

Land Use Alternatives, Compiled Comments

Includes feedback from public workshop, open comment period, and stakeholder interviews

*() Denotes number multiple similar comments received.

Alternatives

Alternative A

- I like A (6)
- Does not take into account real constraints, many areas will not get permits to develop
- Allows most flexibility
- Too large a 'footprint' (4)
- The more spread out, the more crucial the use planning for opportunity sites and SPA
- Needs viable transportation alternatives (2)
- Utilizes logical growth areas
- Very suburban
- Still does not meet community needs
- Reflects continuity of community character
- Provides reasonable boundaries
- Should be the preferred alternative based on site specific opportunities and constraints
- Stop Growth. Do not need to grow out
- Right mixture of growth areas, commercial, industrial, for 50,000 new people (2)
- Too much expansion at densities, that are too low (2)
- Bell/Muir and Mud Creek could possibly work but need to be high density
- Needs more LDR
- Would like to grow NW of Mud Creek too

Alternative B

- I like B (7)
- Add Shuster area, including public facilities (3)
- Like OMU and MUNC
- Redevelop circled areas to achieve needed growth
- CC areas not part of economic viability of City. Small CC areas don't provide effective habitat worth preserving. Larger areas farther out should be focus
- Calls for more growth than necessary
- Use this for Barber Yard
- Use this for Bell -Muir/Mud Creek
- Why not add the whole North Chico Specific Plan?
- Jobs created at edge don't make sense
- Strategic plan, but needs more flexibility and more lower density
- Special Study Area 9 (Schuster) should be included
- Create public value through sustainability in planning and development
- Expanding the Greenline would disrupt agriculture
- The middle ground between Alternatives A and C

- Does not go far enough or have enough mixed use
- Too much expansion at too low of densities
- People want to have back yards
- No VLDR in Growth Area 1, limit industrial and commercial
- No residential west side of airport, ALUC constraints
- Don't put OMU fronting SR 32, will cause people to commute to Chico more
- Place OMU on the east side of Bell-Muir and combine with MUNC
- Add the Rose Ave./5th St. area
- Moderate growth scenario

Alternative C

- I like C (15)
- No buildings over 5 stories
- No canyon like streets w/ deep shadows
- More land acres to accommodate expected growth. Infill should be priority, but doesn't address future needs
- Doesn't adequately address Chico's growth, too restrictive (3)
- Like emphasis on infill/ compact growth in areas already developed
- Allows for higher buildings and mixed use
- Respectful of conservation areas, meeting 'constraints'
- Redevelopment and increasing densities are great challenges here, doesn't mean can't grow in aesthetically pleasing way, maintaining and enhancing quality of life
- MUNC and safe travel corridors are key
- Like its wide range of housing, plus neighborhood centers, creating whole new living experience
- Neighborhood communities, with stores & public spaces
- Too much reliance on unwilling land owners
- Less LDR, more MDR/HDR
- Density too high, control growth, too many assumptions
- Mixed Use corridors are good
- Shouldn't even be considered (2)
- Not compatible w/ Guiding Principles
- Need development to North to extend infrastructure does not appear to plan properly for Chico's eventual growth
- May lead to unplanned growth and quality of life compromises
- Not economically or socially sustainable
- Likes the idea of limiting growth
- Would like to keep E. 20th Street area community commercial, not regional
- Too constrained
- High Density is not what new residents would want
- People are moving here to get away from the Bay Area
- If Chico has to grow by 50,000 people this is the best way to do it
- Will improve transit viability, while reducing auto emissions
- Maintaining the Greenline is key

- Vanella Orchard and Chico Nut sites don't match the Avenues Neighborhood Plan
- Mixed-use is good, especially the walkability
- Does not seem realistic with projected growth (3)
- Most viable considering increased transportation and energy costs
- Best opportunity, for smaller units close together that are affordable
- Like the plan, but needs to be even more proactive. Very little vision in this plan, needs to be more risk taking
- Height limits need to increase, good design, density ranges need to be changed, residential for single family homes need to be at 12 units per acre

Special Planning Areas

Northwest Chico Specific Plan (no longer an SPA)

- Needs to be more compact and close to main arteries

Barber Yard (now called Diamond Match SPA)

- Good Plan (4)
- MUNC in wrong area
- Needs extensive traffic studies
- Consider existing neighbors. High density in the middle of development needs to blend w/ neighborhood (2)
- Include areas to West across railroad tracks
- Vital to Chico integrity of neighborhoods/ Downtown
- Good proximity to employment- walk/bike and bus access
- Meets infill and infrastructure requirements
- Could add creekside opportunities for Chico w/ Comanche Creek
- Access to City water and close to sewer, close to facilities
- Surrounded by residential
- Move Greenline South/West of Dayton
- Commercial should be along railroad, not residential --- use OMU or CMU (2)
- Add LDR to meet public's desire for traditional houses w/ yard
- Need multiple access points east and west
- Include a school site
- Avoid planning on the toxic remediation area

Macintosh Estes

- Vital to Chico integrity of neighborhoods/ Downtown
- Helps meet infill requirements
- Makes sense to include for development
- Makes good sense as part of the City
- Buffer zones are needed for compatibility and protection of commercial agriculture

Southgate (became 2 separate SPAs – South Entler and Midway)

- Makes more sense to annex this area

- Include in Planning Area, but don't develop (so County doesn't get land. Develop = sprawl)
- Should be smaller (closer to highway, not so much to West)
- Infrastructure issues
- Protect farm lands, development not needed
- OK on east side of Greenline
- Reflects land owners land use concepts
- CMU along freeway w/ transition to IMU to north
- Borders of site should buffer to Greenline w/ MDR to LDR, w/ park as buffer between residential and commercial
- Use mixed use
- Has mixed ag viability, not all the soil is good
- Include a school site

