

Copies of this Agenda
Available from:

Planning Services Department
411 Main Street, 2nd Floor
(530) 879-6800

Agenda Posted: 3/21/2008
Prior to: 5:00 p.m.

Telephone:

**CITY OF CHICO
GENERAL PLAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE
AGENDA**

REGULAR MEETING OF March 26, 2008
Municipal Center - 421 Main Street - Conference Room 1
6:30 p.m.

**Noel Carvalho
Thomas Murphy
Nancy Ostrom
James Owens
Jim Stevens
Scott Winter**

**Dave Kelley
David Kim
Tony Kilcollins
Kirk Monfort
Sara Adams
Michael Worley**

NOTE: Items Not Appearing on Posted Agenda - This agenda was posted on the Council Chamber bulletin board at least 72 hours in advance of this meeting. For each item not appearing on the posted agenda, upon which the Committee wishes to take action, it must make one of the following determinations:

1. Determine by a two-thirds vote, or by a unanimous vote if less than two-thirds of the Committee is present, that there is a need to take immediate action and that the need for action came to the attention of the City subsequent to the agenda being posted.
2. Determine that the item appears on a posted agenda for a meeting occurring not more than five calendar days prior to this meeting and the item was continued to this meeting.

Items may be added to the agenda for the committee to acknowledge receipt of correspondence or other information, or for discussion only, of items brought up by a member of the general public that are within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Committee.

AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT:

Please contact the City Planning Services Department at 879-6800 should you require an agenda in an alternative format or if you need to request a disability-related modification or accommodation in order to participate in a meeting. In order to accommodate your request, it should be received at least three working days prior to the meeting. Anyone who has difficulty hearing the proceedings of a meeting may be provided with a portable listening device by requesting one from the City Planning Services Department.

Citizens and other interested persons are encouraged to participate in the public process and will be invited to address the Committee regarding items listed on the Public Hearing Agenda during the public comment period.

Persons wishing to address the Committee are requested to clearly state their names for the record before beginning to speak and to refrain from speaking at any time other than during the public hearing.

CITY OF CHICO
GENERAL PLAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE
REGULAR MEETING OF March 26, 2008
Municipal Center - 421 Main Street - Conference Room 1 - 6:30 p.m.

Part 1: Introduction (10 minutes)

Announcements
Reminder of meeting purpose
Changes to meeting organization and opportunity for public input
Review of meeting materials
Report on ARB and PC Updates

Part 2: GPAC Land Use and Growth Discussion (2 hours)

1. Think Tank Issues/Questions on Land Use (45 minutes)

- A.** Land Use Typology. There are 17 land use categories in the current General Plan. In order to implement the vision for Chico's future, are there any changes that should be made to those land use categories? For example, are there existing land use categories that need to be eliminated or modified? Similarly, are there any new land use categories that should be added? The Project Team will provide relevant excerpts of the vision and what we heard so far relevant to land use types and will offer a few ideas for consideration.

Public Comment on Land Use Typology

- B.** Land Use Mix. Given the existing land use mix (developed and undeveloped), does the City need to consider changes to the land use mix in order to build the desired future City with better jobs, jobs-housing balance, more housing choices, commercial growth, etc? The Project Team will summarize Chico's existing land use patterns and will compare that information to similar cities and relevant state averages. The Project Team will also highlight for the GPAC the vision and what we heard so far relative to land use mix. The focus is on discussion of a healthy mix of uses for the future City. The GPAC is not being asked about an exact numerical mix or geographic application of that land use mix.

Public Comment on Land Use Mix

2. Think Tank Issues/Questions on Growth (75 minutes)

- A.** Amount of Growth. In terms of how much growth the City should plan for in the General Plan horizon, should the City accept the growth projections forecast by BCAG for 2030 or what factors should we be considering relative to the accommodation of that projection? The Project Team will explain how the BCAG numbers were established and present other options for consideration and discussion. The Project Team will also present information regarding growth management considerations and ask for feedback.

Public Comment on Amount of Growth.

- B. Criteria for Growth Allocation. Given some amount of growth to plan for in future Chico, what are the factors/criteria that the City should consider in determining where that growth should occur geographically? The Project Team will explain in general terms what we've heard so far along with what we know (e.g., significant resource constraints) and will ask the GPAC to provide input about important criteria for growth patterns.

