



City Council Agenda Report

Meeting Date: August 5, 2008

TO: City Council and Planning Commission

FROM: Holly Keeler, Principal Planner (879-6803)
Brendan Vieg, Senior Planner (879-6806)
Pam Johns, PMC General Plan Project Manager

RE: General Plan Update - Chico 2030 Draft Land Use Alternatives

REPORT IN BRIEF:

Over the course of the Chico 2030 General Plan update project, the Project Team will conduct strategically timed joint Council/Planning Commission study sessions to clarify policy direction at key points in the process. At the joint meeting, the project team will present an overview of the third phase of the outreach effort to date, the Land Use Alternatives. The workshop provides a public forum for discussion of the Land Use Alternatives in preparation for the selection of a preferred Land Use Alternative by the City Council.

The Discussion section below includes an overview of the baseline conditions, assumptions, projections, and the community outreach process that formed the baseline data, framed the community's desires for the future, and guided the development of the land use alternative concepts. The initial land use alternative concepts were evaluated through further community outreach and have been revised substantially in response to community input to form the Land Use Alternatives A, B, and C now before the joint session of the Council and Commission.

The Description of the Land Use Alternatives section of this report, beginning on page 8, provides a description of the key features of each Alternative, discusses the projected need (ability to meet the land use absorption projections), and discusses the trade off considerations that the community and decision-makers need to consider as they weigh the merits of the three Alternatives.

The selection of a preferred Land Use Alternative concept will initiate the second half of the General Plan Update project. The General Plan Team will begin further refined analysis conducted via the development and testing of the land use principles, development and discussion of key policies, study of environmental impacts (Environmental Impact Report) and fiscal analysis of provision of general infrastructure and services (Public Facilities Financing Plan).

Recommendation:

The Planning Services Director recommends that the City Council and Planning Commission consider the Chico 2030 General Plan Land Use Alternatives and provide feedback as appropriate to the Project Team. No formal action is needed at this joint study session.

FISCAL IMPACT:

There is no fiscal impact associated with this item before the City Council and Planning Commission for information purposes and to provide opportunity for a public forum. The Public Facilities and Finance Plan will assess the costs and fiscal impacts of the alternatives in a later phase of the project.

DISCUSSION:

Background: The Land Use Alternatives represent general land use concepts of three distinct future development patterns in the City that are intended to be achievable within the 20-year time horizon of the General Plan. The Land Use Alternatives were informed by significant public input and serve to "bracket" the probable range of growth choices. The alternatives were created based on the following input:

- Community survey, visioning and stakeholder interviews
- Existing Conditions Report

- Key issues workshops and stakeholder interviews
- GPAC and Downtown Committee comments
- Research of opportunities and constraints, market analysis and absorption
- Land Owner Requests
- Guiding Principles/Big Ideas

At this point, no single Land Use Alternative is offered as a "superior" alternative. However, over the next two months the objective is to select a preferred Land Use Alternative and to ensure the remaining alternatives fully bracket the desired range of growth choices. The proper mix of land uses that implements the Guiding Strategy for the 2030 General Plan of promoting a healthy and sustainable community by balancing the three critical systems: environment, economy and society will probably include elements from each of the Land Use Alternatives. The preferred alternative can represent one of the alternatives (A, B or C), or a combination of features of more than one of the alternatives (hybrid of alternatives). Components in the Land Use Alternatives are interchangeable. Combinations, modifications, and new options are invited.

In addition, not every Special Planning Area identified on a Land Use Alternative may be needed to accommodate projected growth needs. The intent at this stage in the process is to stimulate discussion and informed debate about the choices and the trade-offs involved. However, it is important to note that in selecting a preferred Land Use Alternative during this phase of the update, the City Council will not have made a final commitment to a specific plan or direction of growth, but rather will be providing direction for continuation of the General Plan Update process.

The selection of the preferred Land Use Alternative will define the distribution, mix and types of land uses to begin more detailed analysis and policy development of the preferred land use concepts. Subsequent work efforts include but are not limited to development of the General Plan policy document, development of the circulation plan, preparation of the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and the Public Facilities Finance Plan (PFFP). The other three alternatives bracket the scope of the analysis while providing the flexibility for adjustments as policies are developed and in-depth environmental, social and fiscal analysis are conducted.