Bell Muir/Mud Creek (now 2 SPAs --- Mud Creek and Bell-Muir)

- Good growth area (4)
- No, don't break Greenline (2)
- As TND like Meriam Park
- Develop as shown on Alternative A
- Growth here requires people being in cars, minimizes infill, maybe reality in 20 years
- Move Greenline out to Mud Creek to provide 50 year defensible line.
- Designate Ag.- Urban Reserve with development zoning only when infill potential reaches maximum use
- Buffer zones are needed for compatibility and protection of commercial agriculture
- Mud Creek essential for food production/long-term economic benefits to community
- Urban Reserve
- If there is going to be a change in the Greenline this is where it should occur
- Need to build at the highest densities possible
- Include a school site
- Residents will support Mud Creek development is if it is very low residential
- Northwest Chico Specific Plan needs to address the infrastructure issues dealing with Mud Creek and Bell Muir
- Support Mud Creek to bring infrastructure to Bell Muir.

North Chico Specific Plan (now simply North Chico SPA)

- Given population estimates, you would also assume airport traffic will increase
- Not enough of a buffer zone from airport
- Existing flooding on Rock Creek needs to be resolved prior to development
- Too many constraints to develop
- Turn into Research Park
- Westside of airport should be developed with industrial
- Remove school site, as it needs to be >2 miles from the airport runway
- Build new sewer facilities to accommodate growth here

Schuster (now the Doe Mill/Honey Run SPA)

- Need to include in Planning Area, but not develop
- Address traffic flow. Could be well connected to jobs and residential.
- May have fewer constraints than other areas.
- Too many constraints to develop (2)
- No more development in Foothills (2) (Humboldt Fire example of dangers surrounding growth)
- Good opportunity to master plan (2)
- Current depictions do not address specific site constraints or opportunities
- Avoid sensitive habitat, provide open space corridors, buffer along Stilson and Honey Run
- Create regional park
- Cluster development
- Keep as an open space or conservation area (2)
- Landowner has a different idea for this land
- Include a school site
- This area makes sense, environmental considerations

Swartz (now Nance Canyon SPA)

- Don't want. Sprawl, high cost for infrastructure (5)
- Include in Planning Area to keep from County, but don't develop (2)
- More constrained than plans show, should not be included (5)
- Good as research park to bring in job opportunity
- Too excessive
- Minimal density to preserve vernal pools
- Airport Commercial already there, use that, not South 99
- Yes
- Keep as an open space or conservation area (2)
- Bad idea to build here
- Does not make a pleasant entrance to the City
- Best as a research and business park
- Include a school site
- Nance canyon is an interesting possibility. Needs to have onsite sewage treatment

Mendocino National Forest (no longer considered an SPA)

- Maintain. Incorporate formal paths, often used as a dog park (3)
- Keep more open space, linear park along creek
- Commercial towards Skyway
- Housing to South
- Leave alone, mature trees, not place for housing. (4)

Opportunity Sites

North Esplanade

- Perhaps adding DRMU, RC, OMU or any other attraction
- Between Lindo/Shasta good area for SMU redevelopment
- Great transit opportunity for dense residential w/ OMU and CMU

Chico Nut

- Strictly OMU. Help houses behind want to improve
- Residential would be well fit (2)

Vanella Orchard

- Makes sense as a park, since none in W. Avenues area
- Perhaps high density
- A park should go here
- MDR and HDR next door
- Holly Avenue should be connected through with Warner

Mangrove Avenue

- Any plans to make street changes so not all traffic on Mangrove and Esplanade?
- CMU works, but better circulation system needed (driveway every 10 ft. is a traffic nightmare)
- CMU should address landscaping to create a tree lined street like Esplanade
- MUNC should be integrated into CMU area
- Needs to serve neighborhoods that surround it
- Encourage mixed-use & more residential

North Valley Plaza

- RC and NC zoning. Takes the burden off 20th St. Mall
- Removal of residential plans- prime for commercial.
- Needs careful planned growth (2)

Downtown

- More open "pocket" parks
- No huge parking structures (underground OK)
- Grow to South (Park and Broadway)
- HDR (2)
- Don't allow deliveries during peak hours
- Enforce use of sidewalks/ make as smoke-free zones, no bikes on sidewalks
- Add OMU
- Recommend blend of Alternatives B and C by adding RMU-HD to achieve healthy mix of office, commercial, residential

Train Depot/South Campus

- Reduce or eliminate IOMU (2)

- Going for urban theme would be hindered by IO use
- Restore old house
- Clean-up college rentals

The Wedge

- Good idea, great infill mix use area
- Add more density
- Move Fairgrounds to edge of town
- Fairgrounds- MUNC and MDR or MHDR is good plan

Park Avenue

- Growth good here
- Like the Senior Housing development

East 20th Street

- Is an opportunity area

Skyway

- Development not desirable

Constraints Consideration Sites

West of Airport

- We need growth here (3)
- Needs to be IOMU
- Remove Resource Management (2)
- Should not have as much development here
- HCP constraints need to be observed (2)
- Agree with continued use of land. More urban uses to keep City compact
- Not appropriate given known environmental constraints

Schmidbauer (now referred to as Bruce Road/Skyway)

- If we plan for this, can we be sure County will leave it in City's plan?
- Property constrained
- Too many constraints to develop
- Agree w/ developments planned in Alternative C
- Butte County Meadowfoam is located on west side of Bruce Road, as well as what has been documented on the east side

Eastgate (now referred to as Bruce Road/Stilson Canyon Road)

- Should be Resource Management area
- Should be used for development to greater extent
- Should be HCP
- No more development in Foothills