

Butte County General Plan 2030
Summary of Input Received at the March 27, 2008 Public Workshop
Chico/Forest Ranch/Durham/Central Butte Areas

The March 27 General Plan 2030 public workshop included three main components: an Open House, during which participants visited Issue Stations and Study Area Stations; a presentation explaining the General Plan process as a whole and the Alternatives Evaluation process in particular; and a Town Hall Discussion in which participants shared ideas about policy issues that should be considered, resources that should be protected, and specific study areas.

Public input from this workshop is derived from the following sources:

- Verbal comments made during the Town Hall discussion and recorded by facilitator Joanna Jansen
- Written comments submitted on comment cards, which were available throughout the workshop
- Written comments submitted on the large sheets of paper posted at each Study Area Station
- Written comments submitted to the County either before or after the workshop

This summary focuses on study-area specific comments for the following Study Areas, which will be discussed at the April 24 CAC meeting in Chico:

Study Area 2: North Chico Specific Plan

Study Area 3: Bell Muir

Study Area 4: Forest Ranch

Study Area 6: Upper Stilson Canyon

Study Area 9: Doe Mill/Honey Run

Study Area 14: Nance Canyon/Highway 99

Study Area 15: Hamlin Canyon/Highway 99

Study Area 16: Oroville Chico Highway/Highway 99

Study Area 17: Durham

Study Area 18: Durham Dayton/Highway 99

Study Area 19: Durham Pentz/Highway 99

Note: Study Area 1 covers the Existing City of Chico Limits. Since this area is not within County jurisdiction and will not be part of the County General Plan, we will not be discussing this study area.

CAC members have been provided with raw data, including transcriptions of the large sheets from the Study Area Stations and the Town Hall discussion comments, scans of the written comments submitted via comment card or communication to County staff, and copies of relevant comments submitted via the County's General Plan 2030 web forum. CAC members will also be provided with a synopsis of the comments that pertain to these study areas.

Input on Study Areas

During the Open House sessions at the March 27 Public Workshop, participants were encouraged to circulate among Study Area Stations, staffed with County facilitators. Each Study Area Station included maps of the three alternatives in a given study area, along with an enlarged copy of the Alternatives Evaluation Report Summary Table for that study area. The Study Area Station also included a large sheet of butcher paper for participants to provide comments. The text below summarizes input received not only from the Study Area Stations, but also from workshop comment cards and letters sent to the County.

Study Area 2: North Chico Specific Plan

Three comments were received. All of the comments indicated that water issues in this area are important to consider, and one indicated that wastewater disposal will need to be addressed. One commenter suggested that the study area is too large and that development should only occur along the highway.

Study Area 3: Bell Muir

23 comments were received, the vast majority of which expressed support for Alternative 2. In addition, a petition from Bell Muir residents was submitted, which expressed support for medium and high density housing and commercial development, as the area is no longer viable for agricultural uses. There were also a few comments in support of Alternative 3, or 1-acre lots. One commenter suggested that the boundary be reconfigured to take into account the Eaton Road extension.

Study Area 4: Forest Ranch

Five comments were received. The majority of the comments supported no or limited growth, citing concerns about water supply and a desire to keep the community rural. One commenter did not support any of the alternatives and suggested a policy requiring sustainable harvesting to accompany the agricultural designation. Another comment included a suggestion that the study area be expanded and that growth boundaries take into account slope, fire management activity and forest productivity.

Study Area 6: Upper Stilson Canyon

Thirteen comments were received, the majority of which supported Alternative 2, citing concerns about water supply, wastewater, open space preservation, groundwater recharge and biological resources. There were two comments in favor of Alternative 1, supporting low development levels due to water supply and groundwater recharge issues. Three comments supported some development beyond what would be allowed under Alternative 1, with one supporting the principles of Alternative 3, including clustered residential and open space, and the others in general supporting smart growth.

Study Area 9: Doe Mill/Honey Run

Fourteen comments were received. The majority of the comments were either in support of Alternative 1 or opposed to development, and many concerns about development were raised, including drainage, traffic, noise, loss of rural character, light pollution, wastewater, biological resources, and open space preservation. There were six comments that supported some development, one of which preferred the development proposal under Alternative 3, and many of which cited the area's proximity to an established urban area. Another commenter suggested that the area be developed using ecologically-sensitive design. There were also three comments that supported the use of this study area for recreational and open space uses. One comment indicated that there are less biological species present within the study area than indicated in the Alternatives Evaluation Report.

Study Area 14: Nance Canyon/Highway 99

21 comments were received, the majority of which preferred Alternative 1, citing concerns about leapfrog development, lack of wastewater infrastructure, water supply and impacts to agricultural land, open space, biological resources and cultural resources. Five comments supported some development, one of which specifically supported Alternative 2, three of which supported industrial development, and two of which requested that development occur only along Highway 99.

Study Area 15: Hamlin Canyon/Highway 99

18 comments were received, the majority of which supported Alternative 1 and cited concerns about water supply, open space preservation, and impacts on scenic resources, biological resources, agricultural land and cultural resources. There were a few comments in support of either Alternatives 2 or 3, one of which supported industrial development in particular. Several comments were in support of a modified alternative that would provide a smaller amount of industrial development. One comment suggested that development only occur along the highway, and one requested that any development be sensitive to groundwater recharge.

Study Area 16: Oroville Chico Highway/Highway 99

Two comments were received. One was in support of Alternative 1 due to the distance to existing urban areas and the other recommended keeping the area in low density.

Study Area 17: Durham

Four comments were received, two of which supported Alternative 1 and cited concerns about water, sewer, circulation and market viability. Of the two other comments, one supported 1- to 3-acre lots, growth to support the school and opposed to 5-acre lots. The other supported keeping this area viable for agricultural production.

Study Area 18: Durham Dayton/Highway 99

Nine comments were received, the majority of which supported Alternative 1 and cited concerns about sewer service, circulation, water supply and impacts on groundwater recharge, agricultural land and biological resources. One commenter preferred Alternative 3 due to the freeway access for retail and industrial development. One commenter preferred development levels somewhere between Alternative 2 and 3.

Study Area 19: Durham Pentz/Highway 99

Nine comments were received, the majority of which supported Alternative 1 and cited concerns about water supply, infrastructure, public services, wastewater, market viability and impacts to agricultural and biological resources. The developer also submitted a package to County staff stating that this site would be an ideal location for an Industrial/Open Space designation.