor to replace the one taken over by the Navy at Port Hueneme. Aside from making available port facilities to private craft now generally excluded from Port Hueneme, the principal reason for advancing this proposal seems to be the opportunity it affords for basing a biennial dredging operation for the purpose of restoring eroded beaches down-coast from Port Hueneme. The following figures on estimated costs are taken from the Review of the District Engineer's report, by the Director of Public Works of the State of California, in which the proposal was recommended to the Chief of Engineers, for immediate construction.

3. continued

Estimated Costs (1948)

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
First Costs	\$4,061,000	\$1,602,000	\$5,663,000

This construction would provide mooring and other facilities for about 500 small craft, necessary access roads, etc.

Just what jurisdiction would provide the "Non-Federal" costs is not clear. The County of Ventura is committed by a resolution of the Board of Supervisors, dated November 9, 1948, to assist "insofar as it is authorized by a vote of the electorate". In addition, the Board of Supervisors has made a request upon the State of California for a loan of up to \$2,000,000 to provide the initial "Non-Federal" contribution. One of the owners of land that would be required for the site and rights-of-way has offered to donate that portion of the land which he owns, amounting to something less than half of the land required.

The Oxnard Harbor District which built the present harbor could undoubtedly legally assume local obligations. But so far there has been no move to activate any such local sponsorship.

The project remains, therefore, simply a proposal which injects another new element into the Master Plan. It raises some very serious local problems which will be dealt with in the section on highways below. (III - 25, 29-33 incl.)

4. Changes on the Rincon Beaches.

The State Division of Highways has bought about two miles of beach for highway right-of-way, from which a large number of houses have been removed. At the same time, on the section easterly of County Park No. 5, for a distance of nearly a mile, 8 or 9 new houses have been built recently. Again, easterly of Dulah, a number of new houses have been built.

These few houses do not in themselves constitute a major problem, but they do indicate that there is still some pressure to bring beach property into residential use -- that is, private use, which excludes the public.

4. continued

The necessity to bring desirable beaches into public ownership before it is too late is thus demonstrated.

5. The Oxnard - Hueneme Beaches

As Oxnard has grown and the whole Oxnard plain begins to attract an urban population, the desire for access to, and improvement of the beaches from the Santa Clara River to Port Hueneme, begins to equal if not surpass the traditional attraction of the Rincon beaches. On the Rincon, beaches easily accessible from the Coast Highway were well known and popular. For this reason former versions of the Shoreline Plan tended to emphasize the need for focusing resources for acquisition there. But with the appearance of a large population in the Oxnard area this condition is changing rapidly. Therefore the present plan must regard the beaches in that area for earlier attention.

6. Carrillo Beach.

The State Park Commission has acquired since 1952 a major shoreline park in Los Angeles County, at the Ventura County Boundary. This is Carrillo Beach State Park, a mountain area of 1578 acres, partly wooded, which provides space and facilities for a great variety of activities in addition to those of the beach. Capable of accomodating very large numbers of people, for extended periods because of camping opportunities, the establishment of this park may have some effect in reducing the demands to be made upon Ventura County beaches. (See VI - 43,45,46)

7. Highway Projects.

Recent and contemplated highway improvements in Ventura County are so numerous and have such direct, great impact upon shoreline matters that they warrant a detailed examination. The next section of this report explores this subject.

## PART III

### Highways Affecting or Affected by the Shoreline Plan

#### 1. Proposed Freeways:

The Division of State Highways has recently advanced tentative route plans for construction of a new Freeway from Santa Paula to Ventura Blvd. near the crossing of Arundell Barranca. Ventura Blvd., from Los Angeles to this point is now being converted to a freeway. From this point on another new tentative freeway alignment is proposed which would route through traffic from both these freeways around the Ventura Business district by crossing the Southern Pacific R.R. east of Seaward Ave. and passing below the bluff, past Pierpont Inn and San Jon Road, crossing the railroad again at Fir St., continuing westerly between Meta St. and Front St. to rejoin the present highway at the angle point west of the Ventura River. This route, as now proposed, passes directly through San Buenaventura Beach State Park.

2. The effects upon the park are mixed. The development of the two freeway routes will make the park more quickly accessible to residents of the Santa Clara Valley and San Fernando Valley, and will make it better known to the public travelling the Coast Highway. On the other hand it will take a substantial proportion of the upland area of the park and will introduce a traffic feature into the otherwise undisturbed area.
3. The State is now proceeding with construction of the first link of a freeway to Ojai, extending from the present Coast Highway nearly four miles northerly. Completion of this project will greatly improve travel between Ventura and Ojai, by by-passing the extremely inefficient 3-lane section of Ventura Ave. through the built-up lower section of the canyon. This improvement will make the various Ventura County beaches much more quickly and pleasantly accessible for residents of the canyon, Foster Park, Casitas Springs, Oak View and the Ojai Valley.
4. These three freeway projects will even effect very distant regions. The Ojai freeway is the outlet for traffic from Kern County via the Maricopa Highway; the Santa Paula Freeway taps Kern County by junction with Highway 99 at Castaic Junction; and the Ventura Blvd. Freeway directly leads from the San Fernando Valley and Los Angeles.

5. Together these three projects have a large influence in making various Ventura County beach areas of much greater interest than heretofore to people of large sections of the State.
6. The three freeway routes discussed thus far center in the immediate urban area of Ventura. But other freeway development also affects the entire shoreline directly. West of the Ventura River the State Division of Highways is gradually converting the highway to freeway all the way to the westerly boundary of Ventura County. (Actually, this improvement results in freeway all the way to Santa Barbara.) The effect on the western Ventura County beaches is profound, because, as will be pointed out in case of specific beach projects, (VI - 8 to 18 incl.) for a distance of about seven miles, the freeway will be built on an entirely new right-of-way, landward, leaving the present highway to act as a service road for the beaches. This feature will reduce traffic hazards and give the beaches in this stretch considerably greater recreational value.
7. From Oxnard southeasterly Highway 101 is to be converted to freeway as far as Calleguas Creek. Easterly of this point the highway will be divided. It is not planned to give it legal freeway status, but for all practical purposes it will have almost the character of a freeway all the way to the Los Angeles County boundary. The effect upon beaches in this section will be slight, but the total effect of both of these developments, will be to make all Ventura County beaches increasingly accessible and attractive to people of the entire state.
8. Extended Effects of Freeways.  
In addition to bringing State through traffic directly to the beach at San Buenaventura Beach State Park, in Ventura, contemplated highway connections to the two new freeways (Santa Paula and Ventura Blvd.) will have some profound and basic, new effects upon beaches in the area from Ventura to Port Hueneme.
9. The most significant of these proposed highway connections is the projected extension of Vista del Mar, from Seaward Ave. in Ventura, with a new bridge across the Santa Clara River, to a connection with McGrath Road at Mandalay Beach.

9. continued

This road will create an entirely new, and shorter route, connecting the southerly and westerly portions of the Oxnard plain, Hollywood Beach and Port Hueneme directly with Ventura. Conversely it will make all of the excellent beaches southerly of the Santa Clara River directly accessible to the people of Ventura and the north. This road proposal is an important item in the Master Plan of Shoreline Development.

10. Roads Serving the Oxnard Beach Areas.

Following upon this road extension, connections of various roads in the Oxnard area, into McGrath Road will open up the entire plain to the beaches and to easier access into Ventura as well as into the Freeway for west or north-bound travel. Lastly, the connection thus afforded with the Santa Paula Freeway will make the Oxnard-Hueneme beaches quickly accessible to the population of the Santa Clara Valley.

11. Perhaps the most profound effect will occur in the Oxnard Plain itself. The connection of various roads into McGrath Road will open up a large area for the urban development that is already exerting such force upon this area. (The Santa Paula Freeway will probably have similar effects in the lower Santa Clara Valley, but the pattern of development already established, the easterly spread of Ventura, will not be essentially changed.)

12. Possible road connections in the Oxnard Plain would appear to have such significant effects in respect to beach areas that they are here outlined in some detail. Reference to the plan map will make these effects quite clear.

13. Gonzales Road.

Construction of Vista del Mar-McGrath Road would immediately establish Gonzales Road as a direct route from the northern part of the Oxnard area into Ventura, to San Buenaventura Beach State Park and into the freeway up the coast.

14. An easterly extension from Rose Road to Ventura Blvd. and Santa Clara Ave. (Rice Rd.) at Nyland (about one mile) would then accomplish two very important things:

14. continued

- (1) it would result in a route from Ventura Blvd. Thousand Oaks and the San Fernando Valley directly to the proposed Santa Clara Dunes Beach Park.
- (2) It would create a direct route via Santa Clara Ave., from the Simi Valley, Moorpark and Chatsworth (in the San Fernando Valley) to the proposed Dunes Park.

(The added effect of a new route into Ventura would be negligible, since the Freeway would serve this traffic movement better.)

15. North Road

A relatively short connection (about a mile) of North Road to McGrath Road would create another direct route from Oxnard to the Dunes beaches.

16. Three much longer connections would make North Road a route of considerable regional importance. An extension (of about a mile) to the unnamed road 2100 feet south of Gonzales Rd. at Saviers Rd. would extend the route to Rose Rd.

17. A second short connection easterly from this point to the proposed Gonzales-Santa Clara link (about a mile) would again serve the Simi and San Fernando Valleys.

18. A longer connection from this point (about  $3\frac{1}{2}$  miles) to Pleasant Valley Rd. at Wood Road (beyond the limits of this map) would serve the Camarillo Airport, Camarillo and, by a further short connection, Ventura Blvd. and the San Fernando Valley. Thus this route would become an important highway centering upon Oxnard as the metropolitan center of a rapidly urbanizing agricultural region.

19. West Fifth Street

This cross county highway from Camarillo to the ocean at Mandalay Beach would gain importance by reason of the McGrath Road extension across the River and into Ventura and the freeways. Possible future extension might improve connection with Ventura Blvd. at the foot of Conejo grade

19. continued

(beyond the limit of this map).

20. West Wooley Rd.

21. West Wooley Road would be tapped by the alignment suggested for Vista del Mar extension on the east side of the sand dunes, whereas a short connection (about a quarter mile) is needed to open it into McGrath Rd.

22. Because of its important intersection with Highway 101 Alternate at Saviers Rd., this connection would establish a new route from Santa Monica to the Dunes beach region, and on up the coast into Ventura and the freeways. The easterly two miles of Wooley Rd. would not be significantly affected.

23. Oxnard-Dempsey Rd.

The connection of Oxnard Rd. at Ventura Rd. to Dempsey Rd. at Saviers Rd., an element in the Oxnard City Plan, would create a much needed direct route from the south side of Oxnard to Hollywood Beach and Silver Strand, as well as to the proposed Dunes Beach Park. This would duplicate the connection from Highway 101 Alternate described for West Wooley Road. The further connection northerly into Ventura and the Freeways becomes increasingly important as roads in the area southerly from Oxnard are considered. Thus, Gonzales Rd. and North Road are not even as advantageous as Ventura Blvd. for traffic bound toward Ventura, and Fifth Street becomes nearly as good a route; but for the areas served by Wooley Road and the Oxnard-Dempsey route, the Vista del Mar-McGrath route northerly begins to have advantages. (For the eastern part of this southerly section the Ventura Blvd. route would develop into the best route if a plausible but as yet unplanned freeway connection were to be provided from Oxnard Blvd. to Ventura Blvd. by-passing the City of Oxnard.)

24. An easterly extension of Dempsey Rd. to Pleasant Valley Rd., and of Laguna Rd. to Lewis Rd. would give this road some additional importance as a route from Ventura Blvd. and the Simi Valley to the beaches.

25. Oxnard Road will have a further very important function as the primary east and west road leading to the proposed new harbor at Hollywood-by-the-Sea. In this regard its easterly extension as suggested above, is very significant.

26. Mills Road.

West of the Santa Clara River the extension of Mills Rd., Ventura, northerly to Foothill Rd. and southerly along a now private road to the extension of Vista del Mar would create a secondary route connecting northeastern Ventura with the Dunes beach area. It would be of great value in its own immediate vicinity, but the route is distinctly of only secondary importance from the regional viewpoint.

27. All of the roads discussed in paragraph 13 to 26 incl. are closely related to the Vista del Mar-McGrath Rd. proposal, and secondarily to the freeway.

28. Several other highway suggestions originating in consideration of other aspects of beach development are also significant.

29. West Rd.

By far the most significant of these is West Road.

30. If and when the proposed new harbor at Hollywood-by-the-Sea is developed according to present plans, the southerly extension of West Road to Ocean Drive, Silver Strand, will provide the only access road to this community of beach homes. Ocean Drive and Sunset Lane, the only present access routes will be cut by the proposed harbor entrance channel; the community is now completely isolated from the city of Port Hueneme by the existing harbor and the Naval Base.

31. West Road extension is the only possible route for access to the inland side of the proposed harbor as well as the community of Silver Strand. Consequently it assumes an unusual importance. It will have to serve as an industrial highway serving harbor activities as well as give access to a residential community.

32. The north-westerly extension of West Road is naturally, then considered in turn. A route is suggested that crosses the Santa Clara River on the straight northerly extension of the road (requiring a new bridge). From the bridge a number of choices of route appear to be possible. The route suggested here proposes a connection to Sexton Canyon Road at Foothill Road. A route generally following this line would give all of the connections to the Santa Clara Valley (Santa Paula, Fillmore and Piru) by way of Foothill Rd., Telegraph Rd., the Freeway and Telephone Rd., that should be provided for a commercial harbor. This route is of little significance in relation to Ventura or Oxnard.

33. If this route is developed the harbor would be served primarily by Vista del Mar (Ventura and up-coast), West Road (Santa Clara Valley), and Oxnard-Dempsey Rd. (Oxnard and east).

34. Roads Serving the Beach Area Easterly of Port Hueneme.

Several necessary highway developments appear to be plainly indicated by proposed beach development easterly from Port Hueneme. These may be expected to take place in the ordinary course of County planning and urban development. They are only briefly summarized.