Public Comment on Criteria for Growth Allocation.

Conclusions and Next Steps

(5 minutes)

Summary of what we heard this evening
April 8th Key Issues Workshop (Sustainability and Environment)
April 23rd GPAC Meeting (Sustainability and Environment)

Part 3: Public Comment

(15 minutes)

BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR

The Chair will invite persons in the audience wishing to address the Committee to identify themselves and any matter not appearing on the current posted agenda that they may wish to discuss. Although the Committee may discuss items brought forward at this time, no action can be taken. Should the Committee determine that action is required, the item or items may be included for action on a subsequent posted agenda.

ADJOURNMENT

RESIDENTIAL:				
<i>Six residential land use classifications are established to provide for development of a full range of housing types. Densities are stated as a number of housing units per gross acre of developable land, excluding areas subject to physical, environmental, or geological constraints and areas dedicated for creekside greenways or wetlands protection, provided that at least one housing unit may be built on each existing legal parcel designated for residential use.</i>				
Designation	Density/Intensity		Primary Allowed Uses	Assumed build-out calculation density
	Residential Density (units/gross acre)	Max. Permitted Non-residential Floor-Area Ratio (FAR)		
Rural Residential	0-0.2	--	Detached single-family dwelling units. Clustered development with smaller lots may be permitted if County standards for septic are met.	0.1 units per gross acre
Very Low Density	0.2-2.0	--	Detached single-family dwelling units. Clustered development with smaller lots permitted, provided average density doesn't exceed 2 units per acre.	1 unit per gross acre
Low Density	2.01-6.0	--	Primarily for detached single-family dwelling units. Attached single-family dwelling units may be permitted, provided each unit has ground-floor living area and private outdoor open space.	4.5 units per gross acre
Medium Density	4.01-14.0	--	May include attached or detached single-family housing, duplexes, triplexes, and townhouses.	10 units per gross acre
Medium-High Density	14.01-22.0	--	May include townhouses, garden apartments and other forms of multi-family housing.	17 units per gross acre
High Density	14.01-35.0	--	Intended for multiple-family housing. Especially intended for areas adjacent to Downtown and for designated traffic corridors.	25 units per gross acre
DOWNTOWN:				
<i>This designation provides for a full range of uses in the Downtown area, including retail stores, eating and drinking establishments, commercial recreation, financial, business and personal services, hotels and motels, educational, and social services, government offices, and housing. The maximum non-residential Floor Area Ratio is 2.0 to 6.0, and residential densities of up to 50 units per gross acre are permitted. Although "Downtown" is the only land use designation associated with this area, there are three areas of Downtown which allow different things, as discussed below.</i>				
Area	Density/Intensity		Primary Allowed Uses	
	Residential Density (units/gross acre)	Max. Permitted Non-residential Floor-Area Ratio (FAR)		
Downtown North	50	6.0	Retail; Visitor Commercial (only with retail on first floor); Office (above first floor); Residential (none on first floor).	
Salem / Wall / Flume Corridor	30	2.0	Retail (first floor only); Office (only in conjunction w/ residential project); Residential	
Downtown South	50	4.0	Retail (first floor only); Visitor Commercial; Office; Residential (none on first floor)	

