

## **8-5-08 City Council/Planning Commission Joint Study Session Notes**

### Presentation by Project Team

Holly Keeler introduced the purpose of the meeting.

Pam Johns provided a 50 minute presentation of the Land Use Alternatives. The PowerPoint Presentation was made available as a handout at the meeting and has been posted to the project website at the following link:

<http://www.chicogeneralplan.com/docs/JointStudySessionPresentation-080508.pdf>

### PC and CC Initial Comments

Holcomb - asked if we are legally required to meet the BCAG population projections, and Pam responded that we're required to meet the RHNA allotted amount, and can plan for less than the BCAG projections if we have a good reason that is well documented.

Nickell – stated that he did some research regarding the Mendocino National Forest and learned that there is a strict process for any subsequent selling of the property and that the site should be removed from consideration as an Urban Reserve. Pam responded that the property can be removed from consideration as an Urban Reserve.

Gruendl – asked the reason for the 15% “market buffer” for additional capacity. Pam explained that this is a conservative number at this stage of the process before we know the policy direction of the City Council on several key factors. That number can change moving forward and will likely fluctuate between land use types.

Nickell – Requested his own copies of the large-sized maps. He wants to see the lower Tuscan aquifer on the constraints map. Gruendl commented that the BCAG constraints map includes this information.

Schwab – questioned the City's planning for growth in Butte County and stated that we need strong leadership and coordination with the County. Pam explained that the City only formally has land use authority over those parcels within the City's boundary and not in the SOI or Planning Area. The GP is the place to communicate the land use desires, but it requires coordination to find common ground. Schwab also stated that is pretty naïve to say that we can develop in those areas designated as Urban Reserve and asked for a better definition of Urban Reserve.

Hayes – asked if the numbers in the alternative projection tables meet the RNHA numbers and if the 70/30 mix will work. Brendan responded that the RHNA numbers are a 5 year projection and we don't anticipate any problem meeting those numbers. Also Brendan stated that based on the preliminary numbers, the 70/30 mix would work. Brendan also confirmed that the BCM 50% constraint assumption was consistent with the existing GP.

Luvaas and Hayes - expressed an interest in knowing that the GP would allow the City to meet the RHNA numbers for the next 20 years.

Kelley – asked if expansion could be phased and was answered affirmatively.

## Public Comments

Bob Kromer – Alt A is too sprawling/big for Chico, Alt C is too small & radical, Alt B is a good mix of up and out with variety; it goes with the character of Chico. Colored bubbles on the map doesn't mean that it will happen. Wants an update on the City/County coordination meetings for their General Plans.

Tom Lando – should reflect 20 year housing needs. County added Doe Mill land and Bell Muir to urban growth areas, so the City should too and add Mud Creek as well. Alt B in Entler and Mud Creek should have more residential opportunities. 20/du acre is too low density for the mixed use designations. (30-40 is more true)

Alan Gair – Recommends SWAT analysis to also identify strengths and weaknesses. Look more defensively at Alternative D – consider what to do if you make these plans and it doesn't happen and instead there is a prolonged period of retraction. Need a common sense and realistic strategy.

Hannah Williamson, Single professional – concerned about the types of housing planned. Focus on balance and desirability to get affordable housing and higher paying jobs. Housing costs currently don't match the median income. Avoid situation we have in some areas where everything looks the same. Maintain small town character. Alts A or B are ok.

Elizabeth Deveroux – Chico Sustainability Group (60 members) – must think about what we can leave to future generations. Need to plan to meet our GHG reduction targets of 3% annually. Some of the 1994 GP concepts were good, but were not implemented. Wants to see the transportation ring concept brought back with mixed-use and higher density. There is a benefit to utilizing existing infrastructure. Stop sprawl & get people out of their cars. Busses should have 10-15 min headways Alt C supports vision, but add Bell Muir as an Urban Reserve. The need to meet growth may be arbitrary.

Barbara Vlamis, BEC – explained her understanding of RHNA. Said Alt C is environmentally superior. Doesn't like the conclusions in the staff report regarding tradeoffs as they lack factual basis. Constraints evaluation does not consider air quality, habitat conservation, water, fire, local state or federal budgets. Doesn't think the comments about growth in the Co at the City boundaries is productive. Need to provide housing using a different model. Time to take leadership position on GHG. Best way to avoid legal issues is to avoid impacts. Need to look at recovery plan for vernal pools (e.g., Nance Canyon). How much manipulation of the environment are you willing to consider? Mentioned the example of SACOG reducing their numbers by 30%. Asked how the City plans to provide water. Need to adopt an air quality impact fee.

Jason Bougie, BIA – happy to see so many turned out – a) doesn't agree with assumptions used to determine acreage needs b) doesn't like the staff projections to meet the housing needs, thinks a 25% market buffer is more reasonable c) wants to know when we're going to start listening to the community regarding housing choices. Also said constraints haven't been fully addressed.

Nancy Olstrom, GPAC & CANA member – valuable and meaningful process. Kudos to CC on Neighborhood Services Department and adoption of Neighborhood Plans. Property owner with 2 homes on Esplanade. Doesn't like the OMU designation allowing commercial. Should be SMU (like Meriam Park) from Bidwell Mansion to Enloe Hospital.

Pete Giampaoli – focus on survey that identified the preference for SF detached homes. Referenced his letter in response to the BAE report, specifically that housing prices will increase if land becomes scarce.