35. Saviers Rd.

Saviers Rd. might logically be extended along the drainage ditch to Ormond Beach, to serve Oxnard's proposed new sewage disposal plant. It might follow along the Oxnard City boundary to Arnold Rd. behind the proposed E. Ormond Beach Park, to give access to that park and make a connection with Arnold Rd.

In the event that the Navy at some time in the future relinquishes the Pt. Mugu Naval Base, the connection to the extension of Arnold Rd. along the sand spit would be advantageous.

36. Arnold Rd.

Arnold Road might be extended northerly to connect with Rose Road and Ditch Road creating a route from the east side of the lower Santa Clara Valley to the beach. Possibly this route can be extended all the way up the easterly or southerly side of the Santa Clara Valley, where its function as a beach route would become of little importance.

37. Casper Road.

Casper Road might well be connected to Rice Road, creating a route from Nyland and the Simi Valley.

A westerly extension of lower Casper Rd. to connect with Arnold Road and Saviers Rd. extension would be a link in a by-pass around the Naval Base.

Easterly and north easterly extension of this same road would complete this by-pass. Extension to the Wood Canyon Rd. at Revelon Slough and from the tip of the mountain spur northeasterly to West Potrero Road at the Camarillo State Hospital, would create a partially new route through the mountains to Lake Sherwood. This connection would constitute a slight improvement in the route from Lake Sherwood to Hueneme and Oxnard.

38. Las Posas Rd.

Las Posas Road might well be extended southerly along Calleguas Creek, to create a new, more direct route from the Camarillo area to Pt. Mugu and the Coast Highway to Santa Monica and Los Angeles. Development of this route would to a large extent compensate for the closing of the portion of Wood Rd. that passes the Camarillo Airport.

39. Highways and Roads are Elements in the Shoreline Plan.

Some of the routes outlined above are affected by the Shoreline Plan, or make some great or slight contribution to the effectiveness of the Plan without being actually a part of it. Several roads, however, should be regarded as integral and legally established elements of the plan, because the recreational and land use aspects of the plan would not be complete nor fully effective without them. These road and highway elements, along with several other road proposals that have not yet been discussed, are the ones which lie between the ocean and the Plan Boundary. (They are listed in the section of Significance of the Master Plan, Sec. VII par. 23)

PART IV  
Development Factors in Ventura County  
Since 1941-1946

1. The highway plans discussed in Part III - particularly the projected Freeway construction - may be regarded both as symptoms of what is occurring in the county, and as influences that are going to contribute to the rapid urbanization of the County. This metamorphosis from a rural, agricultural society and economy, to a metropolitan urban agglomeration, is to be expected particularly in the Oxnard Plain and Conejo Valley. And while Oxnard has been growing so rapidly, Ventura itself is not lagging far behind. The eastward spread of Ventura has been very pronounced in the last few years. The development of the County Hospital area and the location of the new Junior College site indicate a tendency for the urbanization fairly soon of the Ventura-Monterey area.
2. All of the areas mentioned have some factors favorable for population growth, and all of the outlying sections are influenced by highway developments that focus upon the Ventura-Oxnard complex. The Coast Highway from Santa Barbara, to be converted to freeway, joins with the Ojai freeway now building, to funnel traffic from the north and west into Ventura, and making Ventura much more quickly accessible from communities like Carpinteria and Ojai.
3. The Santa Paula Freeway will bring the whole Santa Clara Valley - Saticoy, Santa Paula, Fillmore and Piru - many minutes closer. This effect will even be felt in the San Joaquin Valley.
4. The Simi and Conejo Valleys again funnel into the Oxnard plain. With the Ventura Blvd. Freeway nearing completion in Ventura County the entire, cool Oxnard beach area becomes easily accessible from the hot, upper San Fernando Valley with its tremendous population. Thousand Oaks and Camarillo share in this advantage, being many minutes closer to Ventura and Oxnard than a few years ago.

5. The Coast Highway from Santa Monica is also to be converted to a divided highway, and from Pt. Mugu to Oxnard to a freeway, again making the Oxnard Plain the focus.
6. Only a little anticipation is required to see Ventura expand also to the west, across the Ventura River, where a relatively small area suitable for urban expansion remains, on the lower slopes of the coastal mountains.
7. These highways bring traffic, but they also bring people. And they bring not only people who are searching for a place to settle and live; they bring business and industrial enterprises. As a region develops a labor market, coupled with improved transportation and freer traffic movement, industrialists find the region suitable for their enterprises. In the beginning of such a period it is smaller, light industries that seek such locations. If a pool of labor, skilled and experienced, is thus formed to meet the particular needs, a very favorable climate for those industries is created.
8. Such a "favorable industrial climate" is, in fact, in the making in the Oxnard Plain. The existence at Port Hueneme and Mugu Naval Bases of special projects, employing a large number of technician employees, has created a body of particularly skilled labor. Various producers of technical equipment keep their own personnel at these bases and maintain laboratories or shops outside. There is already a basis - in small plants and availability of technically proficient labor - for a plastic and electronics industry.
9. Ventura County's water situation being what it is, this industrial climate will not be favorable to industries using large quantities of water. Moreover, the water problem, as long as it remains a problem, has a direct deterrent effect upon population growth, and consequently an indirect deterrent effect upon establishment of industry through holding back the creation of a labor pool.
10. Water has long been a problem in Ventura County. The County's own major water resources remain, however, mainly to be conserved and developed. Plans for more complete utilization of local water resources are now relatively far advanced, however. The major projects are Casitas dam on Coyote Creek, a tributary of the Ventura River, and dams on the two tributaries of the Santa Clara River: on Sespe Creek just above Fillmore and Santa Felicia dam on Piru Creek a few miles above Piru.

11. Dams at the two latter sites would impound water from relatively very large water-sheds. The Piru Creek water-shed particularly, reaches back to the highest mountains in the county, Mt. Pinos (8831 ft.) and Frazier Mtn. (8026 ft.) where rainfall and snowfall are much heavier than near the coast.
12. Without going into details of the capacity and operation of these reservoirs, it appears that additional water supply can quickly be developed in quantity sufficient for needs of the development period immediately ahead, considering agricultural needs, domestic needs of a sizable addition to population and the requirements of some industry.
13. These plans for impounding more stream-flow water, however, raise a serious question of quite another sort. When water is impounded by damming a stream, the water is conserved for more efficient use, flood hazard is materially reduced, and erosion of land along the channel is considerably reduced. Prevention of erosion is a good thing for the land, but it results eventually in a stoppage, or at least reduction, of the amount of gravel and sand deposited in the ocean, the material which is needed to make beach sand and replenish the constantly moving disappearing sands that form the beaches.
14. The amount of sand on the beaches is a matter of great significance. It is not merely a question of plenty of soft, clean sand to accommodate sunbathers and small children equipped with pails and shovels. The waves of the ocean are constantly battering at and tearing away the land along the shore. The very best protection on any shoreline is a wide beach of sand, sufficient to form a so-called "flat" beach. A very gentle slope extending out beyond a fifteen foot depth causes the waves to break far out. Their force is then dissipated until when they roll up on the beach itself they exert no destructive force. Thus this blanket of sand along the high tide line is a buffer which prevents the waves from tearing out the land itself; good, usable, fertile soil, or rock that forms the foundation for building sites. If the sand blanket is allowed to be removed, the destruction of the land proceeds rapidly.
15. The report of the Beach Erosion Board of July 1954, re-

15. continued

ferred to above\*, established that with a littoral drift predominantly to the south, the sand movement along the beach is "in the order of 250,000 cubic yards annually along the Rincon Shore segment, and increases to about 1,000,000 cubic yards a year along the Oxnard Plain shore". One interpretation of this statement is that the canyons of the Rincon deposit only enough material in the ocean to create a drift of 250,000 cubic yards annually, in view of the stopping effect at the various points which partially interrupt the drift at intervals. But down-coast from the Santa Clara River the drift, amounting to 1,000,000 cubic yards a year, indicates that the Santa Clara River, whose flood is still virtually uncontrolled, is providing an amount of sand sufficient to maintain broad beaches and even allow for creation by the wind of fairly sizable sand dunes from the Santa Clara River to Port Hueneme.

16. The Ventura River with one dam at Matilija Creek, appears to supply scarcely enough sand to maintain the beach in Pierpont Bay. The drift, perhaps 250,000 cubic yards a year as on the Rincon, presumably continues on past the mouth of the Santa Clara River and so contributes to the accretion on the Oxnard beaches. Erosion is clearly evident in the Pierpont Bay sector, and the Beach Erosion Board has recommended construction of three groins at Ventura. These would slow the littoral drift somewhat and thereby allow sand to accumulate on the beach. It is presumed that construction of a breakwater for the proposed Pierpont Bay Harbor, and of a proposed jetty on the north side of the mouth of the Santa Clara River, would further add to this effect so that the Pierpont Bay beach would eventually be restored.

17. If the two dams, on Sespe and Piru Creeks, are built, flow in the lower Santa Clara River will be somewhat reduced, although this may not affect the flow materially in times of heavy rainfall and flood conditions, over a long period. But the result may be that during dry cycles the deposit of silt at the mouth of the river will not equal the littoral drift of sand, in which case the Oxnard Beaches will be de-

\* See I - 15

17. continued

pleted. Counteracting this possibility, the Port Hueneme jetty and proposed jetties for the proposed new harbor would tend to hold more of this sand in the sector than under natural conditions. It must be remembered, however, that the United States District Engineer proposes to dredge 100,000 cubic yards biennially from this sector, pumping it past Hueneme to combat erosion from Hueneme to Pt. Mugu.

18. Calleguas Creek is the most easterly stream of significance, which probably contributes a considerable amount of sand to the natural beach building process. It has a surprisingly large water-shed, but lying near the coast between low mountains it does not have a very heavy rainfall. In any case its influence on beaches in the Oxnard area is very slight because its deposits occur at the extreme southerly tip of the sector, so that the regular littoral drift carries this sand out of the area.

19. The water conservation projects are recognized, of course, as matters of prime necessity. All that can be said at this point is to stress the necessity of watching beach conditions in the Oxnard Plain very closely after the Sespe and Piru Creek dams have been built. If the beaches then suffer depletion, erosion will have been begun and the entire Oxnard Plain itself will be threatened. In such an eventuality the problem of protection against beach erosion will have to be approached with other methods.

## The Need for Planned Urbanization

20. The foregoing paragraphs - dealing with population growth factors, highways, industry, water supply and erosion - have called attention to a complex of problems that can be summed up as the impending urbanization of the Ventura-Oxnard area, within a fairly near future.
21. This increase in population and industry is unavoidable. The only question that remains regarding it is whether or not the people of Ventura County are going to let it "just grow, like Topsy" or direct its growth along the lines they want it to take, for the greatest benefit of the County and its parts.
22. According to census figures the County has experienced an average population increase of a little more than 50% per decade since 1900, as shown in the table below:

Population Ventura County

Census	1900	14,367	At Theoretical Increase of 51% per decade	14,367
"	1910	18,357	22.8% Increase	22,000
"	1920	28,724	51.8%	"
"	1930	54,976	91.4%	"
"	1940	69,685	21.8%	"
"	1950	114,647	64.5%	"
"	1955	153,700	(68.0% on decade basis)	142,000
Estimated 1960				171,000
"	1965			214,500
"	1970			258,000
"	1975			319,000
"	1980			390,000

23. If this trend continues, by 1960 the County will have gained another 17,000 people, by 1970, 104,000 people, and by 1975, 165,000 people.
24. An additional 165,000 people in the next 20 years will require some 16 or 17 square miles of new urban development: subdivisions, streets, houses, water mains, sewers. They will require parks, schools, business districts and new industrial areas. In order for these people to move about comfortable highway extension and improvements will have to be made.
25. Some of this change will occur in other parts of the County but the bulk of it will doubtless take place in the Oxnard Plain and in the Ventura-Montalvo area.
26. The accompanying map, urban expansion, has been prepared to show how this addition of urban area would compare geographically with present urban developed areas. Shown as a base are present urban areas and developed orchard land. Land that is considered as suitable only for Open Uses is also delineated. Upon this background has been laid out an area amounting to 10 square miles designated as needed for urban use by 1975. This land would accommodate about 100,000 people, estimated to comprise that portion of the 165,000 increase for the entire county that would be located within this metropolitan area.
27. This map is not a plan. It is prepared only to show the magnitude of the area required for urbanization. It represents principally an estimate of what will happen if left to chance and haphazard exploitation without benefit of any planning except the reservation of the Open Use areas generally subject to flood hazard. The location of these additional urban areas should not be regarded as significant. The purpose of the map is to demonstrate the amount of land needed, which could be located very differently.
28. It should be understood that this 10 square miles of urban area does not signify merely endless subdivisions with houses and business districts. It would provide room within its limits for the normal complement of other urban uses such as parks, play grounds, schools, churches, institutions and a moderate amount of land for normal, small industry.

29. In the foregoing paragraphs a total county population of 319,000 people by 1975 was taken as a convenient starting point for the discussion, a twenty year period within which it is feasible to program some public policies. The year in which this total population is reached is of practically no significance. The real meaning of the map representing urbanization is simply that by the time the County population reaches 319,000, whenever, that is, it will have been necessary to add new urban area in the amount shown on the map. This may occur as early as 1965, or it might be delayed until 1980 or 1990; the time is not important.

30. What is important is that plans should be made ready to direct this urbanization whenever it occurs. Some of it, and in significant amount, will take place within the next five years. Therefore, to be truly effective, the plans called for should be made now. Without plans mistakes will be made that will result in future expense for correction. The process of urbanization, beginning with subdivision of the land is a drastic change in land use which is nearly always irrevocably permanent. Once land is actually subdivided, it is generally changed, forever, from a rural to an urban use. In the wrong places, pseudo-urban land holdings create very difficult problems.

31. All of this anticipated development therefore calls for careful and immediate planning on a county wide basis, while many very difficult problems will be focused on these two areas on either side of the Santa Clara River.