COMMERCIAL:			
<i>In addition to Downtown commercial uses, five commercial land use designations are established; each of these serves a specific purpose, accommodating either a broad or narrow range of uses.</i>			
Designation	Density/Intensity		Primary Allowed Uses
	Residential Density (units/gross acre)	Max. Permitted Non-residential Floor-Area Ratio (FAR)	
Community Commercial (*)	up to 22.0	0.3	Shopping Centers; Eating/Drinking Establishments; Commercial Recreation; Service Stations; Auto Sales/Repairs; Financial; Business/Personal Service; Motels; Educational/Social Services
Mixed-Use Neighborhood Core (*)	14.1-22.0	1.0	Retail Shops; Small-Scale Financial; Business/Personal Services; Small-Scale Restaurants; Upper-Story Residential Uses Permitted (subject to requirements)
Visitor Commercial	N/A	1.0	Hotels/Motels; Convention/Meeting Facilities; Recreation Vehicle Parks; Campgrounds; Service Stations; Retail Shops; Restaurants
Commercial Service	N/A	0.4	Automobile Sales/Services; Building Materials; Nurseries; Agricultural Equipment Rentals; Contractors' Yards; Wholesaling; Warehousing; Storage
Office (*)	up to 22.0	0.5	Administrative, Financial, Business, Professional, Medical, Public Offices and Support Commercial Uses; Residential/Office Mixed-Use Development (in areas where retail and other Comm. Commercial uses are not appropriate)
(*) Combined maximum non-residential FAR and residential density may not be achievable because of development standards and requirements.			
INDUSTRIAL:			
<i>Two industrial and use classifications are established to provide for industrial areas.</i>			
Designation	Density/Intensity		Primary Allowed Uses
	Residential Density (units/gross acre)	Max. Permitted Non-Residential Floor-Area Ratio (FAR)	
Industrial Park	-	0.35 (**)	Light Manufacturing; Wholesaling; Distribution; Storage; Retailing (accessory use only); Offices (in landscaped setting)
Manufacturing and Warehousing	-	0.5 (**)	Full range of Manufacturing; Agricultural and Industrial Processing; General Service; Distribution Uses
(**) Up to 0.8 allowed for low employment intensities (e.g., warehousing, wholesaling or distribution).			
PARKS AND CREEKSIDE GREENWAYS:			
<i>Public parks and golf courses are designated separately from creekside greenways. The Eastside Little League Field is also shown as a park on the Plan Diagram.</i>			

<p>OPEN SPACE:</p> <p><i>Two categories of open space are delineated on the General Plan Diagram, in addition to the Parks and Creekside Greenways designation.</i></p>	
Area	Primary Allowed Uses
Open Space for Environmental Conservation/Safety	This designation includes sensitive habitats including oak and riparian woodlands, wetlands, creekways, riparian corridors, groundwater recharge areas, power transmission line corridors, areas providing range for Eastern Tehama Deer herds and other hillside areas, viewshed management areas, and areas subject to flooding which are not areas for agriculture. Areas with sensitive biotic habitats included in this classification are further classified as Resource Conservation Areas (RCAs) or Resource Management Areas (RMAs).
Open Space for Agriculture and Resource Management	This designation includes orchards and cropland, grasslands, and very low density rural residential areas, not to exceed one housing unit per 20 or 40 acres, provided that one housing unit may be built on each existing parcel. Agriculture is permitted with fewer restrictions on keeping animals than in the residential classifications. Agricultural processing facilities also are allowed, subject to performance and access standards intended to minimize potential adverse environmental effects and ensure compatibility with adjacent uses. This classification will also accommodate any greenbelts and/or urban buffer areas that may be designated in the future.
<p>PUBLIC FACILITIES AND SERVICES:</p> <p><i>This designation includes sites for schools, government offices, airports, and other facilities that have a unique public character and typically require at least two acres of land.</i></p>	

City of Chico Vacant Land Table:

GP Designation	Total		Vacant		Available Acres*	%	
	Count	Acres	Total Acres	RM Acres			
Very Low Density Residential	1,811	2,109.0	96	414.1	191.9	318.2	20%
Low Density Residential	19,792	5,975.8	206	863.0	599.0	563.5	14%
Medium Density Residential	2,365	1,125.7	26	151.8	68.1	117.7	13%
Medium-High Density Residential	1,725	796.1	25	139.5	33.3	122.9	18%
High Density Residential	6	31.9	1	7.4	7.4	3.7	23%
Special Mixed Use	25	204.3	16	176.4	0.0	176.4	86%
Mixed Use Neighborhood							
Commercial	68	68.3	18	29.7	0.0	29.7	44%
Downtown	331	72.7	9	1.6	0.0	1.6	2%
Community Commercial	912	805.1	111	149.0	0.0	149.0	19%
Commercial Services	197	302.6	13	39.0	0.0	39.0	13%
Office	727	396.1	46	65.7	0.0	65.7	17%
Manufacturing & Warehousing	946	2,386.6	127	1,019.4	408.0	815.4	43%
Industrial Park	6	108.6	4	97.3	97.3	48.6	90%

