

Butte County General Plan 2030

Meeting Series #4:

Land Use Alternatives Evaluation & Development Of A Preferred Alternative

This document includes the final results of the Citizens Advisory Committee deliberations on a preferred land use alternative during the April 10, April 17, April 24 and May 1 meetings.

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
 - Allows ~~~3,800~~ ~3,900 new homes

Note: When the CAC considered this study area at the 4/24 meeting, the information provided to them indicated that Alternative 1 would allow approximately 3,800 new homes. Subsequent to that meeting, further analysis revealed that the alternative would actually allow approximately 3,900 new homes. This correction was explained to the CAC at the 5/1 meeting, but they did not choose to reopen the study area for discussion, and maintained Alternative 1 as the preferred alternative.

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

- ♦ 23 prefer Alternative 4.
 - Majority of area Rural Residential
 - Maintains Retail from Alternative 1
 - Allows ~ 400 new homes
 - Need to address constraints first (e.g. fire, evacuation, water)

Note: When the CAC considered this study area at the 4/10 meeting, the majority of the CAC members preferred Alternative 3, which designates the majority of the study area as Rural Residential, but maintains the Medium Density Residential designation from the existing General Plan. At the time of the 4/10 meeting, the information provided to the CAC indicated that Alternative 3 would allow approximately 400 new homes. However, subsequent to that meeting, more detailed analysis revealed that the alternative would actually allow approximately 3,800 new homes due to the high number of vacant and underutilized parcels within the Medium Density Residential designation. This correction was explained to the CAC at the 5/1 meeting, and they decided to reconsider the study area, resulting in a preferred alternative that is similar to Alternative 3, but allows 400 new homes.

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 4 (community plan presented by the Berry Creek Community Association)
 - Expand boundaries to the North and Middle Forks of the Feather River and the county boundary
 - Rural Residential and Very Low Density Residential; Agriculture; Public; ~20 acres of Retail distributed along Bald Rock Road and Oro Quincy Highway
 - Allows ~300 new homes
- ♦ 5 prefer Alternative 2
 - Majority of area in Agriculture
 - Not a significant number of new homes
- ♦ 1 prefers Alternative 1.
 - Majority of area Very Low Density Residential; also Agriculture and Retail
 - Allows ~300 new homes

Note: At the 4/10 meeting, the majority of the CAC preferred Alternative 2, which designates the majority of the study area for Agriculture. During the 5/1 meeting, the CAC reconsidered this study area, and the majority preferred a new Alternative 4 that reflects the Berry Creek Community Association’s plan.

Study Area 9 – Doe Mill/Honey Run

- ♦ 16 prefer Alternative 4 (project proponent proposal)
 - Allows up to 1,500 new units through a Specific Plan
 - Agriculture as underlying designation
 - Project would happen under County auspices
- ♦ 7 support Alternative 5.
 - Program proposed under Alternative 4, but project would happen under City of Chico auspices.

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. At the 5/1 meeting, the CAC decided to reconsider this study area; this discussion will occur at the 5/8 CAC meeting.

Study Area 11 – Paradise Urban Reserve

- ♦ 18 prefer Alternative 1.
 - Urban Reserve (~~20-acre parcels~~) (no parcelization until the area is annexed by the Town)
 - ~~Allows ~100 new homes~~ Not a significant number of new homes

Note: When the CAC considered this study area at the 4/10 meeting, the information provided to them indicated that Alternative 1 would allow 20-acre parcel sizes, resulting in approximately 100 new homes. Subsequent to that meeting, a countywide urban reserve designation was discussed further by County staff in consideration of the requests made by the Cities of Gridley and Biggs. It was determined that this designation should be consistent countywide and prohibit parcelization until the area is annexed by a city or town. Therefore, the Urban Reserve designation under Alternative 1 would not allow any new homes. This clarification was explained to the CAC at the 5/1 meeting, but they did not choose to reopen the study area for discussion, and maintained Alternative 1 as the preferred alternative.

Study Area 12 – Southeast Paradise Specific Plan

- ♦ All agree to defer to the Town of Paradise Specific Plan
 - Allows ~600 new homes and some retail uses

Note: When the CAC considered this study area at the 4/10 meeting, buildout information for the Southeast Paradise Specific Plan was unavailable. Preliminary buildout information was acquired from Town staff prior to the 5/1 meeting, and then presented to the CAC. The CAC did not choose to reopen the study area for discussion, and maintained the direction to follow the Town of Paradise Specific Plan.

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

Note: At the 5/1 meeting, the CAC decided to reconsider this study area; this discussion will occur at the 5/8 CAC meeting.

Study Area 15 – Hamlin Canyon/Highway 99

- ♦ 15 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 Agriculture, no M-1.

Study Area 16 – Oroville-Chico Highway. Highway 99

- ♦ 18 support Alternatives 1 and 2
 - All Agriculture

Study Area 17 - Durham

- ♦ All support Alternative 1
 - Existing General Plan, consistent with Durham, Dayton Nelson Plan
 - Would allow ~~50~~ 500 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

Note: When the CAC considered this study area at the 4/24 meeting, the information provided to them indicated that Alternative 1 would allow approximately 50 new homes. Subsequent to that meeting, further analysis revealed that the alternative would actually allow approximately 500 new homes. This correction was explained to the CAC at the 5/1 meeting, and they decided to reconsider the study area. This discussion will occur during the 5/8 CAC meeting.