32. The preparation and adoption of the Shoreline Plan is the first step in such a process. For it is far more than just a plan for recreation at the beach. The importance of developments to be expected along the Shoreline is such that the impact is to be felt directly in nearly every phase of County Planning. Clearly evident are the effects upon Highway Planning and Land Use Planning which are discussed at some length in other sections of this report. Before examining them a detailed presentation of the Shoreline Plan itself should be thoroughly understood.

## PART V

### Features of the Plan of Shoreline Development

1. The Master Plan of Shoreline Development is shown and the various items are identified, on a map (consisting of three sheets) and there is included a schedule of shoreline properties classified as to ownership where they are owned by a public (governmental) entity, or as to priority for public acquisition where they are now private property, together with estimates of present value. This schedule therefore constitutes a tentative, long-term program for putting into effect one phase of the plan: the purchase by the public of now private property.
2. The plan consists, however, of considerably more than the map and schedule. It indicates partly by delineation of the map, using certain symbols, and partly by the accompanying descriptive text, a general policy of the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors, determining:
  1. Some general uses to which the property concerned may be devoted, for the benefit of all the people of the county;
  2. Some indication of the type of development of improvement, such as buildings, landscaping and arrangement of principal features, intended to be established on the property;
  3. Provision for accessibility as represented by roads and highways, existing or contemplated;
  4. Appropriate measures for conservation of physical resources including beach erosion control, problems of contamination or pollution, and conservation of natural wild life;
  5. Public safety, in determination of appropriate locations for provision of such things as sanitary facilities and life-guard service, and in determination of locations where occupancy of the land by buildings of various characters may be either permitted or prohibited.

3. Some of these ideas are clearly represented upon the map. Others will be discerned only by reading the balance of this text. It must be emphasized, therefore, that the Master Plan is not a blue-print of a precise, working drawing, complete with specifications for immediate construction. It is a statement of general policy for a long term of years, during which time many factors may be expected to change significantly, requiring new judgements to be made upon matters of detail.
4. By definition under California law, the Master Plan is such a general instrument, which has virtually no force of law until it is implemented by precise plans adopted pursuant to, and based upon it. Thus the Master Plan may designate a certain beach property for use for public recreation or for residence. This designation cannot be enforced except by purchase of the property for recreational use, or by adoption of a zoning ordinance, following established legal procedure, to put the property into the appropriate use zone.
5. The Master Plan, once adopted, is in reality only a point of beginning. In adopting it the county, speaking through the official bodies duly constituted for that purpose, the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors, expresses its intent to work toward stated but general objectives, by proceeding under process of law with the preparation, adoption and effectuation of other, detailed plans.
6. In the case of Shoreline Development Plans the Master Plan, however, has one element of legal effectiveness that Master Plans in other subjects do not have. The State Park Commission is empowered to purchase from certain State funds such beach park properties as are placed in First Priority in a Master Plan of Shoreline Development properly adopted by a county. The schedule of properties showing priorities in this plan, therefore, becomes effective so far as the use of State Park funds are concerned immediately upon its adoption by the County Board of Supervisors. This does not mean, of course, that the State must purchase all such properties; merely, certain State Park funds may be used for purchase of as many First Priority properties as policy of the State Park Commission determines to be appropriate, and those funds may not be used for any properties not in First Priority. (Other State Funds, if available, could be used in either case.)

7. The Board of Supervisors, the City Council of any city, or any other such agency, is not limited by this priority provision, but might purchase any property that its policies and other applicable law permit.
8. In preparing this Master Plan of Shoreline Development 46 items (not separately owned parcels) of property were carefully examined and compared as to their desirability for public recreation purposes, considering the following features:
  1. Width of beach; deficient, moderate or ample;
  2. Condition: sandy, partly or sometimes rocky, always rocky;
  3. Surf: Freedom from currents, rip-tides, undertow;
  4. Suitability for general recreation: largely a matter of area;
  5. Suitability for fishing;
  6. Accessibility (by highway): superior, fair, remote;
  7. Availability of Parking Space: ample, limited, none;
  8. Usability for home-sites: Immediate, future;
  9. Suitability for harbor;
  10. Freedom from contamination;
  11. Availability of still (warm) water bathing;
  12. Attractiveness from a state-wide view-point.
9. Comparison of all of the beach properties in this way, inevitably "brought to the top" those units which obviously would be the "best buys" and offer the public the most enjoyment in their use. The final result was to then group them into three categories as follows:

9. continued

21 locations in First Priority: Beach areas determined as being needed in public ownership as early as feasible; (State Park Funds may be used to purchase them.);  
Total 21.2 mi.  
Estimated Cost: \$6,846,840

7 locations in Second Priority: Beach areas determined as being needed in public ownership, but where acquisition is not urgent;  
Total 7.4 mi.  
Estimated Cost: \$823,000

6 locations in Third Priority: Beach areas desirable for public ownership, but suitable for residential occupancy (mostly so occupied), and comparatively costly to acquire.  
Total 4.2 mi.  
Estimated Cost: \$4,443,000

Total Acquisition Program  
32.8 mi.  
Estimated Cost: \$12,112,840

10. 12 other locations, property already in public ownership, make up the total of 46 items in the inventory. San Buenaventura Beach Park is mostly owned by the State but appears in First Priority because acquisition is not complete. At two other locations, property of the United States is included in First Priority, because of a hope that the United States may at some future time relinquish all or a part to the State or the County.
11. It should be clearly understood that all items in First Priority have equal priority. In making any listing (as in the following table) it will of course be necessary that some properties stand at the head of the list and some at the foot. To avoid any appearance of such significance, the properties in each section of priority are listed merely from west to east.

INVENTORY OF SHORELINE PROPERTY - COUNTY OF VENTURA, CALIFORNIA

No.	Location Name	Planned Function	Length along Open Ocean in feet	Approx. Area in Acres	Estimated Value	Land & Imp'ts	Notes
<b>FIRST PRIORITY</b>							
8	West Rincon Beach	B Bathing Beach	1500	10	\$ 97,500		"Bathing Beach" signifies swimming, sunning, picnicking.
10	East Rincon Beach	H Scenic Highway	2100	negligible	50,000		
11	Padre Juan Beach	B Bathing Beach	7680	16.9	384,000		
15	East Dulah Beach	B Bathing Beach	1650	6.5	107,000		
18	San Miguelito Beach	B Bathing Beach	5200	17.9	370,000		
20	Taylor Ranch Beach	P Beach Park	2900	32	58,000		
			(11,544)	(122)			
24	San Buenaventura Beach Park	P Beach Park	none to be acquired	5 to be acquired	100,000		Length and area figures not included in 1st Priority Totals. Upland only, to be acquired. State owns most of site.
25	Pierpont Harbor	Y Boat Harbor	7600	643	684,000		City of San Buenaventura owns 154 acres. Beach recreation areas included in plan.
27	Gonzales Unit	O Oil Production	11,000	755	326,500		Propose acquisition of surface, without mineral rights.
28	McGrath Unit	P Beach Park	2750	270	101,875		Extensive sand dunes, for a unique camping park.
29	Mandalay Unit	P Beach Park	8750	600	359,425		
(30)	Hollywood Beach Unit)	(B) (Bathing Beach)	(6029)	(27.5)			Now owned by County, Value: \$120,000. Length area and value excluded from First Priority Totals.
31	East Hollywood Beach Unit	B Bathing Beach	1000	6.9	36,000		Beach strip in front of houses. Mainly for use of neighborhood residents.
	Sub-total - Sta. Clara Dunes Pk.(27-31 incl.)		29,529	1659.4			
32	Hollywood-by-the-Sea Harbor	Y Boat Harbor (Entrance Channel)	550	330	797,640		For commercial and recreational boats. Other recreation slight.
33	West Silver Strand Bch.	B Bathing Beach	400	2.8	24,000		Beach Strip in front of houses. Mainly for neighborhood use.
36	Pt. Hueneme Beach	P Beach Park	4900	38	130,000		Includes Port Hueneme Sewage Disposal Plant.
38	East Ormond Beach	B Bathing Beach	5500	150	73,500		
39	Mugu Naval Test Center	M Present Military Use	26,800	3652	1,696,500	(land only)	Now owned by U.S. Propose State acquire for public recreation if U.S. relinquishes all or part.
40	East End of Laguna Mugu	P Beach Park	7200	577	499,400		
42	La Jolla Canyon Beach	B Bathing Beach	6600	53	490,000		Picturesque sand dunes above highway.
43	Sycamore Canyon Beach	P Beach Park	3800	135	201,500		Canyon and beach camping park.
45	Solromar Beach	B Bathing Beach	4000	18	260,000		
	Total First Priority		111,880=21.2 mi	7,452.5 acres	\$6,846,840		
<b>SECOND PRIORITY</b>							
14	West Dulah Beach	H Scenic Highway	1300	negligible	32,500		Scenic Highway: Principal value is preservation of view over ocean. Swimming and surf fishing may be incidental uses at some points.
17	East Solimar Beach	H Scenic Highway	1900	negligible	47,500		Swimming may be incidental use.
19	Fishermen's Beach	A Surf Fishing	8700	10	43,500		
26	Santa Clara River Mouth	F Flood Control	1100	inapplicable	7,500		
41	Pt. Mugu Beach	H Scenic Highway	7900	negligible	200,000		
44	Bass Rock Beach	H Scenic Highway	13,400	negligible	342,000		
46	County Line Beach	B Bathing Beach	5000	11.5	150,000		Strip below bluff; no direct highway access; mainly for use by neighborhood residents.
	Total Second Priority		39,300= 7.4 mi.	21.5	823,000		
<b>THIRD PRIORITY</b>							
1	Rincon Point	R Residential	1300	15	316,000		Residential: now occupied by many houses; use to continue unless bought for public recreation use.
3	Punta Gorda	R Residential	1650	15	371,000		Oil drilling in ocean and on beach to continue.
5	Conoco	O Oil Production	7400	25	1,295,000		
7	Sea Cliff	R Residential	1600	9	250,000		
12	Pitas Point	R Residential	7100	32	1,326,000		
16	Solimar	R Residential	3450	24	885,000		
	Total Third Priority		22,500= 4.2 mi.	120	\$4,443,000		
<b>PROPERTY NOW PUBLICLY OWNED</b>							
2	La Conchita Beach	H Scenic Highway	12,100	negligible	570,600		Owned by State of California for highway purposes.
4	Mussel Shoal	H Scenic Highway	200	negligible	8,000		State of California "
6	County Park No. 5	B Bathing Beach	366	1.5	33,800		Ventura County
9	County Park No. 4	B Bathing Beach	679	1.7	42,600		Ventura County
12	County Park No. 3	B Bathing Beach	510	1.5	32,400		Ventura County
21	Ventura River Mouth	F Flood Control	1700	20	24,000		Ventura County for flood control purposes.
22	County Fair Grounds	P Beach Park	1400	69	1,047,000		State of California.
23	Sewage Disposal Plant	D Sewage Disposal	1000	7.2	455,000		San Buenaventura for sewage disposal.
#24	San Buenaventura Bch.Pt.	P Beach Park	11,544	122	740,000		State of California -acquisition nearly completed.
30	Hollywood Beach	B Bathing Beach	6,028	27.5	120,000		Ventura County
34	Silver Strand Beach	B Bathing Beach	4500	41	129,000		Ventura County
35	Port Hueneme Naval Training Station	M Military Use	4300	inapplicable	unavailable		United States for military purposes.
37	Ormond Beach	D Sewage Disposal	6900	119	324,000		Oxnard for sewage disposal.
#39	Mugu Naval Test Center	M Military Use	duplication	inapplicable	unavailable		United States for military purposes.
#40	" " "	P (Future) Beach Park	duplication	inapplicable	unavailable		United States for military purposes.
	Total Publicly Owned		51,228= 9.7 mi.	410.4	\$3,526,400		
#Duplicated in First Priority							
<b>RECAPITULATION</b>							
	First Priority		111,880=21.2mi.	7.452.5	\$6,846,840		
	Second Priority		39,300= 7.4 "	21.5	823,000		
	Sub-total, 1st and 2nd Priority		151,180=28.6 "	7,474.0	\$7,669,840		
	Third Priority		22,500= 4.2 "	120.0	4,443,000		
	Total Private Property		173,680=32.8 "	7,594.0	\$12,112,840		
	Publicly Owned		51,228= 9.7 "	410.4"	\$3,526,400*		
	Total Shoreline		224,908=42.5mi.	8,004.4"	\$15,639,240		*Omitting Port Hueneme Naval Training Center, and Mugu Naval Test Center.

## PART VI

### Projects included in the Plan

NOTE: In this part the individual properties as identified by location numbers on the map are described. Where pertinent a brief description of the development intended at the location is outlined. The locations are taken in order from west to east. The map delineating the plan and identifying the various items consists of three sheets or sections designated as:

Rincon Section (West)  
Santa Clara Section (Center)  
Mugu Section (East)

#### Section A of Part VI Rincon Section (West)

1. Rincon Point: 1300 ft.; 200-700 ft. wide; 15 A; \$316,000; 3rd Priority.

At this point, on the Santa Barbara County boundary line, the Coast Highway and Southern Pacific Railroad, are located about a thousand feet inland, leaving a very attractive site for residence, which is rather well improved with good houses, several roads and many trees. It presents a very pleasing appearance to the traveller. The beach on the Ventura County side of the point is narrow and somewhat rocky, but picturesque. Because of its established character it is classed as Residential and recommended for Third Priority.

2. La Conchita Beach: 12,100 ft.; negligible width; \$570,600; State Owned.

This property was acquired by the State of California as highway right-of-way. Construction of the highway has literally covered up the beach. A number of houses were removed. It is useful only for preserving the view over the ocean and is classed as Scenic Highway.

3. Punta Gorda: 1650 ft.; 200-600 ft. wide; 15 A;  
\$371,000; 3rd Priority.

Similar to Rincon Point on a smaller scale, this community of beach homes is classed as Residential and recommended for Third Priority.

4. Mussel Shoal: 200 ft.; negligible width; \$8,000;  
State Owned.

Like location 2, a highway acquisition, in which the beach is left with little value other than scenic, this property is classed as Scenic Highway.