* Available Acres = Acres - .5(RM Acres)

** % Vacant = Total Acres / Total Vacant Acres

Procedure:

- 1 Vacant land - Queried parcels within City SOI by vacant landuse codes:
 (2301 - vacant; 1501-1503 agriculture; 1014 SFR empty second lot)
 Figure 5 shows remaining vacant residential land by GP Designation
 Also shows recently approved large scale residential projects:
- 2 Included all legal lots (square footage by zoning district)
 Meriam Park, Oak Valley Subdivision, Mountain Vista\Sycamore Glen
- 3 Land associated with approved subdivisions (Tentatively Approved\Recorded Maps)
 Subdivisions, and the Barber Yard area
 and active within the past 2 years removed list
- 4 Barber Yard area removed and GP Implementation Policy LU-I 56 noted:
 700 to 1,200 units at an average density of 7 to 15 units per acre
 Figure 6 shows remaining vacant commercial\industrial land
 by GP Designation

CHICO GENERAL PLAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 26, 2008 - LAND USE & GROWTH
SUPPORT MATERIAL FOR DISCUSSION TOPIC 1B

2030

Land Use Designation	City Limits		Sphere of Influence		Planning Area		Total	
	Acres	%	Acres	%	Acres	%	Acres	%
Rural Residential	1.6	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	2468.0	3.3%	2469.6	3.3%
Very Low Density Residential	939.3	4.4%	1170.2	27.9%	2683.7	3.6%	4793.2	6.5%
Low Density Residential	5282.8	24.9%	666.4	15.9%	175.6	0.2%	6124.8	8.3%
Medium Density Residential	1052.9	5.0%	84.2	2.0%	77.9	0.1%	1215.0	1.6%
Medium-High Density Residential	807.8	3.8%	0.0	0.0%	25.6	0.0%	833.4	1.1%
High Density Residential	31.9	0.2%	0.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	31.9	0.0%
Special Mixed Use	204.8	1.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	204.8	0.3%
Mixed Use Neighborhood Core	68.3	0.3%	0.0	0.0%	7.4	0.0%	75.7	0.1%
Downtown	72.7	0.3%	0.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	72.7	0.1%
Community Commercial	792.1	3.7%	13.0	0.3%	0.0	0.0%	805.1	1.1%
Commercial Services	224.3	1.1%	78.3	1.9%	0.0	0.0%	302.6	0.4%
Creeks and Greenways	364.6	1.7%	213.7	5.1%	123.3	0.2%	701.6	0.9%
Visitor Services	15.2	0.1%	0.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	15.2	0.0%
Office	396.0	1.9%	0.0	0.0%	24.0	0.0%	420.0	0.6%
Industrial Park	108.6	0.5%	0.0	0.0%	1123.8	1.5%	1232.4	1.7%
Manufacturing and Warehousing	1506.0	7.1%	867.1	20.7%	346.5	0.5%	2719.6	3.7%
Public Facilities and Services	1656.6	7.8%	235.1	5.6%	0.2	0.0%	1891.8	2.6%
Parks	3928.9	18.5%	18.0	0.4%	34.8	0.0%	3981.7	5.4%
Open Space - Env. Cons. / Safety	1186.8	5.6%	367.3	8.8%	32349.9	43.7%	33904.0	45.8%
Open Space - Ag. / Res. Mgmt.	0.3	0.0%	3.6	0.1%	34288.0	46.4%	34291.9	46.4%
Undesignated (Roads, etc.)	2593.8	12.2%	473.5	11.3%	222.2	0.3%	3289.5	4.4%
Total	21235.3	100.0%	4190.4¹	100.0%	73950.9²	100.0%	99376.6	100.0%

¹ SOI acreage total does not include City Limits acreage

**CHICO GENERAL PLAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 26, 2008 - LAND USE & GROWTH
SUPPORT MATERIAL FOR DISCUSSION TOPIC 1B**



² Planning Area acreage total does not include SOI or City Limits acreage

Chico General Plan Advisory Committee
 March 26, 2008 Land Use & Growth
 Support Materials for Discussion Topic 1B

