

STUDY AREA SHEETS

Study Area 1

[no comments]

Study Area 2

Development in/near existing groundwater depressions needs to be designed with those issues in mind → Policy

Keefer Slough/Rock Creek: Septic/sewage disposal standards (*unreadable*) located in the floodplain
Migration of septic/sewage into water stream

Study Area 3

Erma Dean TTEE in favor of Alternative 2!

Ed Dean/Sarah Dean – I am in favor of Alternative 2. Farming is becoming harder and harder due to surrounding housing. We would like to have the choice to do as we wish with property.

Marty Luger & Denica Luger: I strongly favor Alternative 2. It is very difficult to farm our trees (with dust & spraying) with neighbors all around – economically it is a dead-end to replant.

Rachel Luger in favor of Alternative 2

Marshall Thompson, property owner, Bell Muir. My family supports Alternative 2

Joe & Patty McArdle, property owner, Bell Muir, supports Alternative 2

Doris & Jeff Schell – Rodeo Avenue – we have reviewed the there alternatives and find Alternative 2 to be the best for the Bell Muir area. Due to the improvements needed, Alternative 2 would be the best to pay for the improvements.

STUDY AREA SHEETS

Ron & Marilyn Magoon, owner, Bell Muir in favor of Alternative 2

Bopbn & Diane Contreras support Alternative 2

Nick/Terry Andrew – definitely no mix uses, but I like 1 to ½ acre lots for residential; support Alternative 3

Bob & Leeanne Kromer – we strongly support Alternative 2

Bell Muir Neighborhood Assoc. – 50+ property owners – 200+ acres – provided signed petition in support of development. Straw vote 3/27/08 100% in favor of Alternative 2. See petition provided to Pete Calarco, Assistant Director. Call Marshal Thompson (530) 570-1698 for more info.

Julia Jenkins – Alternative 2 is preferable

Kelly Brown supports Alternative 2

Take the Easton Road extension into considering the boundary of Area 3

Mark McCammish (*sp?*)-- yes on Alternative 2

Study Area 4

No on Alternative 1

No development, no water

None of these alternatives work. Please no development because there's no water. Please no logging (timber) unless it's sustainable harvesting.

STUDY AREA SHEETS

Study Area 5

No change to this area. Maintain Alternative 1. I am a land owner.

Until water issues and emergency/transportation routes are improved, no change should be made to the area

Air quality must be considered, addressed, improved today and going forward. Alternative 2 appears to be the one for serious consideration.

No development, no logging

The 3 40-acre parcels on Tika Lane are flat and have no logging assets. The land is idea for 3½ to 5-acre agricultural lots. Alternative 1, 3 units/acre, would be too dense. These 3 40-acre parcels are currently 2½ acres – either leave them the way they are or go to 3½- to 5-acre agricultural parcels.

Study Area 6

Land is in close proximity to Chico and can provide a type of housing that living in Chico cannot. I would recommend placing a Specific Plan designation in the General Plan for this property. The Specific Plan designation would have a housing count maximum, open space percentage, and other basic development criteria based on the opportunities and limitations of the land. This would allow pockets of development and large areas of open space to preserve sensitive environments.

Alternative 2, please:

1. Water (limited)
2. Excellent recharge properties
3. Sewer situation
4. Great needed open space

Golf courses are not sustainable – huge loss of water

STUDY AREA SHEETS

Do Alternative 4 – smart growth, concentrated rural surrounded by lots of open space

Alternative 1, please – this is minor development which is the most prudent as there is no identified water supply

Alternative 1:

- ◆ Upgradient of groundwater depression – consider impacts on recharge and land use
- ◆ On Lower Tuscan surface area – consider infiltration

Choose Alternative 2 – use No. California Regional Land Trust to set aside open space

Alternative 2 – sensitive Blue Oak habitat, rare and important

Study Area 7

Yankee Hill – include in study

Zoning needs to be changed from one house per 10 acres! to 2, 3 or 4 acre parcels. There we agree with the Alternative Action 3, Rural extension.

Alternative 4: Include Yankee Hill and specifically south facing lower area around 70 and Redeye Road; don't go from 1 acre \geq to 40 A. zoning on next property! Nola Force (nolaforce@gmail.com)

Study Area 8

[no comments]

STUDY AREA SHEETS

Study Area 9

Drainage/Runoff

Traffic

Noise

Loss of rural environment along Honey Run Road

Light pollution

Julia Jenkins – leave as Alternative 1

Adjacent to urban area

Good opportunity for community park

Open space corridors and buffers to protect Stilson Canyon and Honeyrun Road

Good opportunity to master plan, but only if very carefully done

Chico could use another regional park to ease pressure off Bidwell

Alternative 1 is the choice

Alternative 2 would tax Chico re: sewer

If city's impact fee insufficient for number 2 and 3; then we should not consider these

Not a good area for development because of too many environmental restraints (vernal pool habitat, etc); choose Alternative 1

STUDY AREA SHEETS

Study Area 10

Alternative 1 then add OS to tan Zoning – this provides strong urban edge, protects viewshed, watershed

Where's the 'traffic' element (2 and 3)

Alternative 2: Setback for development along skyway = ?