5. Conoco: 7400 ft.; 100-200 ft. wide; 25 A; \$1,295,000;  
3rd Priority.

At this interesting spot the traveller on the Ventura County coast can witness oil wells drilled and pumping in the ocean, a momentary visible reminder of the source of funds available to carry on a beach program. In the westerly half of this sector the beach is narrow, but in the entire sector there seems to be a very smooth, relatively flat, sandy bottom. This would all have made excellent recreation area, but the oil development is an established use with a very large investment, and makes the area somewhat less attractive for swimming or beach recreation. It is therefore classified for continued Oil Production, and recommended for Third Priority.

6. County Park No. 5: 366 ft.; 90-150 ft. wide; 1.5 A;  
\$33,800; County Owned.

This park, sandwiched between oil development and beach homes, is of doubtful value as a park. It is partly occupied by a fire station. Its value to the travelling public will become very slight if other beach projects are carried through. It is suggested that the possibility be explored of selling that part not needed for the Fire Station, and using the proceeds to purchase better located beach property. In the meantime it is classed as Beach Recreation zone; in event of sale it should probably be zoned for residential and perhaps other urban uses.

7. Sea Cliff: 1600 ft.; 200-300 ft. wide; 9 A; \$250,000;  
3rd Priority.

7. continued

Another established residential district, this short stretch is classified as Residential land use, and recommended for Third Priority.

8. West Rincon Beach: 1500 ft.; 200-300 ft. wide; 10 A; \$97,500; 1st Priority.

This excellent beach adjoins County Park No. 5, southerly. Adding it to the park would result in a beach nearly 2200 feet long with sufficient width to permit the development of at least two lanes of off-highway parking space. The construction of a new highway on the other side of the railroad, will leave the present highway to function as a service road for the beach, which can also be arranged to provide parking space within the road right-of-way. With utilities and administration already established at the Park, this beach would easily be made very usable. It is therefore classified for Beach Recreation and recommended for First Priority. (Throughout Part VI the term "Beach Recreation" has been used where the term "Bathing Beach" has been used in the Inventory Table and on the maps.)

9. County Park No. 4: 679 ft.: 311-0 ft. wide; 1.7 A; \$42,600; County Owned.

This County beach park has long served the public well providing a shady picnic spot for travellers and bathers, but in a very limited way. Combination with location 10 would vastly increase its usefulness, as a Beach Recreation area.

10. East Rincon Beach: 2100 ft.; width and area negligible; \$50,000; 1st Priority.

This small beach is recommended for First Priority, in spite of its narrow width, because it would be one of the links between County Parks No. 4 and 3. It is classified as Scenic Highway, although swimming would undoubtedly be enjoyed by persons spreading from the wider beaches at each end.

11. Padre Juan Beach: 7680 ft.; 0-150 ft. wide; 16.9 A; \$384,000; 1st Priority.

11. continued.

Only the extreme northerly 1000 feet of this fine beach is actually narrow. It is the one property in First Priority in the 1946 plan on which no acquisition has occurred.\* It now assumes a greater recreational value because of the plan to move the highway to the other side of the railroad. The rather limited parking space available will not be such a detriment when the present highway becomes a service road. In view of its length, which with locations 8, 9, 10 and 12, would result in a beach 12,469 ft., nearly  $2\frac{1}{2}$  miles, in length, this beach easily qualifies in First Priority. It is, of course, classified for Beach Recreation Use.

12. County Park No. 3: 510 ft.; 150-290 ft. wide; 1.5 A;  
\$32,400; County Owned.

Like County Park No. 4, this small, shady beach area has served well in a limited way, and its usefulness would be greatly increased by combination with locations 8, 9, 10 and 11 to create one long beach park. It is classified for Beach Recreation Use.

13. Pitas Point: 7,100 ft.; 80-300 ft. wide; 32 A;  
\$1,326,000; 3rd Priority.

This downcoast side of Pitas Point is the most extensive beach cottage development in the County, and the residential character is well established. As is common along the easterly or southerly exposure of these points, the beach is narrow, and a somewhat rocky bottom is exposed at times of seasonal inundation, generally in the winter months. It is therefore not considered to be one of the most desirable beaches for public recreation. Because of this and the established use it is recommended as a Residential Use area in Third Priority.

14. West Dulah Beach: 1300 ft.; 0-100 ft. wide; negligible area; \$32,500; 2nd Priority.

While this beach has some value for recreation, its limited space, across the highway from an oil refinery, makes it unsuitable for the use of large numbers of

\* See I-4; there referred to as Rincon.

14. West Dulah Beach. continued

people. Because of its narrow width it is not suitable nor safe for residential use. It is therefore designated as Scenic Highway, with swimming only an incidental use, to be placed in a Conservation Zone, and recommended for eventual purchase in Second Priority.

15. East Dulah Beach: 1650 ft.; 100-250 ft. wide; 6.5 A; \$107,000; 1st Priority.

This beach, while short, is wide enough and high enough to allow for good development with shade and parking space on the upper level, about 100 feet wide, and could therefore accomodate beach crowds comfortably. By the same token it would be usable for residence, which condition indicates an urgency for its acquisition. Below the berm is a good sandy beach. It is therefore recommended for inclusion in First Priority as a Beach Recreation Area.

16. Solimar: 3450 ft.; 80-400 ft. wide; 24 A; \$885,000; 3rd Priority.

This little shelf of land extending some 400 ft. out toward the ocean from the present Coast Highway, with its excellent sandy beach, would be considered as a most advantageous site for a beach park were it not for the very attractive cottages which have nearly filled it. With some 40 or 50 houses, the residential use is clearly established. If suitable bathing beaches were not more easily available for public acquisition in this vicinity, the high cost of acquiring this one might be justified. Under the circumstances, however, it is recommended that the Residential Use continue, and that the property be placed in Third Priority.

17. East Solimar Beach: 1900 ft.; negligible width; \$47,500; 2nd Priority.

At one point in this stretch of narrow beach, a sea wall at the right-of-way line, protects the present highway from wave action and erosion. It is clearly a Scenic Highway area, where active recreation could be only incidental and is recommended for Second Priority.

18. San Miguelito Beach: 5200 ft.; 0-300 ft. wide; 17.9 A; \$370,000; 1st Priority.

18. continued

This beach has long been a favorite bathing beach for Ventura people, perhaps because, until the development of San Buenaventura Beach State Park, it was the nearest beach to the city. Lying just westerly from the Southern Pacific Railroad overpass, it now becomes of greater importance for public recreation, because of the plan to move the State Highway to the other side of the railroad. The present highway would then be left as a service road, providing access to, and parking space for the beach, without creating traffic hazards. The beach is therefore classified for Beach Recreation Use and recommended for First Priority acquisition.

19. Fishermen's Beach: 8700 ft.; 0-400 ft. wide; 10 A;  
\$43,500; 2nd Priority.

This strip of land between the Southern Pacific Railroad and the ocean is very narrow except at the extreme easterly end. It is rocky throughout nearly all of the year. Not a good area for swimming it is nevertheless a good location for surf-fishing. It is therefore designated as a Fishing or Conservation area for acquisition. Since there would seem to be very little danger of attempts to make any other use of it, this beach is recommended for 2nd Priority acquisition.

20. Taylor Ranch Beach: 2900 ft.; 400-600 ft. wide; 32 A;  
\$58,000; 1st Priority.

This wide strip of land, partly wooded, lies at a relatively high elevation above the ocean, and would have room for development of a beach park with areas for shaded picnic grounds and some other recreation activities besides swimming. For the same reasons it would be very usable for a colony of beach houses. Adjoining land owned by the County at the mouth of the Ventura River, its acquisition would be an important link in the extension of public beach westerly from San Buenaventura Beach Park, and might even become a part of that park, with common administration.

If joined to San Miguelito Beach (17 & 18) by Fishermen's Beach (19) a public beach of great variety and interest would be created extending from Dulah to Arundel Barranca, a total distance of six and one-half miles.

20. continued.

If this property and the adjoining Fishermen's Beach (19) are both acquired, the old road, which formerly underpassed the railroad about a mile easterly of the present overpass, should be rehabilitated and extended easterly nearly to the Ventura River. From this point it could curve to pass under the railroad and make a connection to West Main Street or the proposed new freeway near the bridge-head. Such accessibility would make this section a very useful park.

This property is classified as Beach Park (indicating its wider recreational possibilities) and because of possibility of residential development recommended for First Priority acquisition.

Section B of Part VI  
Santa Clara Section (Center)

21. Ventura River Mouth: 1700 ft.; 600-1200 ft. wide;  
20 A; \$24,000; County Owned.

The County of Ventura holds this land for Flood Control purposes. Not all of the property will actually be needed for Flood Control works, however, and during long dry seasons of the year even the mouth of the river channel is usable for swimming. On the west bank of the river, which is heavily wooded, approximately one-third of the area, about seven acres, could be added to the recreational area of the proposed Taylor Ranch Beach (20). Thus, while the area is classified for Flood Control Use, recreational use is by no means excluded. On the east side of the river, part of the County's holding is occupied by a portion of the County Fairgrounds.

22. County Fair Grounds: 1400 ft.; 1200 ft. wide; 69 A;  
\$1,047,000; State Owned.

Held by the State for the 31st District Agricultural Association, this property includes the County Fair Grounds and Babe Ruth Ball Park. Thus, while the narrow beach is of little value for swimming, the property is devoted to recreational uses, and is therefore classified as Beach Park.

23. Ventura Sewage Disposal Plant: 1000 ft.; 200 ft. wide;  
7.2 A; \$455,000; City Owned.

This is an incidental use on the beach, apparently causing no difficulty or interference with recreational use of the beach; analysis by State Health officers gave the plant a clean bill of health in the summer of 1954. A proposal has been made for the Shell Chemical Plant, in Ventura Canyon to use the effluent, as cooling water, but this plan has not yet been put into operation. The site is recognized in the Master Plan as a Disposal area, in the belief that there is no danger of contamination at present.

24. San Buenaventura Beach State Park: 11,544 ft.; 150-2000 ft. wide; 127 A; \$740,000; First Priority.

This important unit in the Shoreline Plan is held in First Priority because the acquisition by the State is not legally completed. In the second place, a recent proposal to route a freeway through the park property would take a considerable area from park use; the Division of Parks and Beaches is contemplating acquisition of additional land to compensate for this right-of-way. This is legally proper under the present (1946) Master Plan, since the State has not yet acquired all the property designated in the 1946 plan in First Priority.

In the meantime the Park is a reality, even though it has not approached maximum usefulness. The State has made some improvements reviewed earlier in this report. (I-9) Present design plans of the Division of Beaches and Parks - not by any means final - suggest further development with a lagoon for shallow water swimming for small children, other recreation areas, landscaped picnic areas and parking space for 1100 automobiles.

The improvements suggested above demonstrate the meaning of the classification "Beach Park" as distinguished from the more restricted "Beach Recreation" use.

25. Pierpont Harbor: 7600 ft.; 3400 ft. wide; 643 A; \$684,000; 1st Priority.

This proposal of the Ventura Port District for a strictly recreational harbor with a capacity for 600 boats is presented completely in the report of R. L. Patterson, Aug. 1, 1953. Briefly, the plan calls for acquisition of the site by the Port District and improvement as shown in simplified form in the Master Plan. The City of San Buenaventura owns most of the land of high value within the site, but since this property is not held specifically for a public purpose, it has been regarded in this report as if it were privately owned.

The features of the plan shown on the Master Plan are:

1. Two jetties forming a breakwater, with a 550' entrance and outer harbor;
2. An entrance channel 300 ft. wide, to be dredged 20 ft. deep;

25. continued

3. Two groins to stabilize the entrance channel;
4. A main basin to be dredged 20 feet deep, with the balance of the inner harbor water area to be dredged 10 feet deep;
5. Public beach along the ocean front and on the inner harbor on both sides of the entrance channel;
6. Access roads from Pierpont Blvd. and Vista del Mar, encircling the harbor, and in turn giving access to fourteen minor roads on the several moles;
7. Rental mooring slips for boats in the northern half of the harbor;
8. A harbor business district, boat works and repair yards, and a yacht club;
9. Residential lots on the eleven moles projecting into the southern half of the harbor;
10. A trailer park;
11. Two public landings;
12. Two launching ramps for small boats;
13. Two groins, upcoast, for beach stabilization, in addition to those specified by the Beach Erosion Board.
14. A jetty at the north side of the mouth of the Santa Clara River. The plan further envisions using spoil from the dredging to fill some low lands around the harbor site, and to replenish the beaches in the vicinity. An oil line extending into the ocean would have to be relocated.

The total cost, including land at \$621,000, was estimated (1953) at \$6,415,000, with an estimated annual cost of \$76,000. The latter included operation of a sand bypassing plant to maintain beaches downcoast. In this report a figure of \$63,000, has been added to the land cost to account for recent building in the area.

25. continued

The Ventura Port District, formed in May, 1952, includes only the City of San Buenaventura with a very small unincorporated area, and has an assessed valuation of only \$17,195,260, considered an inadequate base for handling a project of this magnitude. Alternative solutions to this problem are to find additional financing in some way, outside the district, or to enlarge the district.

A very large recovery of capital could justly be expected from the sale of water-front lots, similar to those in Balboa; how this can be handled so as to reduce the very heavy initial costs of land acquisition, breakwaters and entrance dredging is a question difficult to answer at present.

The project has not been submitted to the U. S. Army Engineers for investigation and report.

The harbor plan is presented in the Master Plan of Shoreline Development as a proposal of the Ventura Port District, a legal, responsible entity, with the hope that its many meritorious features will inspire the directors of the Port District to solve the problems that now face them in bringing the project to a point of beginning.