Subsequent to the selection of a preferred alternative is the development of policies to accompany the land use plan. Consistent with State law¹ regarding the preparation and amendment of General Plans, the updates to City goals and policies will occur after the selection of the preferred alternative. The 2030 General Plan policies, goals and objectives will address in more detail issues surrounding future land use change in Chico and the implementation of the preferred land use alternative.

Key Themes of the Alternatives: The general themes of each of the Land Use Alternatives are provided below:

1. Alternative A. In this alternative, development is distributed more widely throughout the Planning Area with less emphasis on infill within existing urban areas. Typically outlying areas under this alternative allow more dwelling units than under Alternative B or A, and densities are often lower in and around the existing urban areas. Expansion is focused on the north/south corridor, southeast area, and beyond the Green line. This development pattern is a continuation of existing development patterns and uses, but does not create new job opportunities in close proximity to residential areas and includes more low to medium housing densities.
2. Alternative B. In this alternative, a combination of infill and new growth areas provide moderate amount of additional growth opportunities. Expansion is focused on the north/south corridor with limited growth beyond the Greenline. This alternative includes substantial residential growth and mixed use opportunity.
3. Alternative C. In this alternative, development is directed towards existing urban areas with the most limited additional growth acreage. Concentrated growth would occur within infill and existing opportunity sites. Higher density development would occur in and around the existing urban areas. Limited expansion would occur north and south with no expansion east or beyond the Greenline. This alternative assumes significant redevelopment of mixed use at medium and higher densities.

¹ California General Plan Guidelines Chapter 3 (Preparing and Amending the General Plan)

Community Outreach: A critical component in the Chico 2030 General Plan Update is community outreach. Significant community outreach was conducted, in part to lay the foundation for development of the land use alternatives. An average of 70 people attended each of the five community workshops (total of over 350) and total attendance for the three phases of stakeholder interviews was 354 stakeholders (see **Attachment 1**).

Key themes that emerged from the community vision and outreach process (Key Issues Workshops) formed the basis for the Chico 2030 General Plan Draft Guiding Principles, as follows:

- The three systems of sustainability: the three-legged stool
- Planned and balanced growth and conservation
- Healthy environment with a reduced ecological footprint
- Strong local economy with diversified employment base
- Resource protection and enhancement
- Enhance Chico's character and identity
- Complete neighborhoods as community foundation
- Development patterns that offer alternatives to automobile use
- Performance based service standards and resource allocation for sustainability
- Social and public services for all Chico residents

1. Land Use Alternatives Workshop and Stakeholder Interviews (Land Use Alternatives series). In June, the General Plan Team unveiled the concept draft Land Use Alternatives and draft proposed land use designations in a public workshop. Participants were asked to comment on the proposed opportunity sites, identified constrained sites, and special planning areas and asked to share their ideas and preferences regarding the three Land Use Alternatives. Following the workshop, the concept Alternatives maps were posted on the General Plan website and also in the lobby of the Planning Department and the public was invited to review the maps and submit additional comments over a two week period. During the month of June and into July a third series of stakeholder interviews were also conducted soliciting feedback on the Land Use Alternatives and land use designations. See **Attachment 1** for a listing of the stakeholder interviews and **Attachment 17** for a list of the compiled feedback received at the workshop, website, lobby, and stakeholder interviews. The Land Use Alternatives maps were significantly revised to reflect input received from the workshop participants and stakeholders.
2. General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC). The GPAC was established by City Council with a primary function to consider, discuss, frame and provide direction on key issues for the community. The Council directed that the GPAC would be made up of members who were "average citizens" that would have the ability to maintain a community-wide perspective.

The GPAC addressed the draft Land Use Alternatives its June 25th meeting. The GPAC was asked to discuss the trade-offs associated with the growth boundaries and expansion areas of the three land use alternatives and to address how well the land use alternatives reflected the vision for Chico 2030. The majority of the GPAC was generally supportive of the urban footprint represented in Alternative B with some changes. Several members did not want the Greenline modified with the exception of support for expansion to Mud Creek as it poses a defensible boundary. Butte Creek on the south was also noted as a defensible boundary. There was little support for Nance Canyon Special Planning Area (SPA), although the other growth areas were supported as long as they provided a well-planned mix of uses and complete neighborhoods. Although there was much support for mixed use, live work opportunities, development intensification along transit corridors, and compact urban form, several GPAC members were concerned that Alternative C represented no growth, would require major changes in lifestyle, and may negatively affect the economy. The desire to become a leader in green technology and provide live-work near CSUC was mentioned. GPAC expressed the desire to retain a healthy downtown and to provide for mixed use and regional commercial at North Valley Plaza and 20th Street. Support for mixed use was also mentioned for the wedge and south of campus (Opportunity Sites #9 and #10).