Oaks, rugged terrain are valuable gift to future generations

No development

A golf course kills the natural wild landscape. With this loss we no longer have a "sense of place."

Maintain Ag and Open Space = Alternative 1

Alternative 1 = Supports the ever endangered "land" = = a valuable resource

The golf course is a beautiful addition to the "scenic" component of the skyway. What would normally be sparse and barren is now green and still open. We would like to change Alternative 3 and modify the designation "Industrial/Open Space" to open Open Space. Perhaps the golf course could be expanded.

The topography determines the land use and density. This factor has not been considered in this area. Much of the area is in excess of 30 percent, which is unbuildable. Thus, the total acreage should be significantly reduced.

STUDY AREA SHEETS

Study Area 11

Urban Reserve is too nebulous. All UR tells me is that town of Paradise/County will determine the development of this area on a case-by-case basis. Could be best alternative/could be worst alternative. Is this area rezoned in Paradise's GP?

Alternative 2: Setback for development along skyway = ?

Alternative 2 plus all OS between Skyway and Neal would create strong town boundary, protect scenic and watershed values

Alternative 1 – least impact on land

Study Area 12

Alternative 2 best of the three, but needs more open space (tan zone)

Continue to communicate with Town Planning staff regarding development of SE Paradise Specific Plan. Thank you!

Smart growth in this area provides fire protection for the Town of Paradise

Study Area 13

Alternative 1 would be best

Alternative 3 appears to be most appropriate. Smart growth in this area is prudent for fire protection.

STUDY AREA SHEETS

Study Area 14

(Note to CAC members: A number of the comments on this sheet appear to be written in the same handwriting.)

Alternative 1 is the only decent option. It's productive for grazing, watershed, and wildlife and should remain so.

There is no need for a vast industrial area as shown in 2 and 3. It would morph into leapfrog development.

No available water! Alternative 1.

Alternative 2 makes the most sense for a growing population that preserves closer development and avoids leapfrog activities

Alternative 1 – no more development outside city limits

Alternative 1 – no water!

Alternative 1 – no water, no sewer – horrible place to develop. Bad grades for everything.

Alternative 1 – agriculture and spectacular Blue Oak protection

Alternative 1 – the others have no water supply!

Alternative 2 provides growth along major transportation routes (good!) and has little/no safety/hazard problems

Please add a business and research park for jobs and economic development

Please keep the research park along Highway 99

STUDY AREA SHEETS

Study Area 15

Water supply? Alternative 1

Buttes? Backdrop to warehouses?

Too close to Williams: 2 and 3

Choose Alternative 1! No water should equal no development!

Allow a reduced impact alternative – provide small area for jobs

How can you reduce “impact” when there’s no water??

Spectacular Blue Oak woodlands -- choose Alternative 1. Alternative 2 and 3 impossible uses.

Alternative 4 – much less industrial acreage – smart development

Upgradient of groundwater depression – consider recharge in development

Study Area 16

[no comments]

Study Area 17

I go for Alternative 1 on account of total grade average plus a big concern over water, sewer and circulation

STUDY AREA SHEETS

Study Area 18

(Note to CAC members: A number of the comments on this sheet appear to be written in the same handwriting.)

Alternative 1 must remain. Highly valuable for grazing, aquifer, special status species. Ideal for conservation easements on transfer of development rights.

Water supply? Alternative 1.

Alternative 3 should be considered because of future zoning needs and its proximity to freeway access. New frontage roads are being planned to accommodate development. Grazing would be minimally impaired.

Only Alternative 1 viable!

No water, sewer, circulation, bad recharge potential

No growth

Study Area 19

Must remain agricultural. Highly sensitive land biologically. Ideal for easement on TDRs.

Water! Studies required.

General comment – provide densities on Study Area maps

This is development which is not tied to City services and will need County expenditure for infrastructure

STUDY AREA SHEETS

Study Area 20

(Note to CAC members: A number of the comments on this sheet appear to be written in the same handwriting.)

Where's the water? Studies? Keep Alternative 1, no sprawl.

Retail configuration – based on traffic highest east of intersection, being 'fed' from three directions out/into Paradise – consider having retail east of intersection extended.

Alternative 1, SE section contiguous to residential zoning and too small to support grazing/crops economically

Important intersection; center of county. What should it be in 10 years?

Who is to provide services and infrastructure for residential development this far away from city?

Study Area 21

We do not, DO NOT, want to be in city; we want to stay very low density in Thermalito; agriculture – animals. Development with schools already has high density traffic. If development goes in on Nelson, more traffic, more problems. Accidents with students walking to and from school; it is bad enough now. Where is the traffic supposed to go? Developers need to clean up they're act before destroying lives and property and being out for the all might dollar!

