



**BUTTE COUNTY GENERAL PLAN 2030
FINAL VOTING OUTCOMES
FOR THE PLANNING COMMISSION
AND
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Meeting Series #4:**

Land Use Alternatives Evaluation & Development Of A Supported Alternative

This document includes the final recommendations and votes from the Planning Commission's Study Sessions held May 30 and June 13, 2008, and the Citizens Advisory Committee meetings held on April 10, April 17, April 24, May 1, and May 8, 2008.

Study Area 2 –North Chico Specific Plan

1. Planning Commission Recommendation:

Confirm CAC Recommendation: Alternative 1, Existing Specific Plan, and to work with the City of Chico on a strategy to annex the undeveloped Village Core area, Vote: 4-0 (Marin Absent)

2. CAC Recommendation:

- ◆ 24 support 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 supported alternative.

Study Area 3 – Bell Muir

1. Planning Commission Recommendation:

Urban Reserve, Review after 5-year period if not developed in City of Chico, Policy to be determined in GP 2030 process (Meeting Series #5),

Vote: 4-0 (Marin)

2. CAC Recommendation:

- ♦ 15 support 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 support Alternative 1.
 - Allows ~100 new homes
 - City of Chico may develop in the future

Study Area 4 – Forest Ranch

1. Planning Commission Recommendation:

Confirm CAC Recommendation: Alternative 2/3, designated area for Agriculture leave Retail “Circle”

Vote: 4-0 (Marin Absent)

2. CAC Recommendation:

- ♦ 22 support Alternative 2/3.
 - Re-designate for Agriculture and keep retail General Plan designation “circle”

Study Area 5 – Magalia/Paradise Pines

1. Planning Commission Recommendation:

Confirm CAC recommendation; support Alt 4 with a cap of 400 new dwelling units in this area

Vote: 4-1 (Marin)

2. CAC Recommendation:

- ♦ 23 support 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 supported 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 supported alternative that is similar to Alternative 3, but allows 400 new homes.

Study Area 6 – Upper Stilson Canyon

1. Planning Commission Recommendation:

Alternative 2 Resource Conservation, no new development

Vote: 2:1 (Nelson) (Marin & Wilson Absent)

2. CAC Recommendation:

- ♦ 14 support 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 support Alternative 2.
 - Resource Conservation designation, no new development allowed
- ♦ 1 abstention: Todd Hall

Study Area 7 – Concow

1. Planning Commission Recommendation:

Confirm CAC recommendation: Support Alt 2; no significant increase in dwelling units Vote: 4-0-1 (Marin)

2. CAC Recommendation:

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

Study Area 8 – Berry Creek

1. Planning Commission Recommendation:

Confirm CAC recommendation: Alt 4 per community request

Vote: 5-0

2. CAC Recommendation:

- ♦ 16 support 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; Agriculture; Public; ~20 acres of Retail distributed along Bald Rock Road and Oro Quincy Highway
 - Allows ~300 new homes
- ♦ 5 support Alternative 2
 - Majority of area in Agriculture
 - Not a significant number of new homes
- ♦ 1 supports 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 supported 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 supported a new Alternative 4 that reflects the Berry Creek Community Association's plan.

Study Area 9 – Doe Mill/Honey Run

1. Planning Commission Recommendation:

Urban Reserve, Review after 5-years if not developed in City of Chico.

Vote: 3-0 (Marin & Wilson Absent)

2. CAC Recommendation:

- ♦ 16 support 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.

Note: At the 5/1 meeting, the CAC decided to reconsider this study area; and this vote was taken at the 5/1 CAC meeting.

Study Area 10 – Skyway/Neal Road

1. Planning Commission Recommendation:

165 dwelling units as a Planned Unit Development (PUD) at Tuscan Ridge portion of Study Area and Alt 1 (existing General Plan) for the rest of the area

Vote: 3-2 (Leland, Lambert)

2. CAC Recommendation:

- ♦ 10 support no dwelling units
- ♦ 10 support developers supported plan for Tuscan Ridge Golf Course with 165 Dwelling Units

Note: At the 5/1 meeting, the CAC decided to reconsider this study area; and this vote took place at the 5/8 CAC meeting.