The State Park Commission can legally acquire and develop such a recreational harbor. So far it has not done so, but its published Five-Year Program (January, 1955) recognizes recreational harbor development as one of its proper functions. (p.6) The inclusion in this plan of residential lots, to be sold for private home building may prove to be an obstacle in any attempt to interest the State Park Commission in the project. An alternative might be to interest the Commission in acquiring the ocean beach frontage as an addition to San Buenaventura Beach Park. Legislation introduced in the legislature this year (A.B. 2939), if passed, might resolve some problems and enable the State, through the State Lands Commission to assist in the proposed development.

If the Port District could induce the City of San Buenaventura to contribute its property to the project, a large part of the problem of land acquisition would be met.

Because of its obvious nature and the continued pressure for developing the site in other ways, this proposal is classified in the Master Plan as Boat Harbor and recommended for First Priority acquisition.

26. Santa Clara River Mouth: 1100 ft.; \$7,500; 2nd Priority.

The mouth of the Santa Clara River should come into public ownership for purposes of Flood Control. Since an acquisition should include right-of-way for a considerable length upstream, the term "width" of beach is inapplicable in this case. Swimming would, of course, be an incidental use at this location. This proposal is recommended for 2nd Priority acquisition, since the State would not be interested in it as a recreational element of the shoreline, and since it is difficult to imagine any danger of its being used for any other purposes than Flood Control.

#### Santa Clara Dunes Beach Park

27. Gonzales Unit: 11,000 ft.; 3500 ft. wide; 755 A;  
\$326,500; 1st Priority.

This piece of land adjoining the Santa Clara River marks the westerly end of the dunes that stretch for five miles to Hollywood-by-the-Sea. In its natural state most desirable for conservation and recreational uses, this section of the dunes is the site of an established oil drilling operation of unusual importance. The operating oil company is developing an elaborately worked out system for off-shore drilling of many wells from a few sites. It is possible that the public authorities - county, city or state - might be willing to buy the surface rights, leaving the mineral rights and oil leases undisturbed. On the other hand it should be possible to negotiate agreements whereby the oil company would arrange permanently to keep all drilling operations back from the beach at least 500 feet from the high-tide line, as now planned by the company.

By appropriate "house-keeping" and landscaping the beach front could be quite usable as a beach park, even so close to an oilfield.

Upon this basis the area is proposed for classification as an Oil Production area, but with the understanding that recreational use need not be excluded, and the area is recommended for First Priority acquisition.

28. McGrath Unit: 2750 ft.; 3800 ft. wide; 270 A;  
\$101,875; 1st Priority.

The sand dunes in this area are not large, but they are extensive, they are covered with interesting native plants and grass, and they are the only ones in Southern California south of the Pismo-Lompoc sector where they are still available for conservation and recreational use. For these reasons they offer opportunity for development of a major shoreline park unique in this part of the state where there is so much interest in the beaches.

The McGrath unit, extending from the present limit of oil drilling operations in the Gonzales Unit to West Fifth Street offers the only clear opportunity to preserve these dunes without complications. It is obvious that on a site of 270 acres, a complete park could be created with locations for all sorts of outdoor sports, camping and picnicking, as well as the usual beach swimming and sunning. The dunes add an important factor of scenic interest and protection from the wind, that make the proposal for a park here even more attractive.

These beaches too, are the closest to the rapidly growing City of Oxnard, as well as being very accessible from other parts of the county. Highway improvements contemplated by the Master Plan will further enhance their social value to people of the county and of the state.

On this reasoning, this site is recommended as a Beach Park for First Priority acquisition.

29. Mandalay Unit: 8750 ft.; 3000 ft. wide; 600 A;  
\$359,425; 1st Priority.

The third unit of the Santa Clara Dunes Park proposal, second largest in area, is unhampered by oil production, but is presently used, on lease, as a small arms range, by the United States Navy, in connection with the Port Hueneme Naval Reservation nearby. It is to be hoped that this use incompatible with public recreation, can be terminated, and that the property can become a public park. It has all of the advantage detailed for the McGrath Unit (28). Therefore it is similarly recommended as a Beach Park for First Priority acquisition.

30. Hollywood Beach Unit: 6029 ft.; 200 ft. wide; 27.5 A;  
\$120,000; County Owned.

This relatively narrow beach, in front of beach homes is now used mainly by neighborhood residents, without automobile parking space, toilets and life guard service which would attract people from elsewhere. If the Mandalay Unit of the Santa Clara Dunes Park becomes a reality, this beach could be more effectively operated than now, under a unified administration; it is assumed that it would be transferred to the State, if the State acquires the Dunes Park.

Because of its limited area and location in a neighborhood of homes this strip is designated for Beach Recreation use rather than Beach Park.

31. East Hollywood Beach Unit: 1000 ft.; 300 ft. wide; 6.9 A;  
\$36,000; 1st Priority.

A small segment of beach in front of Hollywood-by-the-Sea homes between Hollywood Beach and the entrance to the proposed new harbor, remains in private ownership. If the Santa Clara Dunes Park project is carried out this portion should be added to it. Otherwise it is of little public interest. In view of its possible addition to the larger park it is recommended for Beach Recreation use in First Priority for acquisition.

Summary: Santa Clara Dunes Beach Park.

It is intended that any part or all of locations 27-29 be considered for acquisition as a Dunes Park. If locations 27-31 inclusive are all acquired and combined the result will be a beach park site extending for 29,529 ft. or 5½ miles along a beautiful, broad, sandy beach, and having an area of more than 1600 acres, consisting of sand dunes unique in Southern California. The opportunities for development of a major shoreline park of unusual interest are great.

32. Hollywood-by-the-Sea Harbor: 550 ft.; 330 A; \$797,640;  
1st Priority.

This project, its initiation by the U. S. Army Engineers, and its function in contributing to a beach erosion correction program, has been outlined above. (II-3)

32. continued

Part of the proposal is to build an off-shore parallel breakwater to provide quiet water in which to operate a dredge from which sand can be pumped downcoast.

The project is included here as a bona-fide proposal of a competent authority.

Planned as a harbor for commercial shipping, it would doubtless attract many small pleasure craft incidentally but it might not qualify as a recreational harbor for acquisition by the State Park Commission. If legislation introduced in the legislature this year (A.B. 2939) is passed, the State through the Lands Commission, might be able to assist in the proposed development.

Construction of the harbor would require some significant highway changes, which have been discussed above and are indicated in the Master Plan. The most important of these is the absolute necessity of opening West Road, between the new harbor and the Port Hueneme Naval Reservation, in order to serve the easterly and southerly portions of the harbor itself and to create the only possible access road to the community of Silver Strand.

The site is designated for Boat Harbor use, and recommended for First Priority in acquisition. (If the harbor project is not carried out, the beach being in First Priority, can be acquired, for addition to the Santa Clara Dunes Park.)

33. West Silver Strand Beach: 400 ft.; 300 ft. wide;  
2.8 A; \$24,000; 1st Priority.

Similar to location 31, this beach, in front of houses, is classified for Beach Recreation use and recommended for First Priority acquisition mainly as an alternative. If the new harbor (32) is built this beach will remain used only by neighborhood residents. If the harbor is not built and the Santa Clara Dunes Park project is carried out this small property should be added to it.

34. Silver Strand Beach: 4500 ft.; 400 ft. wide; 41 A;  
\$129,000; County Owned.

This excellent county beach is used mainly only by local residents. If the harbor at Hollywood-by-the-Sea is built, the use of this beach will become restricted almost entirely to local residents, because

34. continued

of difficulty of access. If the harbor is not built and this beach should be added to the Santa Clara Dunes Park, its use would continue about as at present. It is classified for Beach Recreation use.

35. Port Hueneme Naval Reservation: 4300 ft.; Federally Owned.

Because of its military use, this shoreline is not available to the general public for recreation. Since the base appears to be a permanent use, this section is merely classified for Military use. If at some future time it appears that the base might be abandoned as a military reservation it would be desirable to amend the Master Plan to put this property into First Priority in acquisition, in order that as much of it as might be desired under the circumstances would then be eligible for such acquisition.

36. Port Hueneme Beach: 4900 ft.; 100-1000 ft. wide; 38 A; \$130,000; 1st Priority.

This section was formerly a flat, sandy beach, very popular for swimming, the sand extending oceanward for a width of 500 feet to 1000 feet. Stoppage of the littoral sand drift at the west Port Hueneme harbor jetty and consequent loss of beach sand for replenishment in this area has caused serious, rapid erosion with the result that the sand beach is now steep and only about 75 to 100 feet wide below the upland. (The width 100-1000 ft., in the heading, includes upland which would have to be used in conjunction with the sand beach in order to make the latter satisfactorily usable for recreation purposes.) Even now, less than a year since the last job of sand fill by dredging at Silver Strand, the mean high tide line has receded to approximately the same position as before the fill, and its steepness indicates that erosion is still taking place. The present Oxnard sewage disposal line empties into the ocean at the foot of Fourth St. Last year, unsatisfactory operation resulted in contamination and quarantine of the beach for swimming. Nevertheless, the beach continued to be popular, drawing people from Oxnard and much more distant points as well as the residents of Port Hueneme for whom it is the nearest beach. These people came to the beach only to discover that it was quarantined and unsafe for swimming.

36. continued

This condition will be corrected soon with the completion of the new Oxnard disposal plant at Ormond beach. The City of Port Hueneme is therefore deeply interested in restoring the status of a recreation beach, and to that end has taken a temporary (3-year) lease on most of the property, from the foot of Second Street to the west side of the Port Hueneme Sewage Disposal Plant. A small parking space has been temporarily surfaced on the upland at the foot of Fourth Street.

Because of the city's interest this parcel is proposed as a Beach Park area in First Priority for acquisition. In general, the proposal is to take all the property seaward of the Ventura County Railway right-of-way, from the Naval Base boundary to the easterly city limits, with a small parcel northerly of the railroad between 2nd and 3rd Streets. This acquisition would provide upland upon which can be developed adequate automobile parking space and such other recreational and landscaping features as the city may determine upon to create a useful waterfront park. The city is also interested in having constructed a fishing pier, approximately at the same location as an old shipping pier west of 2nd Street, and shown in the Master Plan as a "Proposed Pier"; property westerly of this pier and seaward of the railroad would be needed for automobile parking space, bait shop and perhaps other concessions performing recreational functions. Under present conditions of erosion this section of the proposed park would not have any sand beach, usable, for swimming, but the pier functions would give it public recreational value. The entire stretch is therefore recommended for First Priority.

37. Ormond Beach: 6900 ft.; 600 ft. wide; 119 A; \$324,000;  
City Owned.

The City of Oxnard owns this wide beach of small sand dunes, holding it as the site for a sewage disposal plant soon to be constructed. It is designated as a Sewage Disposal area. But sewage disposal will doubtless not require all of the area, and with as efficient operation of the plant as may properly be expected, the discharge of effluent into the ocean need not produce any offensive condition. Thus, while the property is classified for Sewage Disposal use, some recreational use of the beach need not be deemed to be prohibited. In the final analysis, any decision will be the responsibility of the Oxnard City Council.

38. East Ormond Beach: 5500 ft.; 200-600 ft. wide; 150 A;  
\$73,500; 1st Priority.

Looking ahead, probably beyond the twenty years of urban growth discussed in the section on Planned Urbanization, the probability of considerable urban development and a large population in the area east of Oxnard and Port Hueneme must be considered. With so much of the shoreline in the Port Hueneme area taken up by industry and military uses, very little remains available for recreation. This section is therefore proposed for 1st Priority acquisition, even though actual purchase might be delayed many years. Acquisition soon could probably be accomplished at a very low price. The eastern, wide part of the property, consisting of marsh could perhaps be improved by dredging for some kind of still water feature of landscaping and recreation, or left as marsh for a water-fowl preserve. In the meantime it is classified for Beach Recreation use.

Section C of Part VI

Mugu Section (East)

39. Mugu Naval Test Center: 26,800 ft.; 2500-14,200 ft. inland; 3,652 A; \$1,696,500; Federally Owned; 1st Priority.

This location includes only the major part of this naval base, which for purposes of this plan has been arbitrarily divided into two sections. This first section considered is the area where activities and physical improvements are located. The property is recommended for First Priority acquisition solely upon the premise that the United States may at some time terminate this naval use and relinquish the land to local government authorities. By putting it into First Priority now, we would make it eligible for use of State Park funds for acquisition, if the property ever does become available.

The land value given does not reflect present values of the site, nor the enormous investment the United States has made within it, and no attempt has been made to determine that investment. In case the site is abandoned for military use, most of the improvements will have only salvage value. The land value used here is an attempt to establish a value for the land and water areas comparable to that of other shoreline properties in the county and in the Master Plan.

This western part of the base is designated as for its present Military use. At the termination of that use it would be proper and perhaps necessary to amend the Master Plan to designate a recreation or Flood Plain use classification.

40. East End of Laguna Mugu: 7200 ft.; 0-1400 ft. wide; 577 A; \$499,400; Federally Owned; 1st Priority

This property is the eastern portion of Mugu Naval Test Center. It consists almost entirely of beach sand, water and marsh, and its use by the Navy at present is only nominal. The present proposal to make a Beach Park of it is based upon the hope that the United States - that is, the Navy - can be induced to release approximately this unused area for acquisition by the State Park

40. continued

Commission, while continuing Naval occupancy of the major western portion of the base.

Upon this property could be developed a magnificent Shoreline Park containing a variety of features: broad, sandy beaches, surf as well as still (warm) water bathing, boating, fishing, camping, general sports areas and water fowl conservation. All of this could be combined with adequate landscaping, against a background of imposing mountains and an intriguing foreground of lagoon and surf. The total effect would be much like the bird refuge at the entry to Santa Barbara, but on a vastly grander scale, a feature that is rarely found on the California coast.

With this purpose and reasoning this property is classified as Beach Park and recommended for First Priority acquisition. The land value set was determined upon the same basis as that for the western portion of the base, without regard to its value for its present naval use.

The ideal outcome, from the local, shoreline planning viewpoint would be eventual transformation of both portions of the base into one huge reservation and park. In such a case, large portions of the area could be kept in conservation uses, such as water-fowl refuges. There would also be room for still other features, possibly the creation of a pleasure boat harbor.