3. Housing Workshop. Housing and Neighborhood Services, PMC and Planning Services Department held the kick-off stakeholder workshop meeting for the Housing Element Update in May. Over 60 community members attended the meeting, which started with a brief orientation and "Housing 101" presentation. Participants conducted exercises designed to prioritize housing needs (homeless, disabled, seniors, low income, students, etc.); to identify resources that Chico now provides or needs to provide; and to identify the most ideal location for higher density housing to meet the needs of the lower income population. The information gathered at this meeting was used to inform the development of the Land Use Alternatives and will also be used in defining the draft Housing Element policies.
4. Downtown Committee Input. Three growth alternatives for the Downtown have recently been reviewed by the Downtown (Ad-hoc) Committee. The alternatives were derived from similar processes as the City-wide alternatives including public workshops, walking tours, live-polling exercises, etc. The alternatives (A, B, and C) mirror the City-wide Alternatives regarding residential densities but with a focus on the Downtown and application of new land use designations. The Committee generally agreed that Alternative B was most supportable, but wished to see higher allowable residential densities in each of the Downtown designations, including the Commercial Mixed Use designation where densities should be increased up to 70 units per acre in the Downtown. Vitality in the Downtown was identified as being critical to success to be achieved by focusing more residential uses in the Downtown, as well as building a larger office employment base where employees can patronize Downtown businesses throughout the day, including after business hours. Alternative B designated the largest amount of land designated Office Mixed Use (OMU) however, the Committee tended to agree that the amount of OMU designation should be reduced in the area of Lost Park and supplanted with Downtown Regional Mixed Use designated land (with the exception of 25 Main Street which should remain OMU to benefit existing CSUC offices). It was also generally agreed that Big Chico Creek should remain visible and accessible to the public in the area of Lost Park. The added amount of OMU designation along the northwest side of the Downtown (under Alternative B) was generally supported by the Committee to increase high-tech employment opportunities between CSUC and the private office sector.

Expanding the boundary of Downtown land use designations was of great interest to the Committee, particularly in the east and west directions. It was generally agreed that issues of concern where the Downtown transitions to the east and west with other land uses could be addressed in the larger General Plan Update discussion. These issues included higher residential densities to the east and more mixed use opportunities to the west, particularly along W. 5th Street.

5. Landowner Requested General Plan Diagram Changes. Consistent with the ordinance amendment to consider private landowner requests as part of the General Plan alternatives, the General Plan Team developed a process to solicit input from property owners about how and where to change the planned land uses shown on the General Plan Land Use Diagram Map. A Land Use Map Suggestion Form was developed (see **Attachment 2**) and disseminated via a large display ad in the local newspapers, and through a focused mailing to land owners with parcels over 2 acres in size, as well as local real estate and development agents (over 290 property owners and agents). Landowners were asked to provide their suggestions keeping in mind the key themes from the City's existing General Plan and the concepts developed as part of the General Plan update community visioning process. This opportunity was also highlighted during the many General Plan update workshops and stakeholder interviews and was prominently displayed on the General Plan Update website. Applications were accepted between March 20th and June 30th of this year (over 3 months). A total of 17 submittals were received. Some of the submittals have formed the basis for the Special Planning Areas discussed later in the staff report, some have been integrated into the Opportunity Sites shown on the Land Use Alternatives, and others are being considered as fixed changes reflected on all of the Land Use Alternatives. **Attachment 3** provides a numbering system and briefly summarizes each of the submittals. **Attachment 4** corresponds with the numbering system and provides the location of each of the landowner requests.

Map Revisions to Land Use Alternatives A, B, and C. In response to community feedback, landowner suggestions, and requirements to meet projected housing and job needs, significant changes have been made to the concept Land Use Alternatives following their introduction at the June 10th Community Workshop. Below are some key highlights.