Study Area 11 – Paradise Urban Reserve

1. Planning Commission Recommendation:

Confirm CAC recommendation: Urban Reserve

Vote: 5-0

2. CAC Recommendation:

- ♦ 18 support 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 supported alternative.

Study Area 12 – Southeast Paradise Specific Plan

1. Planning Commission Recommendation:

Confirm CAC recommendation: Specific Plan for approx. 600 new homes with the Town of Paradise at the lead.

Vote: 5-0

2. CAC Recommendation:

- ♦ 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

1. Planning Commission Recommendation:

Keep the existing residential designation to allow 1 unit per acre, clustered with a maximum of 335 dwelling units as part of a Planned Unit Development

Vote: 5-0

2. CAC Recommendation:

- ♦ 15 support 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

1. Planning Commission Recommendation:

Alternative 1, all Agriculture, no new development

Vote: 3-0 (Marin & Wilson Absent)

2. CAC Recommendation:

- ♦ 14 support 1,100 acres of Mixed-Use Research and Business Park
 - ♦ Under a Specific Plan
 - ♦ Comply with Landfill Buffer
 - ♦ Develop new Interchange at Skyway and Highway 99
 - ♦ Remainder (approx 4,420 acres) left as Agriculture/Open Space
- ♦ 8 support Agriculture only designation

Note: At the 5/1 meeting, the CAC decided to reconsider this study area; and this vote was taken at the 5/8 CAC meeting.

Study Area 15 – Hamlin Canyon/Highway 99

1. Planning Commission Recommendation:

Alternative 1, all Agriculture, no new development (subject to any existing rights under a Development Agreement for the existing Industrial land), Vote: 3-0 (Marin & Wilson Absent)

2. CAC Recommendation:

- ♦ 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.

Note: At the 5/1 meeting, the CAC decided to reconsider this study area; and this vote took place at the 5/1 CAC meeting.

Study Area 16 – Oroville-Chico Highway. Highway 99

1. Planning Commission Recommendation:

Confirm CAC Recommendation: Alternatives 1 and 2, Agriculture

Vote: 3-0 (Marin & Wilson Absent)

2. CAC Recommendation:

- ♦ 18 support Alternatives 1 and 2
 - All Agriculture
 -

Study Area 17 – Durham

1. Planning Commission Recommendation:

Confirm CAC Recommendation: Alternative 1, confirming the Durham, Dayton, Nelson Plan, with suggestion to Board of Supervisors to modify Study Area boundary for parcel west of Goodspeed Street (Ernesto Alvarado; Assessor Parcel Number: 40-280-089) due to urban impacts on the agricultural viability of this parcel.

Vote: 3-0 (Marin & Wilson Absent)

2. CAC Recommendation:

- ♦ 20 supported Alternative 1 and the Durham, Dayton, Nelson Plan

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 and 5/8 meetings, and they decided to reconsider the study area. This vote took place at the 5/8 CAC meeting.

Study Area 18 – Durham Dayton/Highway 99

1. Planning Commission Recommendation:

Alternative 1, all Agriculture, no new development

Vote: 3-0 (Marin & Wilson Absent)

2. CAC Recommendation:

- ♦ 13 support Retail/Industrial centered on the northeast part of the property, on both sides of the new frontage road (including the “island” of land between the frontage road and Highway 99).
 - ♦ Comply with County’s Agricultural Buffer Ordinance and Policies pertaining to commercial and industrial development
- ♦ 7 support leaving the entire property with an Agricultural designation

Note: At the 5/1 meeting, the CAC decided to reconsider this study area; this vote took place at the 5/8 CAC meeting.

Study Area 19 – Durham Pentz/Highway 99

1. Planning Commission Recommendation:

Confirm CAC Recommendation: Alternatives 1 and 2, all Agriculture, no new development (subject to any existing rights under a Development Agreement for the existing Industrial land)

Vote: 3-0 (Marin & Wilson Absent)

2. CAC Recommendation:

- ♦ 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

1. Planning Commission Recommendation:

Alt 1, Agriculture only, no retail on NE corner

4-1 (Marin)

2. CAC Recommendation:

- ♦ All support 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

1. Planning Commission Recommendation:

Confirm CAC recommendation: City of Oroville's Preferred General Plan (similar to Alternatives 1 and 2)

Vote: 5-0

2. CAC Recommendation:

- ♦ 23 support 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 support 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 supported 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 supported alternative.

