

CITY OF CHICO, GENERAL PLAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

REGULAR MEETING NOTES for May 5, 2010

Old Municipal Building - 441 Main Street - Second Floor Conference - 5:30 p.m.

Committee Members Present: **Dave Kelley, Michael Worley, Nancy Ostrom, Sarah Adams, James Owens, Kirk Monfort, Jim Stevens**

1: Introduction

Staff reported on: status of the General Plan Update, reminder of meeting purpose, and a review of meeting materials

2: GPAC Feedback on the Draft 2030 General Plan

General Comments on the Plan:

- Consider moving ED Element more to the front.
- Add more actions to policies that don't have actions.

A. Sustainability

- Contains much of what was in the 1994 GP. Sets the tone for the General Plan.
- Forward looking; compatible with the realities of today.
- Needs more goals for a sustainable economy, at least add cross references to the ED Element. (maybe from SUS 1.2.1)
- Define "stewardship" that is used in the first line....who is responsible?
- 2.2 – change order of 3Es to match the icon symbol.
- Is it equity or social equity?
- Why only a three-legged stool?
- Sustain the existing character of neighborhoods – mention it in the SUS Element.
- This isn't an overarching Element; all elements are equal
- Like the relationship to other elements.
- Good focus on City operations
- 5.2 – *How* is the City supporting?
- Fits together well
- Good that it stays general
- Social equity isn't clear – What is "ensuring **equal** access for all residents?" This might be hard to implement later. Equity can be interpreted many ways by many people.
- 3E definitions need to all be more clearly defined and added to the glossary
- "Social" is more acceptable than "equity". "Social health" is a better description of the purpose, or "society" or "social access", "social opportunity", "social access".
- Don't mention "Sustainability Task Force" by name, just say the action part of 1.3.1 without saying who will do it.
- 1.2.1 – It may be hard to come up with successful sustainability indicators that are achievable.
- Don't make any of the actions more mandatory

B. Land Use

- Don't see redevelopment happening by 2030, the economic situation doesn't support it.
- The text needs more quantification and context about where growth will occur (where and how).
- It was a horrible mistake to not include the Estes area.
- LU 2.6 – Ag buffer – LAFCO said all SOI land should be developed, so a buffer shouldn't be on the urban side.

- 2.3.1 – Don't include density bonuses because low income properties are exempt (from?)
- 4.2.2 – This emphasis won't allow the City to meet density goals. Just rely on the allowed density range.
- Too many planning concepts that didn't hold together well
- Is it RMU or OMU along lower Esplanade; hard to read the map.
- Mixed-Use might be risky
- Pg. 3-9 – Incentives paragraph text edit will be provided
- Good emphasis on infill and complete neighborhoods
- Support the tiered development program
- The Vision of "small town character" doesn't jibe with the goal of infill development, but we won't likely meet the density/redevelopment goals by 2030 anyway.
- Bring back the urban reserve concept to require coordinated land use planning with Butte County
- 1.3.2 – Clarify the type of financing plan
- 6.2.1 – Be more clear that the whole SPA is meant to be planned and developed together, at once, not piecemeal
- Differentiate the types of infill: based on the size of lots and anticipated types of development.
- Soils are good in the Estes area, and there is a lot of agriculture happening there now. The Greenline wouldn't be broken if taken to a City vote.
- Supports the coordinated planning for the SPAs
- Estes and MacIntosh should have been included, at least as Urban Reserves
- Not sure that the potential can be realized without stronger incentives
- The tiered fee schedule will be a big incentive
- Include a neighborhood map to share the notion of neighborhood as being larger than the immediate block
- Further develop the notion of neighborhood compatibility that goes beyond shared property values
- 4.2.4 – to help spread a bigger notion of neighborhood, don't use a 300' notice area for pre-application meetings; use a larger area to dispel the idea of small, immediate neighbor neighborhoods
- What is meant by "sustainable land use pattern"? – define it if you use it.
- 6.2.3 – keep it industrial, reduce the number of residences – keep it available for rail goods movement
- South Entler gateway site – don't make taxpayers pay for gateway features; have the developer pay.
- Don't force "neighborhood compatibility" just use the allowed density range. Don't have staff push higher density.

C. Circulation

- "grade separated" as a term wasn't totally clear
- 5.3 make the relationship mutual for supporting transit and development
- CIRC 2.2.1 and CD 2.1 are in apparent conflict; make sure there's wiggle room to sometimes allow cul-de-sacs.
- Pessimistic about realistically seeing more transit serving Chico
- City can subsidize routes if we really want them.
- Good emphasis on complete streets and MMLoS
- Like the emphasis on a central city, rather than "inner-ring", transit route
- How can you have shared parking with all the Downtown private lots?

- 1.5.1 – State *who* will identify the standards that trigger the City’s adoption of a MMLOS system.
 - 2.2.1 & 2.2.3 are in conflict inherently; explain “cut-through”
 - Just say that arterials can be LOS E, rather than skirting the reality of that in 1.4
 - Not enough emphasis on automobiles as the reason for circulation connection decisions
- Circulation Plan Notes –
- Need better access to the north and south industrial parks.
 - Don’t believe we will see any non-grade RR crossings without dividing the community; it’s a pipe dream.
 - Connect links #6 and #8 on the circulation and bike system maps

D. Community Design

- Vision statement saying “small town character” is at odds with the 3 story urban structure images
- Define “compatible”
- Center design descriptions (pg. 5-7) – say “they’re not mutually exclusive”
- Be cautious about not mandating
- 6-2 add that it’s incompatible with the social leg of sustainability
- Appreciated the description of eclectic character in the vision statement (add it to the Design Guidelines Manual)
- Add the neighborhood map to this element (zoomed into the Avenues, Downtown, and SW neighborhoods w/o borders)
- 5.2 is too vague and subjective...suggest deletion. It seems to be at odds with the vision statement which celebrates Chico’s eclectic architectural styles. Project team suggested adding a description of “context sensitive”.
- Change the call for maintaining the Design Guidelines Manual a policy, not just an action
- 5.3 identify “defining qualities”
- 3.1 – what is “timeless character”?
- Point to examples of successful neighborhood centers – especially w/ small groceries.

E. Downtown

- Make a permanent facility for the farmers market (with restrooms, etc), like in Davis
- Pg. 6-11 Get a better graphic that is more inspirational
- 2.2.2 – edit to clarify residential “parking” spaces
- Support the removal of parking requirements
- 3.2.2 – Not sure the DT business owners will support the additional retail space; will need support from property owners as well as business owners
- 3.6 – Does it conflict with CD 3.4.3 on natural surveillance?
- CD 5.3.1 supports the City’s façade improvement program
- Uses more imperative language than in other Elements, so be careful with the budget implications of these commitments.

3: Conclusions and Next Steps

Staff explained how the GPACs comments will be brought forward to Council and Commission.

4: Public Comment

None