Several of the Special Planning Areas (SPAs) as first introduced straddled the Greenline --- a portion of the identified growth area was located on the urban side of the Greenline and the other portion was on the agricultural side. In this case, two separate SPAs were created for ease of future consideration by the Council and Planning Commission. Further, there were many nomenclature changes made to the SPAs, as well as the Constrained Areas, in an effort to make naming conventions geographic descriptors, not individual landowner names.

A new Opportunity Site was added to all of the Land Use Alternatives --- the East 8th & 9th Street Corridor. This was identified as a key underdeveloped corridor that also serves as a gateway to the City core. New designations were applied throughout the corridor to reflect the transitions at SR 99 and near Downtown, to acknowledge existing uses, and to increase opportunities for multi-family residential development.

Without culling out the specifics of the significant land use refinements that have been made to the SPAs and the Opportunity Sites, the following is a general list of changes that were made and the reasons for the change: 1) there was an increase in the amount of areas designated for higher density residential development in order to meet projected housing needs and to enhance the mix of uses, 2) there were selective increases in the use of the new industrial, office, and retail mixed use designations to enhance job opportunities, 3) there were changes to the mix of uses in many of the SPAs to better reinforce the complete neighborhood concept, and 4) there were many strategic redesignations of areas as open space to reinforce the urban edge, and to ensure compatibility with adjacent agriculture uses or existing development. In addition, the unveiling of the Land Use Alternatives at the June 10th Land Use Alternatives workshop proceeded receipt of all of the Landowner requests, so in an effort to ensure that at least one of the Land Use Alternatives reflects a Landowner proposal, some of the SPAs were reconciled to create that consistency.

Also worth noting is that the Urban Reserve category was applied to both the U.S. Forest Service Genetic Research Center and the Silver Dollar Fairgrounds as a place holder that the City, in the event that these areas become available, is interested in the significant redevelopment potential on these large state and federally-owned areas located within the City fabric.

Changes have also been made to the assumptions associated with the new land use designations. The range of densities on several of the new mixed-use land use designations was increased to accommodate greater opportunities along key transportation corridors and in the SPAs (i.e., the high end of density range for the Commercial Mixed Use designation was increased from 14 units per acre to 20, and the maximum density for both the Downtown Retail Mixed Use and the Residential Mixed Use-High Density designations was increased from 50 to 60 units per acre). Further, the Live-Work designation was eliminated as it was determined that this type of activity could be accommodated under the Residential Mixed Use or Industrial Office Mixed Use designation. It is anticipated that the live-work concept will be integrated through a subsequent zoning amendment.

General Plan Foundation Documents. The following documents represent the results of the community outreach process at several key steps, the definition and identification of the baseline conditions and assumptions upon which they are based, and the land use projections used in formulating the Land Use Alternatives.

1. Imagine Chico 2030 Vision book. The Imagine Chico 2030 Vision book was developed as a guiding tool by summarizing the future ideas and visions of Chico residents captured during the initial public outreach. Its purpose was to give residents, staff, and leaders of Chico insight into what the community wants as we move forward developing the Land Use Alternatives and Guiding Principles. Next year, the Vision book will also provide a framework and reference for development of the General Plan policy document: the goals, policies, and actions that will achieve the vision through the General Plan.
2. Existing Conditions Report. The Existing Conditions Report was prepared as a resource document to inform and support preparation of the 2030 General Plan Update by defining the baseline conditions as of December 2007. The report was used to inform the development of the Land Use Alternatives in terms of current known constraints and opportunities. The Existing Conditions Report establishes the baseline for Environmental Impact Report analysis of the preferred Land Use Alternative (the "Project" under CEQA) at a quantitative level and the alternatives to the Project (the other three alternatives) that are analyzed at a qualitative level of detail.
3. The Key Issues Report. The Key Issues report organized the input from the three workshops, which comprised 158 identified issues, into eight general categories that roughly correspond to the City's

General Plan elements. These issues informed the development of the Guiding Principles and will be an important reference and starting place for development of the 2030 General Plan policy document: the goal, policies, and actions that will be developed under next year's work program.