41. Pt. Mugu Beach: 7900 ft.; negligible width; \$200,000; 2nd Priority.

This stretch of rocky coast east of Pt. Mugu includes only very narrow, intermittent and variable beaches, where swimming and fishing are sometimes dangerous, and at best are only incidental use. Its highest and best use is obviously to serve as an element in a Scenic Highway. Because there is no other apparent use nor urgency it is recommended for Second Priority in acquisition.

42. La Jolla Canyon Beach: 6600 ft.; 0-300 ft. wide; with upland 600 ft. wide; 53 A; \$490,000; 1st Priority.

A beautiful beach lying between the Coast Highway and the ocean, is flanked at this point by one huge sand dune on the opposite side of the highway, that piles up some fifty feet above the highway against the mountain

42. continued

side. It is proposed that this dune area should be acquired along with the excellent beach, simply to have control over this nearly unique natural feature. (A similar, much higher formation is found on the westerly side of Pt. Dume in Los Angeles County, but it is not on the main highway and consequently not noticed by as many people.) Classified for Beach Recreation, this property is recommended for First Priority acquisition.

43. Sycamore Canyon Beach: 3800 ft.; 0-3400 ft. inland;  
135 A; \$201,500; First Priority.

This very well known spot is a favorite stopping place on the Coast Highway, where what amounts almost to a little village proves its attractiveness. A State Highway maintenance station is located in the canyon upland from the highway. An eating place, service station, a small fishing pier, a bait shop, trailer park and several other buildings serve the traveller in various ways.

The canyon on the opposite side of the highway offers an opportunity to provide space for camping, horseback riding, additional parking area and other recreation features that would make a beach park at this point considerably more useful than the beach alone. This would be somewhat comparable in function to Carrillo Beach, only five miles away in Los Angeles County, but on a very much smaller scale. This duplication of functions within such a short distance may reflect unfavorably upon this proposal, which, on the other hand, may be considered as a desirable extension of Carrillo Beach State Park. A resolution of this question will, of course, be a matter of policy for the State Park Commission to decide.

The entire property is recommended for First Priority acquisition as Beach Park.

44. Bass Rock Beach: 13,400 ft.; negligible width; \$342,000;  
2nd Priority.

This section, classified as Scenic Highway, is recommended for Second Priority acquisition.

45. Solromar Beach: 4000 ft.; 100-300 ft. wide; 18 A;  
\$260,000; 1st Priority.

On this broad beach, some of which lies as much as twenty-five feet above sea level, conditions appear to be safe for house building, and four houses have recently been built. As a matter of policy, however, it can be argued that the location of houses on this beach is contrary to public interest, and that the highest and best use of the land between the Coast Highway and the ocean is for public recreation. This beach, too, might be considered as an extension of Carrillo Beach State Park.

On this basis the Master Plan classifies this property for Beach Recreation use, and emphasizing the urgent need for early acquisition because of the pressure to locate houses here, recommends that the property be put in First Priority for acquisition.

46. County Line Beach: 5000 ft.; 100 ft. wide; 11.5 A;  
\$150,000; 2nd Priority.

For the most easterly mile in Ventura County, the Coast Highway lies approximately 600 feet inland, traversing a coastal mesa about 75 to 100 feet above sea-level, with a rather sharp bluff separating it from the beach below. The area between the highway and the edge of the bluff is eminently suitable for residential use, as already demonstrated by several subdivisions and a dozen or more houses. In an area of this kind not every lot or homesite can actually front on the beach, which then becomes a strictly private beach enjoyed, legally, by only those few owners whose property does run to the beach.

In order to make the beach available to all residents of the neighborhood, as at Silver Strand and Hollywood Beach, it is proposed that only the actual beach below the bluff, be acquired for public ownership and Beach Recreation use. As there would seem to be little urgency in this case, the property is recommended for Second Priority acquisition.

One minor purpose which public ownership of this beach would accomplish would be to join Carrillo Beach State Park, in Los Angeles County to Solromar Beach and Sycamore Canyon Beach Park.

46. continued

This joining would consist only in establishing a legal right for persons to walk along the beach, below the bluff, from one major beach area to another; considering the distance it is doubtful if this opportunity for walking would be exercised very often.

The real purpose of making this beach public is to assure right of its use to people living in the neighborhood. With no street access, no parking space and no visible evidence of it from the highway the general public would make virtually no use of it. But to ensure means of access to the beach, the county should require, as subdivision proceeds, dedication of occasional walkways from the streets of the mesa to the beach.

## PART VII

### Significance of the Master Plan of Shoreline Development

#### A - GENERAL NATURE OF PLAN

1. The primary significance of the Master Plan of Shoreline Development has been rather thoroughly explained in the preceding section. In summary, it was stated to be:

A statement of policy determining:

1. General land uses on the shoreline;
2. Type of development intended;
3. Accessibility;
4. Conservation measures;
5. Public safety;

and; a directive to the State Park Commission establishing certain items in First Priority, thus making them eligible for purchase by the State Park Commission.

2. It is the desire of the Planning Commission, however, to have the general public appreciate more fully all of the implications of the Plan as presented.

#### The Plan is Flexible.

3. First it must be understood that the Plan is general, not specific. Boundary lines of properties are not fixed with any precision. When a purchase is being negotiated it may be found advantageous to take somewhat more or less of a given property than would appear to be specified by the map or priority schedule.
4. Time will almost certainly change the cost factors, materially in many cases. The estimates of value given are the best that can be justified at the present time. They have been made by reference to recent purchases of beach property for State Highway right-of-way, and with the advice and opinion of several individuals who are

4. continued

well acquainted with land values in the county. Purchase may not occur for some years. Limits and areas of properties to be acquired may be changed. An appraisal made with greater effort toward exactitude at this time would be entirely inapplicable at the time of purchase, and the expense of such an appraisal now would be wasteful and unjustifiable.

5. Details, of the arrangement or design of beach parks are left for proper study at the time of development. Where details appear to have been indicated on the map (as at San Buenaventura Beach Park or the proposed Pierpont Harbor) they are not to be construed as final or definitive. They are shown in order to give a picture indication of the character of the development possible and anticipated under the proposal, where (as in these two cases) something is available to show the intention.

6. The development of San Buenaventura Beach Park is in the hands of the Division of State Beaches and Parks, whose personnel will prepare adequate detailed development plans, when various preliminary difficulties (such as title and exact Freeway alignment) are out of the way. The design is their job, and they have demonstrated in various instances that they are capable of handling it.

7. Various proposals will doubtless be made from time to time, for projects not specifically indicated at present. Any such projects, whether they comprise less or more than one item as shown here, may be fitted into the plan, and be precised and effectuated under its authority if they conform to the general standards and purposes of the plan.

The Plan May Be Amended.

8. Changing conditions may bring about different views of some aspects of the Plan. A property in 2nd or 3rd Priority may for some now unforeseen reason become extremely desirable. The Plan can be amended by regular process of planning law to change the priority schedule.

9. Proposals for some radically different use and treatment of some section of the shoreline may come up. If study and public hearings at that time determine that the new element would be of benefit to the community, the Plan can be legally amended to accomplish that purpose.

B - The Plan is a Recreation Facilities Plan.

10. Certainly the subject of greatest interest in the Shoreline Plan is the designation, reservation and development of beach areas for recreation. Recreation is not to be limited only to swimming and sun-bathing. The shoreline offers many other kinds of recreation. In some localities activities other than swimming and lounging on the beach assume very large importance. In Ventura County, however, some of the minor activities are negligible. There seems to be very little opportunity for what is termed "marine exploratory" activities: shell collecting, shell-fishing, goggling or skindiving.
11. But surf fishing is an important recreational activity, probably more important than in some other southern counties. Pier fishing and sport fishing might become more important with the construction of more piers and, particularly, harbors for small boats.
12. Camping at the beach could become a possibility at several of the sites designated in the plan.
13. The recreational features of sections of the beach are adequately discussed under the various site descriptions.
14. As a Recreation Plan, however, the Shoreline Plan is incomplete. It includes, of course, only a portion of a Master Plan for Recreation for the County of Ventura. Here as in the case of Highways, the shoreline is a good starting place from which to evolve a Master Plan. The shoreline exerts a powerful influence on living and travel habits. But recreation as such will probably not focus as much on the beach as highways do.

15. The climate of the Ventura-Oxnard area is so mild, with so little excess of heat, that it does not "drive" people to the beach. Beach patronage will derive mainly from the residents of the warmer inland valleys, Ojai, Santa Clara, Simi, Conejo and even the San Fernando Valley in Los Angeles.
16. Since we are anticipating a large metropolitan population on the Oxnard Plain and east of Ventura, the large demand for recreation facilities will not be adequately met by proposals of the Shoreline Plan. The people who will occupy this coastal area will need inland parks and play grounds within a mile or two of their homes, golf courses, equestrian trails, and other specialized kinds of parks, the same as any other urban population. Some of these can well be located within the Open Uses areas here designated. A larger total County population will also create a greater demand for mountain parks for camping and picnicking, fishing, hiking, skiing and other winter sports.
17. A good beginning has been made by the County in the latter category, but since the need for mountain parks will increase with population, plans should be made early to acquire the relatively inexpensive sites before they become developed for other, perhaps incompatible uses.
18. In case of parks and playgrounds to be located in future urban areas, the responsibility for acquisition and operation may not fall upon the County. Much of the new urban area will be included in cities, some still to be formed, which would assume that responsibility to their citizens. But the land at present is not within any city. Hence, it is the County's duty to establish a plan for parks in the first place, in order to assure that new urban areas, developing first perhaps as unincorporated communities, will have a balanced land use, and park areas, among other things, when they eventually come to be incorporated as cities or are annexed to some city.

#### C - The Plan is a Highway Plan

19. Although the emphasis has been put on the recreational features of the Plan, it is at the same time a Highway

19. continued

Plan. Highway proposals included within the plan boundary have the same standing and authority as the basis for precise plans, as if they had been proposed on a separate Master Plan of Highways. They are a framework, an integral part of the plan to make the shoreline usable and convenient for the people of the County and the State. To neglect the development of these highways would be to leave the beach areas inadequately served, in which case the recreational advantages of the Plan's proposals would be impaired.

20. The Plan contemplates large investment by the State and local jurisdictions in development of these recreational areas. This investment cannot be wholly justified unless the accessibility implied by the highway portion of the Plan is provided.

21. The highway phase of the Plan, also, must be regarded as general, and as flexible as other portions. Alinements are not fixed to precise lines; indeed no widths are even indicated. As in case of all Master Plans, this one should be followed up by precise plans for each road or highway as the need for acquisition of right-of-way and improvement occurs.

22. Again, in this phase, adoption of the Master Plan, lays out an assignment for certain further work for the Planning Commission to undertake in cooperation with other county departments. Highways and roads that are integral parts of the Master Plan are listed in the following paragraph.

23. Highway and Road Elements of the Master Plan for Shoreline Development.

1. The Coast Highway and proposed Freeway sections from the Santa Barbara County Boundary to the westerly boundary of San Buenaventura;
2. The present Coast Highway as a service road for the beaches from Conoco to the overpass at Solimar Point; (See III-6; VI-8,18 incl.)
3. A service road parallel and adjacent to the S.P.R.R. from Solimar Point to the Ventura River; (See VI-20)

23. continued

4. The Freeway where it lies within San Buenaventura Beach State Park, and easterly to the Plan Boundary, at Vista del Mar;
5. Vista del Mar and alternate extensions, from Seaward Ave. to Oxnard Road, or via McGrath Road at West Fifth St.;
6. Roads shown within the Pierpont Harbor Proposal. (See VI-25)
7. Beach Road, from Oxnard Road northwesterly, and its extension northwesterly to an intersection with the Vista del Mar extension at the Santa Clara River.
8. North Road extension, where it lies within the plan boundary.
9. Roads in the Hollywood-by-the-Sea Harbor Project: (See III-29; VI-32)
  - (a) West Road from Oxnard Rd. to Ocean Dr., Silver Strand;
  - (b) Unnamed curved extension of Vista del Mar;
  - (c) Unnamed road along westerly boundary of harbor project;
10. Saviers Rd. extension from Ventura Co. Ry. to Arnold Rd.;
11. Arnold Rd. from the beach to the Plan Boundary;
12. Casper Road and extension from Arnold Rd. to U. S. Highway 101 Alternate;
13. U. S. Highway 101 Alternate, proposed freeway section and divided highway section from plan boundary, northerly corner of Pt. Mugu Naval Base, to the Los Angeles County Boundary.

The maps clearly show these highway links, as well as their extension beyond the limits of this plan. The effectiveness of this feature of the plan will depend, in part, upon incorporation of these proposals into a Master Plan of Highways for the entire county.

D - The Plan is a Land Use Plan.

24. Important as recreation aspects of the plan appear, the truly basic, and most significant aspect of the plan is its function as a Master Plan of Land Use. Applying only to that narrow strip along the ocean called the Shoreline, it nevertheless constitutes a segment of the Land Use plan for the County which has a significance all out of proportion to the small area that it covers.
25. The Master Plan of Shoreline Development is a plan for the utilization of the shoreline area, not merely a recreation plan. \* In this plan for utilization Recreation is one of the Land Uses considered. The Plan indicates in no uncertain terms, broad land uses for which the various sections of the included territory are best suited. In addition to (1) recreational uses indicated rather generally throughout the area, locations are designated for:
  - (2)- Residential use;
  - (3)- Petroleum production, specifically designated because of certain characteristics that differentiate it from industry in general;
  - (4)- Boat harbor, including fishing; and
  - (5)- Military uses.
26. These five land uses are familiar urban land use categories. The plan goes a step farther and proposes a sixth, less familiar, broad classification called Open Uses, which includes the recreational uses within a much broader class. It groups together certain appropriate uses for land of considerable variety of physical and environmental conditions and influences, and provides for a number of uses that may seem in some instances to be incompatible.

\* For this reason it is proposed that this amended plan be adopted as a Master Plan of Shoreline Development, not merely a section of a Master Plan for Recreation, as was the case in the adoption of the 1941 and 1946 plans.

