

**Butte County General Plan 2030 Citizens Advisory Committee
Meeting Summary
May 8, 2008**

The Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) held meeting #4-2E on Thursday, May 8, 2008, a fifth CAC meeting (a continuance of the fourth CAC meeting) in Meeting Series #4 (Selection of a Preferred Alternative). This meeting was held to finish reviewing the 4 remaining Study Areas that were re-opened on May 1st. The meeting was held at the Oroville Sports Club conference room in Oroville. Of the 40 attendees at the meeting, 22 were representatives of the Citizens Advisory Committee and 18 were members of the public.

This CAC meeting focused on the selection of a preferred land use alternative for the following study areas in the Chico area and central Butte County:

- #10 Skyway/Neal Road
- #14 Nance Canyon/Highway 99
- #17 Durham
- #18 Durham Dayton/Highway 99

CAC members were presented with the meeting materials from the May 1st Citizens Advisory Committee meeting that pertained to the above 4 Study Areas as well as additional comment provided since May 1st. Citizens Advisory Committee members also received a document that summarized all of the Citizens Advisory Committee's votes through the May 1st meeting.

Introduction

Tim Snellings, Development Services Director gave a brief introduction of the continuance from the last meeting. This also included an overview of the population and housing projections through year 2030. Tim Snellings presented the CAC with an overview of the requirements of the Brown Act relating to CAC processes.

Meeting Overview

Dan Breedon, Principal Planner, gave an overview of the packet information that was prepared for the CAC meeting, voting tallies from previous meetings and corrections to the dwelling unit counts that were previously reported to the CAC and unit changes after the CAC's discussions. Those are as follows:

<u>Study Area</u>	<u>Corrected/Updated Housing Unit Count</u>
#2	3,900
#5	400 (The corrected number was 3,800 but the CAC opted for the 400)
#11	No significant number of new homes
#17	500
#21	11,600
#23	17,000
#26	9,000
#28	400
#29	400

Discussion of Remaining Study Areas (continued from May 1, 2008)

The following summarizes the outcomes of the large group discussion:

Study Area 14 Nance Canyon/Highway 99 Study

Dan Breedon introduced the discussion of Study Area #14 as continued from the previous CAC meeting on May 1, 2008. The CAC generally agreed to start fresh with the discussion instead of moving right to a vote.

The CAC discussed concerns over habitat constraints, the relationship to the HCP process and vernal pool recovery area, important views and retention of agricultural land. Several members consider this site to be urban sprawl compared to other study areas. Several members expressed interest in alternatives for this site that would be a job creation potential, compatibility with the landfill and uses that would complement the landfill and tax exchange agreement potential with the City of Chico. Additionally, any potential development should contribute to interchange/circulation improvements.

There were suggestions to include a landfill compatibility modification to the preferred alternative, a mix of residential within the 1,100 acre area while retaining the remainder of the property in agriculture through a master plan.

14 CAC members voted for Alternative #2, an Industrial/Research and Business Park designation with residential mixed uses on 1,100 acres, the remaining acreage (approximately 4,420 acres) to remain in agriculture/open space through a specific plan. Alternative #2 would also include contribution to an interchange and a landfill buffer component.

8 CAC members voted for Alternative #1 that would designate the lands as Agricultural only

Study Area 10: Skyway/Neal Road

Dan Breedon gave an overview of the prior vote of the CAC on this Study Area.

The CAC discussed the relationship between development in the study area and the existing golf course. Some considered development to be appropriate and other considered it leapfrog development. While the previous vote was to limit development to 50 units, the CAC decided that the vote should be on either no development or 165 units as proposed by the land owner.

10 CAC members voted for Alternative #1 – No development

10 CAC members voted for Alternative #3 – 165 units.

Study Area 17: Durham

Dan Breedon gave an overview of the last vote. He reminded the CAC of the correction to the unit county stating that the existing General Plan would allow 500 new homes. This was a result of the Durham Dayton Nelson plan approval from the early 1990's.

There was concern expressed regarding the unit count, prime agricultural land and flooding. There was additional discussion regarding the existing general plan designation, the review and approval process of the Durham, Dayton, Nelson Plan.

The CAC voted unanimously for Alternative #1 – Existing General Plan (Durham Dayton Nelson plan).

Study Area 18: Durham Dayton/Highway 99

Dan Breedon gave an overview explaining the Study Area location, frontage road leading to the Book Family Farm, road locations and the prior vote.

There was a suggestion that this study area was appropriate for commercial/industrial development in the “island” area between the frontage road and Highway 99. This area would serve to be the least visible and have the least effect on agricultural land. Others felt that an agricultural designation would be more appropriate listing the Alternative Evaluation Report ratings of “D” and listed species.

13 CAC members voted for Alternative #3 for retail and industrial in the island area between the frontage road and Highway 99 and on the west side of the road for a distance equal to the island area width to serve at least 300 feet to provide an agricultural buffer for commercial and industrial development.

7 CAC members voted for Alternative #1 – Agricultural.

(Break)

Review of Revised Preferred Land Use Alternative

Tim Snellings gave a general overview of the dwelling unit projections with comparisons given in county-wide numbers. A total of 69,400 potential dwelling units can be accommodated with the selected land use designations. We will have a discussion to refine this in the Policy meeting series #5. The selected Study Area alternatives have a theoretical yield of 68,000 jobs. This showed that the CAC had arrived at an alternatives selection that was about balanced for jobs and housing.

Final CAC Recommendation on the Preferred Land Use Alternative

Dan Breedon announced the need to take a straw poll of the CAC as to whether the vote tallies taken represent to position of the Citizens Advisory Committee and whether the Citizens Advisory Committee wished to now have staff transmit the Citizens Advisory Committee recommendation on the Preferred Land Use Alternative to the Planning Commission for consideration. The vote was unanimous to send the Citizens Advisory Committee's recommendations to the Planning Commission for their consideration.

Public Comment

DC Jones thanked the CAC for their hard work. He stated that having the public comment section after the votes is not good.

Carol Perkins a Durham resident indicated that 8 out of 34 of the study areas directly affect the Durham watershed. She also appreciated the CAC's work but felt that public comment should have been taken before decisions were made. She expressed concern over the impacts to the Lower Tuscan Aquifer, drainage, flooding, ground water depression and effects on private wells. She later provided her comments to Development Services staff for the record.

Scott McNall indicated that these comments are helpful and asked that they should be added when we talk about the Water Element.

Nora Burnham of Butte Valley asked how to submit comments and if she could submit written comments that would be received by the Planning Commission.

Tim Snellings indicated that written comments can be submitted to the comment box at each CAC meeting or handed to a staff member. If sending written comments to Development Services, the comment should be sent, preferably two weeks in advance of the Planning Commission hearing so that it can be distributed with their agenda packet. Any written comments received after the agenda distribution will be handed out to the Commissioners at the meeting.

There were no more public comments.

Closing and Next Steps

Tim Snellings reminded the group that there is a Planning Commission meeting on May 9 and May 30 to receive the CAC recommendation and public testimony. The Planning Commission will make a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors. There will be a CAC meeting on June 5 regarding the organization of the general plan.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 7:30 p.m.