4. Guiding Principles. The results of the community vision and key issues outreach series formed the basis for development of a key component of the 2030 General Plan Update---the Chico 2030 General Plan Guiding Principles (**Attachment 5**), which provide an overarching framework and benchmarks to direct Chico's future, consistent with those community values and desires expressed to date. Guiding Principles provide broad statements of purpose, intent and/or direction to achieve the community vision and were used to guide development of the growth alternatives maps. Additionally, the Guiding Principles establish benchmarks for development of the 2030 General Plan goals, policies and actions, which will follow City Council's selection of the growth alternatives.
5. Market Opportunities and Land Absorption Projections Report, BAE. The Report is intended to assist in the evaluation of the three Land Use Alternatives. The information in the Report includes an assessment of current market conditions, to help set the context for the land use projections. A retail leakage analysis is included, to assess the extent to which there are current opportunities to expand the local retail base by meeting unmet retail demand from within the City or the surrounding communities. The Report presents absorption projections for the City's major land use sectors, including residential, office, retail, and industrial (under the assumption that the current development pattern continues into the future) that would be necessary to accommodate an anticipated increase in population of 40,000 residents. The absorption projections are an assessment of the magnitude of demand for developable land under one set of assumptions that would be necessary during the General Plan time horizon; they are not a required benchmark. Finally, the paper concludes with an assessment of market opportunities for the Downtown Element of the General Plan to help promote new retail, office, and residential uses in the downtown area.

Over the next year, as policies are developed and the results of further analysis are received, the community, stakeholders, and public officials should consider how the land use alternatives may be affected in light of their own knowledge, perceptions, and values in order to ultimately arrive at the General Plan Land Use Diagram that will best serve the community's needs, considering the potential market factors as well as other important planning considerations.

Growth Opportunities and Constraints: When developing the Land Use Alternatives the General Plan Team reflected the information from the community and stakeholders, information from the foundation documents, and also applied good planning principles and considered known key opportunities and constraints that could have an effect on location or designation of land uses as described below.

1. Good Planning Principles. In addition to understanding community conditions, issues, and vision, the General Plan project team has applied sound planning principles to the development of land use concepts. Specifically, key principles of smart growth and community building are as follows:
 - **Balanced Land Uses**. Planning for the right mix and distribution of land uses needed for the community to thrive.
 - **Building Blocks**. Planning based on a system of neighborhoods, villages, and districts throughout the City in both developed areas of the City and new growth areas.
 - **Complete Neighborhoods**. Planning for recreation, education, services, and jobs in proximity to homes for a more livable and healthy community.
 - **Transportation Choices**. Planning for the movement of people and goods throughout the community.
 - **Housing Choices**. Planning for housing to meet the needs of all existing and future residents of the community.
 - **Integrated (Mixed) Land Uses**. Planning for the mixing of compatible uses (vertically and horizontally) for a more livable and sustainable community.
 - **Compact Urban Development**. Planning a more efficient land use pattern with a mixing of uses in a more dense and intense development pattern to reduce ecological footprint and infrastructure and service costs and to create vibrant core areas of the community.

- Preservation/Integration of Natural Resources. Balance preservation and development interests effectively to maintain valuable resources.
 - Quality Design/Sense of Place. Planning to ensure quality design that enhances the character of immediate area and community as a whole.
 - Reuse/Infill. Planning for revitalization of existing areas of the community in a manner that respects desired development patterns and enhances the area.
2. Key Opportunities. Within Chico's current city limits, twelve opportunity sites have been identified for changes to the General Plan Land Use Diagram. Opportunity sites represent those areas where the Project Team and/or community believe that there is significant potential for infill development, redevelopment, and new development to meet the community needs and desires. Many of the opportunity sites include multiple parcels (e.g., Downtown Chico is one of the twelve identified opportunity sites). The proposed changes are being suggested for one or more of the following reasons: to introduce land use designations that encourage a mixture of uses, to add or increase residential density, and/or to better align the designation with existing and anticipated land uses on or near the site. In limited cases, one land use solution (fixed solution) is proposed for all three alternatives. However, most of the opportunity sites include a range of land use solutions for consideration of Alternatives A, B & C (see **Attachment 6**). Detailed descriptions of the changes proposed for each opportunity site are provided in **Attachment 7**.
3. Constraints. Growth Alternatives have been shaped by a number of currently known constraints. The most significant environmental constraint that limits development opportunity is the habitat for Butte County Meadowfoam (BCM), a critically endangered state and federally listed endangered plant species that is found only in limited areas in Butte County. These populations are depicted on the biological resources maps prepared on behalf of the Butte County Association of Governments (BCAG) as a part of the work effort in developing the Butte Regional Habitat Conservation Plan. Three areas of significant BCM populations are noted on the Land Use Alternatives maps (West of Airport and the Bruce Rd/Skyway, Bruce Road/Stilson Canyon Road, and Doe Mill SPAs), which are designated Resource Management, Butte County Meadowfoam (RM/BCM) on Alternatives A and C. Alternative B reflects the current underlying land use designation from the 1994 General Plan with the RM/BCM overlay.