Land Use Comparison to Similar Cities

City:	Chico, CA	San Luis Obispo, CA	Arcata, CA	Davis, CA	Eugene, OR
Population:					
City	84,396	44,239	16,888	64,938	146,300
% change 1yr	7.3	-0.2	---	0.5	---
Size:					
planning area	150 sq miles	10.5 sq miles	---	160 sq miles	---
city acres	18663	6393	3580	6232	2832
Location:	Northern CA	Central Coast CA	North Coast CA	Yolo County CA	Central Oregon
College or University:	CSU Chico	Cal Poly	CSU Humboldt	UC Davis	University of Oregon
Land Use Designation :					
res %	43%	40%	41%	64%	64%
com %	11%	16%	3%	11%	7%
ind %	9%	3%	13%	3%	14%
public %	36%	42%	41%	20%	13%
res ac	8144	2547	1500	4044	1821
com ac	2135	998	130	730	2259
ind ac	1614	170	461	206	3944
public	6770	2678	1489	1252	3912
Housing Units:					
total	24,352	19,340	7,261	23,611	61,330
SF unit %	52%	53%	49%	54%	60%
multi.res 10 or more %	19%	21%	15%	28%	18%
multi.res other less than 10	29%	26%	36%	16%	22%

*****All figures above do not include road rights-of-way. *****

* population number as of 1/1/07, source: CA DoF E-1: City/County

** population number as of 1/1/06, source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2000

***1 unit detached or attached, Census Bureau, Census 2000 Summary

****buildings with 10 or more units, Census Bureau, Census 2000 Summary

Growth and Growth Projections

Population (incorporated City):

2006 Population: 84,396 (end of year)
 2030 Population (est.): 135,746 (additional 51,350 persons)
 Average Annual Rate of Growth: +/- 2% 1994 – 2007 (w/out annexations)
 Assumed Annual Growth Rate: 2.6% (1994 General Plan)

Physical City Size:

2007 Incorporated City Limits: 33.14 square miles or 21,210 acres
 2007 City + Sphere of Influence: 34.8 square miles or 22,285 acres

Historic and Projected Growth:

Historic Population and Growth: Chico City Limits 1994 - 2006

	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Population	48,300	50,100	51,100	54,200	56,900	58,800	65,175	66,767	68,589	71,317	73,558	78,653	84,396
Annual Pop. Increase	1,000	1,800	1,000	3,100	2,700	1,900	6,375	1,592	1,822	2,728	2,241	5,095	5,743
% Pop. Change	2.11%	3.73%	2.00%	6.07%	4.98%	3.34%	10.84	2.44%	2.73%	3.98%	3.14%	6.93%	7.30%
New Housing Units	311	243	292	312	363	562	493	510	540	618	935	680	610
Annexed Housing Units	31	121	1105	710	419	84	1507	315	184	669	548	1840	2031
Growth % New DU's	2.01%	2.49%	0.41%	1.83%	2.27%	2.90%	2.42%	1.20%	2.02%	1.91%	1.98%	1.85%	1.66%

Source: City of Chico 5-year Review and Annual Report

Projected Population Growth (@ 2%): 2006 -2030

2006	2010	2015	2020	2025	2030
84,396	91,353	100,861	111,359	122,949	135,746

Source: 2006 Population – Calif. Department of Finance
 Projections – Butte County Assoc. of Governments 2006

Residential Growth:

- Between 1995 and 2007, approximately 1,820 acres of land were approved for residential growth. Average annual growth rate: 162 acres.
- Approximately 59% of the vacant residential acreage in 1992 (2,263 acres) have been developed since that time.
- Residential uses comprise approximately 76% of the total developed acres in the City.
- Since 2000, the City has grown by an average of 626 new housing units per year.
- Average residential density: (du/ac = dwelling units per acre)

1994 Current	2002-2007	General Plan Goal
5.5 du/ac	6.1 du/ac	7.0 du/ac

- The 1994 General Plan projected an average annual growth rate of 2.6% resulting in a projected build-out in the year 2012.
- Projecting this same growth rate (2.6%) from the existing 2006 population results in a projected build-out in the year 2013.
- Utilizing a 2% average annual growth rate and projected from the 2006 population, the projected build-out of the City would occur in the year 2015.

Based upon an average persons per household rate of 2.45 (2000 US Census), the City of Chico is projected to need approximately 21,000 new residential dwelling units to accommodate the projected population (BCAG, 2006).

