

## 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
  - Allows ~ 3,900 new homes

#### 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; maintains the Medium Density Residential and Public designations from the existing General Plan
  - Allows ~ 3,800 new homes
- ♦ 5 prefer Alternative 2.
  - Majority of area Agriculture and Resource Conservation; maintains the Medium Density Residential and Public designations from the existing General Plan
  - Allows ~ 3,400 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 (no parcelization until the area is annexed by the Town)
  - Not a significant number of new homes

### **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

### **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 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 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

#### **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

### **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 ~ 11,600 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 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

### **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

#### **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
  - Allows ~ 400 new homes

#### **Study Area 29 – Palermo**

- ♦ 26 prefer Alternatives 2/3.
  - Majority of area in Agriculture
  - Very Low Density Residential near town center
  - Allows ~ 400 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 ~ 400 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