Chris Giampaoli – Chico is a unique model that needs to be treated uniquely. If we don't get housing people want, they'll simply live somewhere else and that is not good for the environment. Vehicle travel is the City's biggest impact to carbon footprint. Alt C is not sustainable. Expand Alt A to include more opportunities off River Road toward the sewer plant. Alt A with Eaton & Skyway extensions will provide transit corridors.

Holly Anderson – prefers Alt A – noted a correction to a street name on the maps. People want homes with large enough yards. Vacant land does not reflect availability. Need to keep the price of land reasonable for quality of life. Alt A works – only plan that does not encourage leapfrog development.

Richard Harrington – Diagnostic perspective of GP. Attorney – land use and environmental litigation. Balanced analysis is the goal. Wants to see the circulation and finance analysis. Alt A will likely be unreasonable. Health based standards – air quality connection – significant adverse impacts. Will need overriding considerations to approve Alts A and B (e.g., ag land impacts). Alt C is least of evils.

Geoff Lane – represents Jane Smith property owner on Midway. Currently OSRM on Alt B. Support plans A and B, but wants B to be modified to multi-family residential on that site. Alt C scares him – doesn't understand why it has to be multiples stories.

Duke Warren – South Chico Diamond Match (west of Greenline) – great infill site, access, infrastructure (H<sub>2</sub>O & sewer), creek access. Schwab asked how productive the orchard is now. He responded not very.

Craig Sanders, representing Dan Cummings with 40 acres in North Chico SP – supports Alt B with more low density residential (25%). Holcome asked if he supports MUNC. Answer Yes.

Jane Dolan – Survey results are illustrative and should be attached. Important to report on City/County GP collaboration. Staff report on tradeoffs is outdated in its representation of Butte County land use decisions. Does not support any change to the Greenline, especially all the way to Mud Creek. The Greenline is a significant boundary and policies are still valid. BOS voted unanimously not to change the Greenline. Mentioned BOS decision to not support the Nance Canyon site for development.

Grace Marvin, Sierra Club Yahi Group Chair – address natural resources. Strong support for Alt C as most sustainable. Mixed high density, walkable neighborhoods, housing, water element, don't spend \$ to expand infrastructure and services. Strong support for Greenline and increased participation in the Butte Co. GP process.

Bill Webb – GP should reflect community values and desires. Historically, Chico homes are 4.5 du/ac GP assumes 7 – 8. Explained what that difference means in lot size. Brendan corrected that the BAE report number of 7 is a net (not a gross figure), which makes the 2 assumptions about average development density very close. Bills stated that Alt A doesn't even meet our needs because we need a market factor of 2, not .15 for additional capacity for a variety of reasons. He'd like a range of 4-12 du/ac allowed. Expand Alternative A to the north and south .

Bill Broward – important to make sure we plan for enough space in 2030 to accommodate our needs. Excited about Doe Mill/Honey Run SPA – discussed advantages of this site (proximity, access, limited environmental constraints) and concerns that the City's SPA bubbles don't reflect the property owner requests on Alts A or B.

Lee Calendar – vision is to maintain Greenline. Ag is integral to life and success in Chico. Stimulate local economy with higher density and mixed use. Don't become Anytown, USA.

Ken Fleming – survey's shortcoming was no perspective on what community can afford – question should be, "what is needed?" Need to make housing affordable. Planning process represents what we've heard. Think about future decision makers and whether this plan will help them make good decisions. Requested that we make the data and details of our growth projections available.

Ernie Washington – likes Alt C – Chicoan since 1944, lives south of town, business downtown. Sees sprawl as economically and environmentally detrimental to the community. Recommends preserving the Greenline. May need to modify the idea of the American Dream.

Mark Steven – need historic facts regarding resource consumption. We don't have the resources to support any of the 3 alternatives.

Jason Bougie – Asked who owns the Greenline and why isn't it reviewed every 5 years consistent with policy? Need to focus on what ag is viable. Wants to see City push this.

#### Closing Comments from PC/CC

Schwab –Exciting time to shape our future. Important to understand what Chicoans value (OS, Greenline, walk/bikeable neighborhoods, safety, uniqueness, etc). Must consider the impact of rising fuel prices. Look hard at a hybrid between B and C. C is best from a transportation and infill perspective. Concern with B because of the Greenline and meadowfoam sites; remove BCM sites from Alt B. Look at infill/revitalization. No Greenline expansion. Look at economy – infrastructure costs to sprawl and services (to Bell Muir, Diamond Match). Find best of Alts A, B, and C. Need to study demographic projections.

Holcomb – well said Anne. We have been listening to the community. We're listening through the filters of the Guiding Principles. Where we vary from our principles, we need to think about the impacts.

Flynn – She came to listen and needs to let things percolate to think about it.

Larry – lots of folks trying to tell us what the market wants, but the market will decide what's best for the community. Don't try to force it.

Susan – wants to understand what the community did with the 1994 plan after adoption. Requests a history of how it was implemented and what was changed. Generally, were GPAs modified to increase density?

Gruendl – Greenline discussion needs to continue. Consideration of mitigation for loss of ag land should be presented. What is the correct buffer size? Greenline should be more than a line moving forward with intent to stand for the next 20 years (with clear meaning). Hard time

understanding how the 3-legged stool of sustainability plays into this discussion and how it's addressed in the three alternatives. Wants to know how we arrived at the "market factor" why the discrepancy of 15% or 200%. Need more discussion about the tax base impact of the three alternatives.

Luvaas – wants more useful numbers for population projections. Need to understand who we're planning homes for in the future. Survey tells values, but that is not the whole story, what's likely? Suggested additional opportunity sites at mid-Esplande, Nord, & East Ave.