Study Area 23 – Eastern Oroville/Oroville Hills

1. Planning Commission Recommendation:

Confirm CAC recommendation, with the addition of various specialty Agricultural lands being protected that are located in the 'Banana Belt' area where frost days are limited, eliminated Miner's Ranch Road Mixed Use designation, and clarified that "Versie's Place" and "Moss Property" (Assessor Parcel Numbers: 079-170-002, 079-220-001, and 079-220-002), were not to be included in a Resource Conservation (Open Space) designation.

Note: Staff recommends a Low Density Residential designation (1-3 d.u. per acre) for the Versie's Place and Moss Property area based upon the request under the existing Versie's Place subdivision application. The designation should also be extended to Parcel Number 079-220-004 for a logical extension of this designation's boundary; staff also recommends that the Agricultural designation be extended to the area currently designated Rural Residential to protect specialty agricultural lands as requested by the Planning Commission. Staff recommends that more specific zoning pertaining to this area be developed under the Zoning Ordinance (Task J) phase of the Butte County General Plan 2030 update.

2. CAC Recommendation:

- ◆ 15 support City of Oroville General Plan modified.
 - Add Retail/Residential uses along Miners Ranch Road
 - Allows ~17,000 new homes
- ◆ 9 support 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 supported 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 supported alternative.

Study Area 24 – Stringtown Mountain

1. Planning Commission Recommendation:

Confirm CAC recommendation: Support Alt 4 per developer request, Resort and approx. 2,700 new homes
Vote: 4-1 (Nelson)

2. CAC Recommendation:

- ◆ 25 support 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

1. Planning Commission Recommendation:

Alt 2, Agriculture

Vote: 4-1 (Wilson)

2. CAC Recommendation:

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

Study Area 26 – Las Plumas/Southside/Ophir Road

1. Planning Commission Recommendation:

Confirm CAC recommendation: Alt 4 per City of Oroville Request, majority of area in Residential and Mixed Use designations, allows approx. 9,000 new homes.

Vote: 4-1 (Marin)

2. CAC Recommendation:

- ♦ 26 support City of Oroville General Plan.
 - Majority of area in residential and mixed use
 - 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 supported 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 supported alternative.

Study Area 27 – Pacific Heights Road/Highway 70

1. Planning Commission Recommendation:

Confirm CAC recommendation: Specific Plan Overlay per City of Oroville's Preferred General Plan for approx. 2,700 new homes. Vote: 4-1 (Nelson)

2. CAC Recommendation:

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

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

Study Area 28 – Southern Oroville

1. Planning Commission Recommendation:

Confirm CAC recommendation: City of Oroville Preferred General Plan, allows approx. 400 new homes

Vote: 5-0

2. CAC Recommendation:

- ♦ 25 support 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 supported 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 supported alternative.

Study Area 29 – Palermo

1. Planning Commission Recommendation:

Confirm CAC recommendation: Alternative 2/3, majority of area in Agriculture, Very Low Density Residential near town center

Vote: 5-0

2. CAC Recommendation:

- ♦ Support 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 supported alternative.

Study Area 30 – Bangor

1. Planning Commission Recommendation:

Confirm CAC recommendation: Alternative 2 modified, Majority of area in Agriculture restricting Retail Zoning to current properties:

Vote: 5-0

2. CAC Recommendation:

- ♦ Support 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

1. Planning Commission Recommendation:

Confirm CAC Recommendation: Urban Reserve Designation, work on specific Policies during Meeting Series #5

Vote: 4-0 (Marin Absent)

2. CAC Recommendation:

- ♦ 23 support 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 support not to establish a policy with the Urban Reserve designation to require a buffer between the two communities.
- ♦ 4 support 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 supported 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 supported an Urban Reserve designation for all three study areas.

--END--