Study Area 18 – Durham Dayton/Highway 99

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

Note: At the 5/1 meeting, the CAC decided to reconsider this study area; this discussion will occur at the 5/8 CAC meeting.

Study Area 19 – Durham Pentz/Highway 99

- ♦ 13 support Alternatives 1 and 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 City of Oroville General Plan (similar to Alternatives 1 and 2).
 - Majority of area in Medium Density Residential, Medium-High Density Residential
 - Allows ~~7,000~~ ~11,600 new homes
- ♦ 3 prefer Alternative 3.
 - Majority of area in Rural Residential, Very Low Density Residential
 - Allows ~ 1,500 new homes

Note: When the CAC considered this study area at the 4/17 meeting, the information provided to them indicated that the City of Oroville General Plan would allow a similar buildout as Alternatives 1 and 2, which allow approximately 7,000 new homes. Upon detailed mapping and analysis of the Oroville General Plan, it was determined that the preferred alternative would allow approximately 11,600 new homes. This clarification was explained to the CAC at the 5/1 meeting, but they did not choose to reopen the study area for discussion, and maintained the City of Oroville General Plan as the preferred alternative.

Study Area 23 – Eastern Oroville/Oroville Hills

- ♦ 15 prefer City of Oroville General Plan modified.
 - Add Retail/Residential uses along Miners Ranch Road
 - Allows ~17,000 new homes
- ♦ 9 prefer City of Oroville General Plan (similar to Alternative 1)
 - Allows ~18,400 new homes
- ♦ 2 support Alternative 2.
 - Allows ~2,600 new homes
- ♦ 2 support Alternative 3.
 - Allows ~5,900 new homes

Note: When the CAC considered this study area at the 4/17 meeting, the information provided to them indicated that the City of Oroville General Plan would allow a similar buildout as Alternative 1, which allows approximately 18,400 new homes. Upon detailed mapping and analysis of the Oroville General Plan, modified to include Mixed Use along Miners Ranch Road, it was determined that the preferred alternative would allow approximately 17,000 new homes. This clarification was explained to the CAC at the 5/1 meeting. Although the CAC reopened the study area for discussion, they unanimously agreed not to change the preferred alternative.

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 General Plan.
 - Majority of area in residential
 - Allows ~9,000 new homes

Note: When the CAC considered this study area at the 4/17 meeting, the number of new dwelling units allowed by the City of Oroville General Plan within this study area was unknown. Upon detailed mapping and analysis, it was determined that the preferred alternative would allow approximately 9,000 new homes. This clarification was explained to the CAC at the 5/1 meeting, but they did not choose to reopen the study area for discussion, and maintained the City of Oroville General Plan as the preferred alternative.

Study Area 27 – Pacific Heights Road/Highway 70

- ♦ 14 prefer the City of Oroville’s General Plan
 - Specific Plan designation to allow ~2,700 new homes
- ♦ 8 prefer Alternative 2
 - Entire area in Agriculture
 - Not a significant number of new homes

Note: At the 4/17 meeting, the majority of the CAC preferred Alternative 2, which designates the entire study area for Agriculture. During the 5/1 meeting, the CAC reconsidered this study area, and the majority preferred an alternative that reflects the City of Oroville General Plan.

Study Area 28 – Southern Oroville

- ♦ 25 prefer City of Oroville General Plan.
 - Majority of area in Rural Residential, Environmental/Safety
 - Allows ~400 new homes

Note: When the CAC considered this study area at the 4/17 meeting, the number of new dwelling units allowed by the City of Oroville General Plan within this study area was unknown. Upon detailed mapping and analysis, it was determined that the preferred alternative would allow approximately 400 new homes. This clarification was explained to the CAC at the 5/1 meeting, but they did not choose to reopen the study area for discussion, and maintained the City of Oroville General Plan as the preferred alternative.

Study Area 29 – Palermo

- ♦ 26 prefer Alternatives 2/3.
 - Majority of area in Agriculture
 - Very Low Density Residential near town center
 - Allows ~~100~~ ~ 400 new homes
 - 20 acres of retail and industrial

Note: When the CAC considered this study area at the 4/17 meeting, the information provided to them indicated that Alternatives 2 and 3 would allow approximately 100 new homes. Subsequent to that meeting, further analysis revealed that the alternative would actually allow approximately 400 new homes on existing vacant and underutilized sites. This correction was explained to the CAC at the 5/1 meeting, but they did not choose to reopen the study area for discussion, and maintained Alternatives 2/3 as the preferred alternative.

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 Areas 31– Biggs Area, 33 – South of Biggs & 34 – North of Gridley

- ♦ 23 prefer the Urban Reserve designation presented by the Cities of Gridley and Biggs.
 - Prohibit parcelization until the area is annexed by the Cities.
 - Not a significant number of new homes
- ♦ Majority prefer not to establish a policy with the Urban Reserve designation to require a buffer between the two communities.
- ♦ 4 prefer to establish a policy with the Urban Reserve designation to require a buffer between the two communities.

Note: At the 4/17 meeting, the majority of the CAC preferred Alternative 2 for Study Areas 31 and 33 and Alternative 1 for Study Area 34. These alternatives designate the majority of the study areas for Agriculture, as well as some Industrial in Study Areas 31 and 33, Retail in Study Area 33, and residential uses in Study Area 34. At the 4/17 meeting, the CAC also agreed to consider the City of Biggs' and City of Gridley's plans for these study areas. During the 5/1 meeting, the CAC reconsidered these study areas, and the majority preferred an Urban Reserve designation for all three study areas.