City of Chico Demographic Profile:

City of Chico Population – By Age

Age	1990		2000		2006 (est.)	
0 - 9 years	4692	12%	7122	12%	7955	11%
10 - 19 years	5888	15%	9541	16%	12620	18%
20 - 34 years	17471	44%	21222	35%	24968	35%
35 - 54 years	6915	17%	13137	22%	15012	21%
55 - 64 years	1501	4%	3000	5%	4713	7%
65 - 84 years	2947	7%	4752	8%	4975	7%
Over 85 years	665	2%	1180	2%	1485	2%
Total	40,079		59,954		71,728	
Median Age:	24.6		25.9		25.7	

Source: American Fact Finder – US Bureau of the Census (1990, 2000, 2006)

Note: Population totals due not match City population numbers due to the use of differing base data sets. Information intended only to highlight population data trends.

ANNEXATION HISTORY

Historically, annexations to the City have included areas where property owners have requested annexation. As a result, many areas developed under county jurisdiction were bypassed in the annexation process, with properties proposed for new development being annexed along the City's periphery. In 1994, the city limits of the City of Chico comprised about 22 square miles (Annual Report, pg 16, 2008). By 2002, the City had grown to a size of 28.78 square miles, but with irregular boundaries and almost 80 unincorporated County "islands" -- described as unincorporated territory surrounded by properties within the City limits. The intensity of development within these islands varied widely; some islands were developed at urban intensities, others at suburban intensities, and some contained rural and agricultural development patterns, including working orchards. The islands and irregular boundaries made service delivery inefficient and the community was under the jurisdiction of two agencies - the City and the County. In 2000, the state enacted new annexation laws which provided that island areas could be annexed without the support of the voters or owners within the islands. The City Council considered the opportunity to provide more regular boundaries, consolidate services under a single municipality, and unify the community. Staff was directed to pursue annexations under this law and eliminate the islands where possible.

Between 2002 and 2007 a total of 70 annexations were completed by the City. Twenty-four of the projects resulted in the elimination of 71 island areas. The other 56 annexations ranged in size from a single parcel to over 600 acres. During that same period, the incorporated City limits grew from 28.78 square miles to 33.14 square miles (Annual Report, pg 16, 2008) - an increase of 4.36 square miles or 2,790 acres - and the City's population grew from 68,589 to 84,396. Of the 15,807 population increase between 2002 and 2007, annexation activity accounted for approximately 65 percent of the population increase of the City (10,275 residents).

As shown in the **Table 1**, of the 2,790 acres annexed over the last five year period, approximately 1,610 acres were already developed for residential use or designated for residential use. 300 of these annexed acres were either developed or designated for commercial and industrial use, the remaining acreage represents a variety of other uses.

Annexed Land by Use 2002-2007

Land Use Category	Total Acres Annexed by Land Use	Developed Acres by Existing Use	Vacant Acres by General Plan Designation
Single-Family Residential	1,210	975	235
Multi-Family Residential	400	250	150
Commercial	165	135	30
Industrial	135	55	80
Open Space, Parks, Schools	530	525	5
Other (Roads, Creeks, etc.)	350	350	0
Total	2,790	2,290	500

Source: City of Chico (2002-2007) General Plan Five-Year Review and Annual Report, 2008

What Have We Heard So Far Regarding Growth Amount/Allocation

Phone Survey (400 participants) – November 2007

In November of last year, the City hired a consultant (Godbe) to conduct a statistically valid phone survey of Chico residents to better understand the issues and priorities of the community at the outset of the General Plan process. The full report has been previously distributed to the GPAC and can also be found on the project website at www.chicogeneralplan.com. Please review the executive summary and topline report relative to growth (survey questions 8 and 9).

Visioning Workshops (~175 participants at two workshops) – December 2007

At the two Visioning Workshops, participants voted in a live polling exercise and provided written comments about the things that they most wanted to preserve, improve, and add to the Chico in the year 2030. They also provided individual written and group verbal responses to what they thought the City would look and feel like in the year 2030 if their ideas were implemented. While this input is not statistically valid in the same way the phone survey results are, the input reflects the ideas of the 175± persons in attendance at the workshops. From the written participant notes to questions, the most common recurring themes from participant responses about the future City relative to growth are listed below. Complete set of input and responses can be found on the project website at www.chicogeneralplan.com.

