

Butte County General Plan 2030

Meeting Series #4:

Land Use Alternatives Evaluation & Development Of A Preferred Alternative

Outcomes of April 10, April 17 and April 24 CAC meeting deliberations

Study Area 2: North Chico Specific Plan

- ♦ 24 prefer Alternative 1.
Keep Public designation in Village Core if uses can be consistent with Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan

Study Area 3 – Bell Muir

- ♦ 15 prefer Alternative 4.
Development of up to 3,000 new homes, as in Alternative 2
Occurs only after annexation and/or in close coordination with the City of Chico
- ♦ 8 prefer Alternative 1.
Allows ~ 100 new homes
City of Chico may develop in the future

Study Area 4 – Forest Ranch

- ♦ 22 prefer Alternative 2/3.
Redesignate for Agriculture and keep retail General Plan designation “circle”

Study Area 5 – Magalia/Paradise Pines

- ♦ 16 prefer Alternative 3.
Majority of area Rural Residential
Allows ~ 400 new homes
- ♦ 5 prefer Alternative 2.
Majority of area Agriculture and Resource Conservation
Not a significant number of new homes
- ♦ All agree that Retail from Alternative 1 should remain.
- ♦ All agree that constraints need to be addressed first (e.g. fire, evacuation, water).

Study Area 6 – Upper Stilson Canyon

- ♦ 14 prefer Alternative 3.
 - Development of up to 600 homes through a Specific Plan based on project proponent proposal
 - Resource Conservation as underlying designation with Specific Plan overlay
- ♦ 4 support Alternative 4.
 - Development of up to 300 homes through a Specific Plan
 - Resource Conservation as underlying designation with Specific Plan overlay
- ♦ 3 prefer Alternative 2.
 - Resource Conservation designation, no new development allowed
- ♦ 1 abstention: Todd Hall

Study Area 7 – Concow

- ♦ 21 prefer Alternative 2.
 - Majority of area Resource Conservation
 - Small Retail area
 - Not a significant number of new homes
- ♦ 2 oppose Alternative 2, and prefer Alternative 1 or 3 instead.
 - Rural Residential, Medium Density Residential
 - Small Retail area
 - Allows ~ 200 to 500 new homes

Study Area 8 – Berry Creek

- ♦ 16 prefer Alternative 2.
 - Majority of area in Agriculture
 - Not a significant number of new homes
- ♦ 10 prefer Alternative 1.
 - Majority of area Very Low Density Residential
 - Allows ~ 300 new homes
- ♦ All agree that Retail from Alternative 1 should remain

Study Area 9 – Doe Mill/Honey Run

- ♦ 9 prefer Alternative 4 (project proponent proposal).
 - Allow up to 1,500 new units through a Specific Plan
 - Agriculture as underlying designation
 - Project would happen under County auspices
- ♦ 5 support Alternative 5.
 - Program proposed under Alternative 4, but project would happen under City of Chico auspices.
- ♦ 3 support Modified Alternative 2
 - Same development program as alternative 4, but development would be concentrated in northwest portion of Study Area

Note: Alternatives 4 and 5 are the same, but differ on whether the development would occur under the City or the County. Together these two alternatives were supported by a total of 14 CAC members.

Study Area 10 – Skyway/Neal Road

- ♦ All prefer Alternative 1 with the exception of the Tuscan Ridge Golf Course development area.
 - Rural Residential, Agriculture, Resource Conservation
- ♦ 9 prefer no golf course development (Alternative 1)
- ♦ 6 support allowing approximately 165 homes in the golf course development.
- ♦ 6 support allowing approximately 50 homes in the golf course development.
- ♦ All agree that any visual impacts and traffic along the Skyway will need to be addressed.

Note: A total of 12 CAC members supported allowing at least 50 units of new housing on the golf course.

Study Area 11 – Paradise Urban Reserve

- ♦ 18 prefer Alternative 1.
 - Urban Reserve (20-acre parcels)
 - Allows ~ 100 new homes

Study Area 12 – Southeast Paradise Specific Plan

- ♦ All agree to defer to the Town of Paradise.

Study Area 13 – South Paradise/Pentz Road

- ♦ 15 prefer Alternative 1.
 - Resource Conservation
 - Not a significant number of new homes
- ♦ 4 support allowing approximately 150 homes on 1-acre parcels with the caveat that constraints (e.g. access, water) be addressed prior to development.

Study Area 14 – Nance Canyon/Highway 99

- ♦ 11 support Agriculture only
- ♦ 4 support Agriculture with 1,100 acres of Industrial (Research and Business Park) use and no residential development
- ♦ 5 support Agriculture with both Industrial and Residential uses

Study Area 15 – Hamlin Canyon/Highway 99

- ♦ 10 support Alternative 4
proponent’s proposal for 400 acres of Industrial (Research and Business Park) along Highway 99/Durham Pentz
- ♦ 7 support Modified Alternative 1
includes the existing M-1 designation as currently designated in the General Plan (the description erroneously states the entire area is currently designated for agricultural use).
- ♦ 2 support Alternative 1
all Ag, no M-1.