27. But no matter what the variety of permitted uses, or differences in physical condition, the various pieces of land proposed for Open Use Zoning always have one feature in common:

the land is unsafe or unsuitable, for one or more reasons, for residential occupancy, and for intensive coverage by buildings, or, in some cases for places of public (indoor) assembly.

28. The purpose of designating use zones in any Open Use category is largely to promote public safety, sanitation, health and general welfare by prohibiting the construction and occupancy of homes and places of assembly in areas which are unsafe, or in some cases unsuitable merely because of an established land use policy recognizing community needs. The working out of such zones consists in determining then what uses shall be permitted, and under what conditions. The designation of permitted uses changes the force of the regulation from prohibitory to permissive, re-establishes an economic value based upon appropriate use, and thus enables an owner to plan confidently for use of the property, including buying, selling and renting.

29. The Master Plan of Shoreline Development is a land use plan setting up six categories of land use. These uses are all broad, without specific regulations such as are contained in a zoning ordinance. They are enforceable only by following up with zoning ordinances, based upon the Master Plan, and prepared and adopted by the regular processes of zoning law, or by purchase of land needed for public uses. The preparation of such zoning plans - maps and text - will require the same careful study and delineation as any other zoning plans. They must be adopted only after holding the required public hearings, following the democratic process of acquainting the interested public with the proposals and regulations, and determining the public interest in each case.

30. Because so much attention to land uses other than recreation has been indicated in this Master Plan it seems necessary to clarify the meaning of the several categories by a somewhat detailed discussion.

#### Residential Uses.

31. There are at five different sites on the Rincon (locations 1, 3, 7, 13 and 16) sections of beach (between the highway and the high-tide line) where the land, being high enough above the ocean, is occupied by numbers of houses. These houses, constitute an established use and give these sections a residential character. The fact that many have been there for many years establishes that the location is safe for residential use under reasonably typical conditions.
32. There are other sections, however, where the beach is much narrower and at a lower elevation where danger to houses (or other structures) from attack by ocean waves is serious and frequent. In these locations building of houses (and nearly all other buildings, except in unusual circumstances) should be prohibited.
33. Thus we have a clear case demonstrating the propriety of placing certain property on the beach such as locations 1, 3, 7, 13 and 16 in a residential zone, and placing certain other beach properties in a zone that prohibits dwellings.
34. Unfortunately the issue is not always so clear. There are other areas where although the land is high enough to make building reasonably safe from wave action, public welfare indicates that it should be devoted to public recreation use. It is within the authority of the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to determine the "highest and best use" of a given district or section of the community, and this determination can be made - indeed must often be made - solely on the basis of community needs, since physical differences will frequently be lacking.
35. This principle is repeatedly demonstrated in determining zone boundaries within the familiar urban setting of streets, lots and blocks on level land where there are no physical differences in the land to differentiate the function of one lot from another. In these cases the decision between one class of use and another is made solely on the basis of community need and practice.

36. In still other cases land is high enough to be safe, but consists of such a narrow strip between the highway and the ocean, that building could be accomplished only by crowding the highway and blocking the ocean view. In most of such cases the beach is very narrow, and rocky, so that it is not suitable for intensive use for swimming. These sections are designated as Scenic Highway in the Master Plan; a zoning ordinance should place these sections in an Open Use zone which will prevent building and permit little else than limited recreation, including fishing.
37. The Master Plan therefore designates certain portions of the plan as areas suitable or unsuitable for residence. It does not specify what class of residence is to be required, what set-backs or side-yard restrictions or height limits, are to be established. Those are functions of the detailed zoning ordinance which should follow, and may legally be based upon the authority of the Master Plan. And the designation as residence property is not enforceable until such a zoning ordinance has been adopted.
38. It must be realized also that the "Residential" classification in the Master Plan means "predominantly residential". Some other urban uses such as necessary stores, restaurants, gasoline stations or motels may prove in time to be needed at some points within these residential areas. The preparation and adoption of a detailed zoning ordinance would make due provision for such other uses along with strictly residential uses.

#### Industrial Use.

39. No industrial use areas (except Oil Production) are found within the limits of this Master Plan.

#### Sewage Disposal.

40. (This operation is regarded as a particular type of Open Use.) Three sewage disposal plant areas are indicated on the map. Each of these lies within the limits of the city operating or proposing to operate the plant. The zoning ordinance in each case, then, which would properly designate such a land use will be the responsibility

40. continued

of the City rather than the County. The situation at Ormond Beach, Oxnard, is not made altogether clear by the Master Plan Map. The ocean frontage of 6900 feet will certainly not all be needed for the sewage treatment plant and disposal purposes. With proper efficient operation the disposal of the effluent into the ocean should not create any problem of contamination, or even prejudice against use of the major portion of the beach, for bathing and general recreational purposes. A decision and policy on this matter is, of course, the responsibility of the City of Oxnard.

41. The plant at Port Hueneme is located within the area described as location No. 36 (Part VI). Adjacent to proposed recreational beach, it nevertheless appears to present no problem, as its operation has been entirely satisfactory.

42. The San Buenaventura plant is the only such use on the beach in its vicinity, although several oil tanks, marine oil pipe lines and the railroad nearby give the district immediately above the beach a slightly industrial character. The operation of the plant does not seem to interfere in any way with recreational use of the beach. The property, along with the Fair Grounds and Ball Park is in an R-4 zone at present. (See VI - 23)

#### Oil Production.

43. Locations 5 and 27 represent a special kind of industry. Oil production must be located where the oil is found. The Master Plan of Shoreline Development recognizes this, as well as the fact that oil drilling is already legally established at these locations. (It would be perfectly legal, if an incompatible "higher and better use" were found to be more in the public interest, to place such property in a zone excluding oil wells, as has infrequently been done in case of rapidly declining fields. But the Master Plan does not contemplate any such change.) When the beach area is zoned, oil drilling in these locations should be placed in a zone permitting oil drilling, or given whatever other legal status is appropriate under the zoning ordinance.

Military Use.

44. The two military establishments should also be placed in whatever zone will permit the continued use of their present activities, although since Federal government properties are not to be legally bound by local ordinances, this is a purely theoretical exercise of zoning authority. Nevertheless, the zoning of such establishments should be as realistic as possible in order to be consistent with and support the validity of zoning classifications in adjacent or nearby property.
45. The foregoing paragraph applies to the developed, used portions of these properties. At Port Hueneme it applies to the entire base, but at Mugu Naval Test Center there are large areas within the base boundaries, consisting of water, marsh and "unused" low level, land. By "unused" is here meant "unoccupied by buildings or other improvements of permanent nature". As long as the Navy maintains this land for its present purposes, it is part of the necessary land use of the base. But if this land should pass out of military ownership and use, it would constitute vacant unused land. This vacant land, virtually all below the 10-foot contour should be regarded as suitable only for Open Use. Most of the Center property, therefore, if not all, should be placed in an Open Use zone. This action would not interfere with the Navy's continued use of the property. But if the land passes into private ownership, it would be already zoned for its "highest and best use".

Boat Harbors.

46. One existing harbor is shown in the plan but designated as for Military Use, merely recognizing its present status. Sites for two proposed harbors, one recreational, the other commercial, are included and designated for Harbor use. Thus the land which would eventually be replaced by water, plus the land to remain abutting upon the water area to be created, is placed in a Land Use category that directs its development.

47. As financial programs approach solution, and construction becomes imminent, and on the basis of final construction plans, the land abutting on the water should be zoned in detail, using such zones for residential, commercial, industrial and recreational uses as will best point to the agreed upon objectives of each project.

Open Use Zones.

48. Some of the factors leading to the proposal of Open Use Zones have been referred to above, (par. 26-29; 32-35) where the discussion was limited mainly to the conditions which show the need for prohibiting certain land uses. The more positive aspect, the determination of uses to be permitted, needs a full discussion. In the first place Open Use zones are defined as those in which for a variety of reasons the land is "unsafe or unsuitable" for:

residence;  
some kinds of industry;  
some kinds of business; and  
some kinds of agriculture.

49. The reasons for such determination may arise from a number of conditions, the principal ones being classified about as follows:

1. Unfavorable topography: low elevation above sealevel or river-level, and therefore subject to some form of damage by water; or terrain too steep or rough for economic development;
2. Soil conditions; alkaline, sterile or rocky;
3. Difficulty of drainage (closely related to topography)
4. Existing uses: those that create: hazards to life and property, noise, objectionable fumes or odors, and unsightly conditions, (examples: airports, gun clubs, shooting ranges, oil-fields and refineries);

50. Not all of these factors will apply in all cases, but they may occur singly or in any combination, so as to make a given location unsuitable for ordinary building and human occupancy.

51. Depending upon which factors determine this condition the uses that can be permitted will also vary from place to place within the broadly defined Open Use areas. In general, appropriate uses can be outlined as:

1. Land uses requiring little or no coverage by buildings;
2. Enterprises or activities undisturbed by poor drainage or occasional flooding;
3. Enterprises actually requiring flooding or very high ground-water level (such as duck-ponds, frog farms, rice growing, etc.)
4. Land uses requiring no need for permanent residence, or places of public indoor assembly.
5. Land uses themselves little disturbed by hazardous or objectionable environment, and perhaps having some objectionable character themselves.

52. Careful study of land uses in the community will show that in spite of the generally prohibitory character of the proposed Open Use regulation, there is a surprisingly long list of land uses that could be permitted under the above outline.

53. Logically, Open Uses would fall into at least three zones of rather definite character:

1. Areas unsafe because of some kind of danger from water, usually referred to as Flood Plain Zoning;
2. Areas where the conservation of some natural resource, such as water supply, wild-life, forest, scenic features, or recreation areas, has been determined to constitute the "highest and best use" in the public interest, and

53. continued

3. Areas unsuitable for intensive occupancy because of some other kind of danger to life and property or because of fumes, noise or odors from other legally established uses.

54. In order to give an idea of the variety of permitted uses that would be included in these three categories the following incomplete list groups uses under the three headings. Many of these are now found on the land included in this Master Plan, as indicated by asterisks.

Table of Permitted Open Uses.

1.	2.	3.
Flood Plain Zone	Conservation Zone	Limited Open Use Zone (Unfavorable Environment)
Water-works, Reservoirs	Waterworks, Reservoirs	
Spreading Grounds,	Spreading Grounds	
*Flood Control Works	*Flood Control Works	
Waterfowl Refuges	Waterfowl Refuges	
Natural Park, Primitive Area	Natural Park, Primitive Area	
Willow Work-Fabrication		
Frog Farm	Frog Farm	
Trout Farm	Trout Farm	
Fishing; Stocked Pools	Fishing; Stocked Pools	
Fish Hatcheries	Fish Hatcheries	
Equestrian Trails (Stables on higher ground)	Equestrian Trails	
Camping area (under supervision)	Camping area (under supervision)	
Picnic Area	Picnic Area	
Archery Course	Archery Course	
Polo Field		
*Recreation Beach	*Recreation Beach	
*Golf Course (club house on higher ground)	*Golf Course	
Driving Range		
Miniature Golf		

Table of Permitted Open Uses. (continued)

(continued) Flood Plain Zone	(continued) Conservation Zone	Limited Open Use Zone (Unfavorable Environment)
*Gun Club		*Gun Club
Skeet Club		Skeet Club
Farming (no residence)		
Seasonal Grazing (no dairies)	Seasonal Grazing	
Nurseries	Nurseries	Nurseries
*Radio-T.V.-Transmitters	*Radio-T.V.-Transmit- ters	*Radio-T.V.- Trans- mitters, (if not hazard to airport)
Temporary Construction Camp	Temporary Construction Camp	Temporary Construc- tion Camp
*Gravel & Sand Quarrying, Washing		*Gravel & Sand Quarrying & Washing
*Oil Wells	*Oil Wells	*Oil Wells and Re- fining
	Cemetery	Cemetery
	Automobile Service Sta.	Automobile Service Sta.
	Automobile Parking (Incidental to other use)	Automobile Parking (Incidental to other use)
	Restaurant	Restaurants
	Hiking Trails	
	Shell & Stone Collec- tion and Jewelry Fab- rication	
	Residence strictly incidental to above uses, (As care-takers house, or home of pro- prietor of a permitted business.)	Rifle & Pistol Range
		Animal Hospitals
		Pet Cemetery
		Automobile Race Track
		Outdoor Skating Rink
		Electric Power Station
		Chemical Mfg. & Storage. (Paint, Explosives, Soap, Fertilizer) if on isolated site.

Table of Permitted Open Uses. (continued)

Limited Open Use  
Zone (Unfavorable  
Environment)

\*Dump, Disposal  
Area (under regu-  
lation)  
Incinerator  
\*Airport  
Model Airport  
(for Miniature  
planes)  
Automobile Wreck-  
ing (under regula-  
tion)  
Industrial Salvage

\* Uses now found in Open Use Areas designated in the Master Plan.

55. In the framing of a zoning ordinance, these listed uses would require careful definition, and some permitted uses would have to be regulated with certain limitations, a few of which have been suggested in the list. For example, in open fields in a Flood Plain Zone, grazing during good pasture season would be a perfectly legitimate use, but it would only be good husbandry to corral the herd on higher ground during periods of flood. But from the public safety viewpoint animals should not be herded intensively as in a typical dairy, in a flood zone where drainage may be inadequate for extensive periods and where contamination of ground water could be a factor. Therefore "seasonal grazing" of natural pasture would be a permitted use, but the operation of a "dairy," with concentrated corral feeding would not be permitted.

56. Also it is most important to remember that these zones are intended to be applied to privately held land. Because many of the uses permitted are often carried on by public agencies or on public land, the reader is likely to assume that such a use as Golf Course or Fishing is intended to refer to these recreations at public

56. continued

parks. But this type of zoning is intended to give the owner of the land the right (among others) to provide such activities as a business: he may charge admission, or so-much per fish caught; he may rent equipment such as beach umbrellas, tents, golf clubs, and so on. A moment's reflection will recall any number of similar services run as businesses at various resorts of all sorts.