Most Common/Recurring Growth Related Responses:

- Protect small town feel of Chico
- Chico will be the same in the future, but inevitably larger
- Chico will be more compact (less sprawl)
- Chico will be more urban in City Core/Downtown
- Chico will be more dense/intense

Stakeholder Meetings: December 2007 – February 2008

Between December 2007 and February 2008, the Project Team (City Staff and PMC Team) conducted 12 initial stakeholder outreach meetings with more than 200 individual stakeholders associated with dozens of local stakeholder groups and organizations. The purpose of the initial outreach was to understand the priorities, key issues, and ideas about the City's future at the outset of the General Plan Update process. While this input is not statistically valid in the same way the phone survey results are, the input reflects specific comments made during respective stakeholder meetings. Excerpts of the comments received during those 12 meetings relative to growth are provided below. Complete set of meeting notes for each meeting can be found on the project website at www.chicogeneralplan.com.

BIA Stakeholder Meeting Input 12/5/07:

- Get the County out of Chico – put annexations behind us
- Development west of the airport is underutilized – good opportunity for job growth
- Need to establish both growth and no growth areas – no growth is bad for business and bad for the community – if we don't grow, people will just move to other areas
- Currently lack good ready-to-go land opportunities – need to study areas for new development to ensure that there are not huge environmental issues
- Commercial land opportunities for clean industry are very limited

- Need to establish more certainty in the process with clear policies regarding growth and development, then create tools to ensure consistency in the implementation for a more transparent process
- Want to see growth boundaries moved to natural boundaries – allow development in the foothills, north, and south

Sustainability Task Force Meeting Input 1/7/08:

- Develop growth areas that reflect sustainability principles and community needs (redevelopment and revitalization of existing areas too)
- Immediate needs include economic sustainability, better jobs, and a defined growth area

K-12 Education Meeting 1/23/08

- Preserve small community feel and size of community

Community and Social Services Meeting 1/23/08

- Keep the theme of “compact urban form”

Environmental Groups Meeting 1/23/08

- Continue theme of a compact urban form
- Use natural resource constraints to assist the process of land use planning
- Keep open space around the perimeter of the City
- Continue to focus on infill
- Buffer zones between agricultural and urban areas is a good notion, but we need to really look at how to create effective ones that protect air quality (overspray) for urban residents
- Keep compact urban form
- Build the urban core “up” to provide more density

Neighborhood Groups Meeting 1/23/08

- Maintain the City's "small town feel" by preserving and enhancing existing neighborhoods

Health Services Meeting 1/24/08

- Continued focus on infill. People need to be able to live in the City core. It reduces impacts by keeping people close to services.
- Preserve Chico's character and its small town feel.

Historical Interest Groups Meeting 1/24/08

- Recommend economic incentives for developers to encourage resource protection (via an historic preservation ordinance).

Butte Environmental Council (BEC) 2/13/08

- Need to have a well defined urban boundary/urban limit lines (which requires coordination with Butte Co).
- Value the agricultural aspects of the community and access to agricultural resources (preservation of agricultural lands).
- Compact design is the cornerstone –particularly in light of sustainability.
- Identify growth areas.

CSUC Meeting 2/13/08

- Preserve the small town feel/community atmosphere.
- Preserve agriculture and the Greenline.

Economic Development Committee Meeting 2/14/08

- Well planned growth (downtown, mixed-use).
- Chico lacks commercial and industrial property that is ready to go. Need more ready inventory now.

Mayor's Business Group Meeting 2/19/08

- Slow and environmental sensitive, well planned, sustainable growth while enhancing quality of life.
- The City should continue to develop and enhance business in the Downtown area by building up.
- Provide opportunities for housing at the City's edges at lower densities.

Key Issues Workshop – Land Use/Local Economy (~70 participants) – March 2008

At the first of four Key Issues Workshops, participants provided input on six key issues associated with land use/growth and local economy/economic development. For those key issues relevant to growth, a summary of what we heard is provided below. Additional details regarding participant input can be found on the project website at www.chicogeneralplan.com. While this input is not statistically valid in the same way the phone survey results are, the input reflects the ideas of the 70± persons in attendance at the workshop.