Study Area 16 – Oroville-Chico Highway. Highway 99

- ♦ 18 support Alternative 1/2
All Ag

Study Area 17 - Durham

- ♦ All support Alternative 1
Existing General Plan, consistent with Durham, Dayton Nelson Plan
Would allow 50 new homes
Medium and Medium-High Density Residential, Retail, Industrial and Public designations near the center of Durham
Very Low Density Residential around the edge of town
Agriculture in the remainder of the Study Area

Study Area 18 – Durham Dayton/Highway 99

- ♦ 14 support Alternative 1
All Ag
- ♦ 4 support Alternative 3
all Industrial and Retail
- ♦ 1 supports Modified Alternative 3
eastern corner of Study Area in Industrial/Retail
remainder in Agriculture

Study Area 19 – Durham Pentz/Highway 99

- ♦ 13 support Alternative 1/2
All Agriculture
- ♦ 6 support proposal from project proponent
400 ac of Industrial/Open Space
no new homes

Study Area 20 – Highway 191 (Clark Road)/Durham Pentz

- ♦ All prefer new combination of Alternative 1 and Alternative 2.
Majority of study area Agriculture (Alternative 1)
Expanded Retail from Alternative 2 (30 acres)

Study Area 21 – Thermalito

- ♦ 23 prefer Alternatives 1/2/City of Oroville GP.
Majority of area in Medium Density Residential, Medium-High Density Residential
Allows ~7,000 new homes
- ♦ 3 prefer Alternative 3.
Majority of area in Rural Residential, Very Low Density Residential
Allows ~1,500 new homes

Study Area 23 – Eastern Oroville/Oroville Hills

- ♦ 15 prefer City of Oroville GP modified.
Add Retail/Residential uses along Miners Ranch Road
Allows ~18,400 new homes
- ♦ 9 prefer City GP.
Allows ~18,400 new homes
- ♦ 2 support Alternative 2.
Allows ~2,600 new homes
- ♦ 2 support Alternative 3.
Allows ~5,900 new homes

Study Area 24 – Stringtown Mountain

- ♦ 25 prefer the land proponent's alternative.
A mixture of Very Low, Medium and Medium-High Density Residential, with clustered development where appropriate
Includes resort
Small area in Retail
Allows ~2,700 new homes

Study Area 25 – Thermalito Afterbay Area

- ♦ 16 prefer Alternative 1.
Entire area in Rural Residential (0.2 du/ac)
Allows ~ 100 new homes
- ♦ 8 prefer Alternative 2.
Entire area in Agriculture
Not a significant number of new homes

Study Area 26 – Las Plumas/Southside/Ophir Road

- ♦ 26 prefer City of Oroville GP.
Majority of area in residential

Study Area 27 – Pacific Heights Road/Highway 70

- ♦ 15 prefer Alternative 2.
Entire area in Agriculture
Not a significant number of new homes
- ♦ 7 prefer Alternative 3.
Majority of area in Residential Mix
Allows ~ 2,700 new homes

Study Area 28 – Southern Oroville

- ♦ 25 prefer City of Oroville General Plan.
Majority of area in Rural Residential, Environmental/Safety

Study Area 29 – Palermo

- ♦ 26 prefer Alternatives 2/3.
Majority of area in Agriculture
Very Low Density Residential near town center
Allows ~ 100 new homes
20 acres of retail and industrial

Study Area 30 – Bangor

- ♦ All prefer Alternative 2 modified.
Majority of area in Agriculture
Redefinition of Retail uses
Not a significant number of new homes

Study Area 31- Biggs Area & Study Area 33 - South of Biggs

- ♦ 12 prefer Alternative 2 for both Study Areas.
 - Majority of area in Agriculture
 - Some Industrial in both, plus some Retail uses in Study Area 33
- ♦ 8 prefer Alternative 1 for Study Area 31 and Agriculture for Study Area 33.
 - Majority of the area in Agriculture
 - Some Very Low and Medium High Density Residential
 - Allows ~ 1,600 new homes

Study Area 34- North of Gridley

- ♦ 13 prefer Alternative 1.
 - Majority of area in Agriculture
 - Some Very Low and Medium High Density Residential
 - Allows ~ 300 new homes
- ♦ 10 prefer Alternative 3 modified.
 - No SR-99 Retail/Residential mix
 - Medium Density Residential, Agriculture, Retail and Public
 - Allows ~ 5,600 new homes

Study Areas 31, 33 and 34

- ♦ All agree to consider updated City plans at CAC meeting on May 1, 2008