Study Area 22

[no comments]

STUDY AREA SHEETS

Study Area 23

Alternative 1 – No

- Keep east half of study area rural residential
- Medium to low density on west side OK

Study Area 24

Alternative moving in better direction; more open space would improve

Keep open space with 5/10 acres minimum for residence

Study Area 25

[no comments]

Study Area 26

Alternative 1 – no. Alternative 2 and 3 better.

Mostly low density housing with industrial along Lincoln

Medium density housing and commercial is best

Commercial/residential transition to industrial in west of Railway

Commercial/Residential (2) – mostly com/res or vacant in area now.

STUDY AREA SHEETS

Study Area 27

1. Fiscal impacts

Alternative 3 commercial site will provide jobs

3. Alternative 3 Public Services, see Area 28

4. Alternative 3 Water Supply. South Feather Water and Power is able to service project and has adequate capacity.

5. Alternative 3 Wastewater – SC-OR new connection fees provide adequate capacity

6. Alternative 3 Schools – Rio d’ Oro project provides 10-acre K-8 school site. Currently working with Palermo School District for future school site within the Rio d’ Oro project.

7. Alternative 3 Critical Habitat – Rio d’ Oro has set aside 150 acres of Area 28 for mitigation purposes

8. Alternative 3 Recharge Potential – Rio d’ Oro will provide retention basins, recycling of landscape water and preservation of open space and sensitive areas

2. Alternative 3 Jobs Housing Balance – Rio d’ Oro’s commercial and maintenance aspects will provide many jobs

Alternative 2 best for urban services, wildlife etc.

Study Area 28

Public services

Alternative 3 fire and sheriff’s substation proposed on corner of Palermo and Hwy 70 by Rio d’ Oro project

Alternative 2 moving in right direction; more open space east of Power House Hill Road

Agreed – no on Alternative 1 and 3. Alternative 2 is better. Area between Lone Tree and Power House Hill should be 5/10 acre ag/res zoning

Keep area between Power House Hill and Highway 70 as open space

STUDY AREA SHEETS

Study Area 29

Alternative 1 – no. Alternative 2 – first choice; Alternative 3 – second choice.

In Palermo limits, more infrastructure is needed, especially a sewer system, road improvements, utility improvements (high-speed internet please!), → go satellite – financial incentives to improve storefronts (along Palermo Road)

Need better bikeways in Palermo limits

Some areas (light green) in Alternative 2 and 3 could have more rural residential (is that 5-10 acre parcel minimums?)

Save some areas along Lone Tree Road for farmland/grazing areas

Need public transit south of Ophir Road

Protect Wyman Ravine

Outside Palermo limits, keep gravel paths on sides of road for horse paths

Incentive and infrastructure to increase business development along/near Palermo Road/Lincoln intersection

Alternative 2 – keeps Palermo rural

Study Area 30

Keep Bangor rural

STUDY AREA SHEETS

Study Area 31

Continue 31 to encompass study area west to rain tracks, east to 99E, land in between tracks and 99, north to Hamilton Road, south to present south border

Acknowledge 162 as relief option to 99E and connector to Interstate 5.

Further 162 to 70 / bringing recreational travelers to Oroville Dam, Oroville Afterbay, Oroville Forebay, trails

Faster than their trip to Mt. Shasta

Save time and fuel – go for the Gold City

Heighten recreational access to Oroville/Thermalito Afterbay and concentrate on recreational element in that area. Biggs should concentrate recreation/afterbay as Gridley should concentrate on Grey Lodge Wildlife Refuge.

Study Area 32

[no comments]

Study Area 33

Keep the historical nature of Gridley/Biggs downtowns and enhance

Honor (*sp?*) open spaces with agricultural-oriented development between the two cities, with a strong conservation element

No development along train tracks – except businesses that support and enhance agri-business and tourism. Enhance the circulation element in and around the communities to include biking, walking and horseback riding recreational elements.

STUDY AREA SHEETS

There is duplication of study area south of Biggs here and 33 and 31. We need a map that addresses south area on 33/then north area, 31. North to Hamilton Road/99, north to Hamilton Road to train tracks.

“Small farms” low density 2-5 acre development in keeping with the “historic” feel of vital downtowns, with affordable housing close to town centers, in concert with mixed uses.

A WATER ELEMENT in the County General Plan with vital recharge areas protected

Recreational element concentration of Grey Lodge/Gridley Thermalito Afterbay/Biggs

Study Area 34

Keep the historical nature of Gridley/Biggs downtowns and enhance

Recreational element concentration of Grey Lodge/Gridley Thermalito Afterbay/Biggs

Gridley desires flexibility to grow to the north toward Biggs on both sides of the tracks. (Gridley was written a letter re: this desire to Supervisor Josiassen.)

Also south of area is ideal for development because it has existing ROWs.