Recreation.

57. The beaches constitute a special example of Open Use which may be thought of as existing within either a Flood Plain Zone or a Conservation Zone. Since it is desirable to stress the recreation uses on the beach, it would be well to use a fourth category "Beach Recreation Zone". In this zone private or public owners would be permitted to provide any appropriate facilities to accomodate the beach public, as a business enterprise if desired.

58. It must be made perfectly clear that such a Beach Recreation Zone is established not for the purpose of holding it unused or at low value pending decision by some public body to buy the land, but rather, and definitely, to direct that the land be used for those purposes established by the Master Plan as "highest and best in the public interest" whether it is in private or public ownership. As a matter of fact such development of beach properties for appropriate recreational uses, with proper improvements, landscaping, parking space, and service facilities, would doubtless raise the land value far above the raw land value. An example of this kind of development is to be found on the Malibu in Los Angeles County at Paradise Cove, where private ownership has developed a shoreline park of great usefulness with a variety of services, very satisfactorily fulfilling a genuinely public purpose in harmony with the Master Plan, and as a business. Should the County or State now proceed to buy this property, the cost would be much greater than before the development began. In such a case the County or State would be justified in paying this much higher price because it would be getting an appropriately improved property instead of raw land, and subsequent development costs would be saved.

59. Thus the establishment of the various Open Use Zones is seen to be a directive, permissive exercise of zoning as clearly as in the familiar urban use zones. The purpose is to organize and regularize the development of certain sections of the County for the benefit of the community as a whole, while demonstrating and guarding the rights of the individual land owners.
60. The Master Plan extends the plan of land use over not only those beach parcels set up in the Priority list, but also over some of the contiguous lands back of the beach.
61. Along the beach the symbols used to identify the locations considered for acquisition designate by an initial the land use contemplated in each case. That land use will not become a legally effective regulation unless zoning ordinances are adopted. These symbols point out the general nature of the zoning which should be applied. The intention in using these symbols is briefly outlined in the following few paragraphs.
62. R. Those properties designated by R are intended to be put usually into some residential zone. The determination of the particular class of residence, along with such matters as setback, height limit, etc., are left for determination under the established zoning process, in which the residents and owners concerned will have a voice, through public hearings, in determining the details. The need for some commercial use sites within such "Residential" areas can also be met by detailed zoning.
63. Y. The symbol Y, indicating yacht, or small boat, harbor, presents a rather special case in this Master Plan. In many cases, the activities in a recreational harbor would all be accommodated in a recreation use zone. But in the case of the two harbor projects proposed here there must be provisions for a greater variety of uses. At Pierpont Bay Harbor, the land abutting the water front should be variously zoned for beach recreation, residential, commercial and industrial (i.e. boat building and repair) uses. The plan submitted by the Ventura Port District indicates these various sections very clearly.

63. continued.

At Hollywood-by-the-Sea the land between the waterfront and the nearest road should be zoned for harbor industrial uses including business. Determination of the appropriate land use for the remainder of the site will have to be made at the time detailed zoning is undertaken, when the harbor plans will have been completely worked out.

64. The other symbols all indicate uses which should be included in some Open Use Zone.

65. P, A, B. In general the beaches themselves could obviously fall into a Flood Plain Zone. But since the land attached to the beach does not always come into that category another classification, Beach Recreation Zone should be used in many cases, and the zoning ordinance will be stronger if this more accurate classification is used generally.

Thus, locations marked

P for Beach Park

A for Angling

B for Bathing

should generally be considered for regulation in a Beach Recreation Zone,\* but with somewhat different regulations in each case.

\* Exactly this sort of Beach Recreation Zone was included in a Zoning ordinance of the City of Manhatten Beach a few years ago. Its validity was tested and upheld by a suit contesting awards under condemnation a few years later. Appeal to the California Supreme Court resulted in a decision upholding the decision of the lower court, and the validity of the ordinance. The case is an important one in establishing the legality of the basis for this type of zoning. (See McCarthy vs. City of Manhatten Beach, (1953, 41 C. 2nd 879)

66. H designates Scenic Highway. At these locations the beach is too narrow and subject to wave action to be useful for any purpose except incidental swimming, beach-combing and fishing. Its principal function is simply to be there as part of the view over the ocean. This property could well be put in the Flood Plain Zone, but it could as well be justified in the Conservation Zone. In either case most of the permitted uses listed above would not be applicable. The most important aspect at these locations would be the prohibitory effects of the zone.
67. F, indicating Flood Control, is used only at the mouths of the Ventura and Santa Clara Rivers. The former is now in public ownership, the latter still to be acquired. It is an obvious location where Flood Plain zoning should be applied.
68. D, Sewage Disposal, indicated by D, occurs at three places, all in incorporated cities, and has been discussed above.
69. O. Oil Production, designated on the map by O, occurs at two locations. In both cases it would be proper to place them in the third class of Open Use, a zone that approaches industrial character.
70. M. The zoning to be applied in Military Use areas has been discussed above. In summary, it may be repeated that at the Port Hueneme Naval Reservation, various ordinary, urban use zones would be applicable. At Mugu, the "vacant land" should be placed in a Flood Plain Zone. The intensively used portion might be placed in an Industrial Zone, if it seems desirable at the time it comes under actual consideration.
71. In all of these designations of beach properties, the program for eventual purchase of the land by some public agency, assumes the fulfilling of this Land Use planning by such public acquisition. The land use designated would continue permanently after acquisition.

72. Landward of all of the properties just discussed are various pieces of land of considerable variety in character and extent, which are included within the boundary of the Plan. Some of these areas are marked "Recommended Open Use Zone".

73. On the Rincon, a 1000-foot strip northerly from the railroad, and easterly of Pt. Mugu a 1000-ft. strip northerly of the highway consists mainly of rugged mountain slopes that could be covered only by a Conservation Zone (that is, conservation of scenic resources would be the principal basis for applying an Open Use Zone here). It must be understood, however, that in applying detailed zoning under an ordinance some of the less rugged portions, suitable for development and buildings, as at La Conchita, for example, would have to be sorted out and placed in appropriate residential or commercial zones, or, in case of oil development, in some Industrial or Open Use Zone.

74. Along the Santa Clara River a very large area is designated for Open Use Zone. This includes both Flood Plain Zoning, where large portions of the land are not measurably higher than the bed of the river and an "environmental" Zone area between the airport and the oilfields. The suggested uses to be permitted in the two types of zone are quite typical of the land uses now found in these areas: gun clubs, golf course, oilwells, sand and gravel production and airport, as well as "natural" willow growth along the bed of the stream. It offers an excellent opportunity to maintain a large area of open "breathing" space between the rapidly urbanizing districts between Ventura and Oxnard. One advantage of regulating such land as this by zoning is that investment in flood control works to protect unwisely located "improvements" will be either eliminated or reduced.

75. Adjoining Mugu Naval Test Center is another extensive area included within the plan boundary and suggested for Flood Plain Zoning. This land all lies below the 10-foot contour line, as much as three miles from the ocean. It may not be subject to flooding in the sense of moving or flash-floods, but drainage is obviously inadequate for many purposes. It is characterized by marsh, gun clubs, and duck-ponds.

76. Inclusion of as much of this area as is actually deficient in drainage, along with the Mugu Test Center property in a Flood Plain Zone would be a proper use of the police power and would be in the public interest.

77. In summation the various pieces of land included in the Master Plan of Shoreline Development are tabulated below showing the Land Use indicated on the map and the type of detailed zoning contemplated thereby for future enactment.

#### Beach Property

Location	Name	Symbol	Meaning of Symbol	Recommended
1	Rincon Point	R	Residence	Residence
2	La Conchita Beach	H	Scenic Highway	Conservation
3	Punta Gorda	R	Residence	Residence
4	Mussel Shoal	H	Scenic Hwy.	Conservation
5	Conoco	O	Oil Production	Limited Open Use
6	County Park No. 5	B	Bathing Beach	Beach Recreation
7	Sea Cliff	R	Residence	Residence
8	West Rincon Beach	B	Bathing Beach	Beach Recreation
9	County Park No. 4	B	Bathing Beach	Beach Recreation
10	East Rincon Beach	H	Scenic Highway	Conservation
11	Padre Juan Beach	B	Bathing Beach	Beach Recreation
12	County Park No. 3	B	Bathing Beach	Beach Recreation
13	Pitas Point	R	Residence	Residence
14	West Dulah Beach	H	Scenic Hwy.	Conservation
15	East Dulah Beach	B	Bathing Beach	Beach Recreation

Beach Property (continued)

16	Solimar	R	Residence	Residence
17	East Solimar Beach	H	Scenic Hwy.	Conservation
18	San Miguelito Beach	B	Bathing Beach	Beach Recreation
19	Fishermen's Beach	A	Fishing	Conservation
20	Taylor Beach	P	Bathing Beach	Beach Recreation
21	Ventura River	F	Flood Control	Conservation
22	Fair Grounds	P	Beach Park	(now R-4) Beach Recreation
23	Ventura Sewage Disposal Plant	D	Sewage Disposal	(now R-4) Beach Recreation (non-conforming use)
24	San Buenaventura Beach State Park	P	Beach Park	(now R-1) Beach Recreation
25	Pierpont Harbor	Y	Boat Harbor	(now partly R-1) Mixed Urban Uses
26	Sta. Clara River	F	Flood Control	Conservation
27	Gonzales Unit	Santa O	Oil Production	Limited Open Use
28	McGrath Unit	Clara P	Beach Park	Beach Recreation
29	Mandalay Unit	Dunes P	Beach Park	Beach Recreation
30	Hollywood Beach Unit	Beach B	Bathing Beach	Beach Recreation
31	East Hollywood Beach Unit	Park B	Bathing Beach	Beach Recreation
32	Hollywood-by-the-Sea	Y	Boat Harbor	Commercial & Industrial (part now zoned) (R-B, R-A, C-1, C-2)
33	West Silver Strand Beach	B	Bathing Beach	Beach Recreation

34	Silver Strand Beach	B	Bathing Beach	Beach Recreation
35	Port Hueneme Naval Reservation	M	Military Use	Various Urban Uses
36	Port Hueneme Beach	B	Beach Park	Beach Recreation
37	Ormond Beach	D	Sewage Disposal	Conservation and Beach Recreation
38	East Ormond Beach	B	Bathing Beach	Beach Recreation
39	Mugu Naval Test Center, West Part	M	Military Use	Industrial and Open Use
40	Mugu Naval Test Center, East Part	P	Beach Park	Beach Recreation
41	Pt. Mugu Beach	H	Scenic Hwy.	Conservation
42	La Jolla Canyon Beach	B	Bathing Beach	Beach Recreation
43	Sycamore Canyon Beach	P	Beach Park	Beach Recreation
44	Bass Rock Beach	H	Scenic Hwy.	Conservation
45	Solromar Beach	B	Bathing Beach	Beach Recreation
46	County Line Beach	B	Bathing Beach	Beach Recreation

Unnumbered Upland Locations

1000-ft. strip n'ly of R.R. - Sta. Barbara County to boundary of San Buenaventura	Conservation (with small areas in Residential and Commercial Zones, as at La Conchita.)
Between S. Buenaventura Beach Park, Vista del Mar, and Pierpont Blvd. (contains airpark & radio towers)	Limited Open Uses

Unnumbered Upland Locations (continued)

Between Pierpont Blvd. and beach (partly in the City of San Buenaventura)	R	Residential (Portion in S. Buenaventura now zoned R-1, R-2)
Santa Clara River bottom Vista del Mar extension to S.P.R.R. (N'ly and S'ly boundaries to be de- termined by detail studies)		Flood Plain
Santa Clara River to West Fifth St. Vista del Mar extension to Plan Boundary		Limited Open Uses
Land between Ormond Beach Mugu Naval Test Center and Plan boundary		Open Use
Land between Hollywood Beach and Proposed Harbor (partly unzoned)	R	(now C-1 & R-B) Residential and Commercial
Silver Strand Subdivision	R	(now C-1 & R-B) Commercial and Residential.

## PART VIII

### Summary

1. The factors and sections of the community examined in preparation of the Master Plan of Shoreline Development demonstrate the increasing need for directing Ventura County's growth at this particular time. The plan offered outlines practical steps for providing such direction, with effects and implications that go far beyond the narrow limits of the shoreline itself.
2. In brief, adoption and adherence to the plan, and implementation of it by all of the means implicit in the plan, should lead to orderly accomplishment somewhat as follows:
  1. A plan of land use for the Shoreline itself, as bounded, will have been established.
  2. Of most direct importance, recreational area reservations of state-wide as well as local interest will have been proposed in definite form.
  3. Other land use patterns will have established a basis for detailed zoning which can assure many features of the plan.
  4. A program for acquisition of beach parks with the assistance of the State Park Commission will have been definitely put into operation.
  5. A program of highway organization will have been begun which draws together a number of proposals not previously recognized as related, and which are of tremendous importance to the people of Ventura County as well as the thousands of newcomers expected during the next two or three decades.
  6. By making all of these proposals effective through vigorous and steady adherence to the plan, an urban setting approaching metropolitan proportions will result that offers a much larger population a healthful, convenient, interesting community situation in which to live.

3. Beyond this immediate result it is to be hoped that the plan will result, being a starting point, in bringing about early completion of county-wide Master Plans for highways, land use and recreation, upon which can be based somewhat more detailed plans for recreation and community design.
4. Again it must be emphasized that the adoption of the Master Plan of Shoreline Development accomplishes (with one exception) nothing unless it is followed up by other actions such as the adoption of precise plans for land use (zoning ordinance), for highways and for recreation. The one exception is that the beach acquisition program can go forward on the basis of the Master Plan, dependent on the policies of the State Park Commission, the Board of Supervisors and the City Councils of the coast cities.
5. It is recommended that an amendment of the Master Plan of Shoreline Development, taking account of Anacapa and San Nicholas Islands which are part of Ventura County, be developed within a reasonable time. These islands are omitted from the plan at this time through lack of time for any serious investigation or proper consideration of these interesting islands.