Work Station #1 Growth Opportunities (mapping exercise)

Participants were given a fact sheet about growth projections and set of 6 small stickers (2 green, 2 yellow, and 2 red). They were invited to place their stickers on a large scale aerial map (labeled) to show where they definitely want growth to occur (green) where they might want growth to occur (yellow) and where they definitely do not want growth to occur (red). Although the stickers were scattered throughout the City map, there were four primary areas that were suggested for growth. These areas are listed below, with the dot counts shown to represent the votes.

Growth "Green Sticker" Areas:

- The area receiving the most suggestions for future residential growth is located in the northwestern part of the City. This area, known as the "Bell-Muir" area, is generally located south of Bell Road and north of Henshaw Avenue, within a pocket of primarily vacant lands. It should be noted that this area is located outside of the existing Sphere of Influence and Greenline. (Sticker Counts: 28 Green, 8 Yellow, 11 Red)
- The second highest area of suggested residential growth is located in the southwestern part of the City. This area is commonly known as the "Diamond Match" property. It is located south of the downtown area and west of Park Avenue. The majority of the land suggested for growth is located inside of the existing Sphere of Influence and Greenline. (Sticker Counts: 22 Green, 6 Yellow, 4 Red)
- The third highest area of suggested residential growth is on the southeastern part of the City. This area is known as the "Bruce Road Area" and is bounded by the Skyway on the south and E. 20th Street on the north. Growth was suggested on both sides of the

existing Sphere of Influence, although it was only disputed by "red" votes on the east side of the boundary. (Sticker Counts: 10 Green, 5 Yellow, 4 Red)

- The #4 area of suggested residential growth is in the southern area of town. This area is known as the "Southgate Area". Although suggested growth is on both sides of Highway 99, the majority of growth is suggested on the west side, especially near the Eastside Little League Park. The majority of lands suggested for growth are inside of the existing Sphere of Influence and Greenline, though some areas are also suggested on the outside of these boundaries. (Sticker Counts: 9 Green, 6 Yellow, 0 Red)

No Growth "Red Sticker" Areas:

- The area receiving the most "red" votes to discourage residential growth is located on the east side of town in the Upper Bidwell Park area. Development was heavily discouraged along both the southern and northern boundaries of the park. (Sticker Counts: 1 Green, 3 Yellow, 21 Red)
- The second highest area discouraging residential growth is located on the east side of town, east of California Park on both the north and south sides of Highway 32. (Sticker Counts: 2 Green, 0 Yellow, 14 Red)

GENERAL PLAN PLANNING TERMS

The Chico General Plan Planning Area includes the City boundaries, the City's Sphere of Influence (SOI), and additional areas in which adopted City policies may relate (Planning Area). Definitions for each area is as discussed below:

- **City Limits** are the current legal boundaries of the City of Chico. The City of Chico City Limits encompasses incorporated territory where land use is controlled by the City.
- **Sphere of Influence (SOI)** is the incorporated City limits plus the area intended for eventual annexation to the City of Chico, to be developed at urban densities. The City is required to assign General Plan land use designations to those lands outside the City Limits but inside the Sphere of Influence. The Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) in every county adopts a sphere of influence for each city to represent "the probable physical boundaries and service area" of that city (§56076), (OPR General Guidelines, pg 10, 2003).
- **Planning Area** includes all lands within the Urban Development Boundary, along with surrounding lands which may never be developed at urban intensities but nevertheless may have an effect on or be affected by Chico's General Plan and planning activities. The City of Chico's Planning Area encompasses incorporated and unincorporated territory which bears a relation to the City's planning. The planning area extends beyond the sphere of influence.

According to the California State Office of Planning and Research (OPR), cities and counties should work together to delineate planning areas and may establish formal agreements for processing development proposals. For example, Yolo County delegates a portion of its land use authority to the City of Davis within areas surrounding the city. As urbanization occurs and adjoining cities expand, the potential for conflict between cities competing for the same lands increases. Intercity cooperation in establishing planning areas can proactively help to avoid such disputes (OPR General Guidelines, pg 10, 2003).