Also depicted on the biological resources maps are other sensitive environmental resources including streams, wetlands, oak woodlands, and riparian habitats which have varying degrees of flexibility with regard to physical constraints to growth. The Land Use Alternatives maps all reflect additional lands designated Creekside Greenway along Little Chico Creek. Areas adjacent to Mud Creek and State and federally recognized preserve areas have been designated Open Space -Environmental Conservation and Safety.

Noise and safety constraints posed by the railroad and Chico Municipal Airport were addressed by locating residential uses away from the tracks in the Diamond Match SPA and away from the airport safety and noise zones adjacent to the airport.

Other notable physical constraints involve steeper foothill terrain along the eastern side of the planning area. Steeper foothill areas carry constraints of viewshed impacts, as well as reducing grading ability due to acclivity and underlying volcanic hardpan geology. The Doe Mill/Honey Run SPA land uses are designated to take advantage of the ridge and valley system to screen development and this level of detail would be achieved through policy language.

The Nance Canyon SPA land uses are designated to recognize compatibility issues with the proximity to the County Landfill. Again, this level of detail would be achieved through development of General Plan policies.

The availability of infrastructure (sewer) and access currently constrains growth in the north and south-most portions of the planning area. It is recognized that these issues need to be resolved through development of the Circulation Plan and Infrastructure Plan and through development of General Plan policies. The constraint of sewer service is compounded in the southeast growth areas (Nance Canyon and South Entler SPAs) due to low elevations, which may add to the cost of engineering. Extension of

roads in these southeast areas also presently constrain ready development, where new interchanges will be necessary on Hwy. 99 and access developed to serving industrial areas.

The Butte County Greenline (agricultural land protection) has been recognized by the City along the western edge of the City to protect viable agricultural uses and prime agricultural soils. The Alternatives reflect Creekside Greenway and Open Space, Resource Management designations to further buffer areas adjacent to the Greenline in the Midway and South Entler SPAs.

See **Attachment 15** for the Constraints Map.

DESCRIPTION OF THE LAND USE ALTERNATIVES

The purpose of this section of the report is to describe the three land use alternatives in terms of key features and assumptions, distinctions, trade offs, and ability to meet the minimum projected needs of Chico in 2030. However, all four alternatives (existing condition plus three viable alternatives) will be considered moving forward. It is important to note that these alternatives can be refined and will include a greater level of detail moving forward with the environmental, economic, and social analysis of the General Plan Alternatives. Other key planning considerations for the land use alternatives analysis are described below.

1. City Boundaries, Sphere of Influence, and Planning Area. Through the visioning and key issues outreach process for the General Plan update, the General Plan Team heard a strong desire for the City to create clear growth boundaries and to identify areas where growth will and will not occur. While all of the Land Use Alternatives include land use proposals for the areas within the City, Sphere of Influence, and General Plan Planning Area, it is important to note that the City does not have formal land use authority over any lands that are outside of the existing City boundary. Through this process of evaluating future land use needs and through subsequent policy discussions, the City may consider a process to expand the City's Sphere of Influence. In the meantime, it is important to recognize that some of the opportunity sites and SPAs are located outside of the current City boundary and may not represent viable options to meet future needs due to the complexities of the annexation process, landowner desires, and political considerations.
2. Land Use Designations. The General Plan Team has proposed several changes to the existing land use designations to encourage better integration of uses, consolidate similar land use categories, and to improve the description or development standards. Specific changes are summarized below:
 - New mixed use categories include Residential Mixed Use, Office Mixed Use, Commercial Mixed Use, Downtown Retail Mixed Use, Industrial Office Mixed Use. The Office Mixed Use category replaces the existing Office designation and the Industrial Office Mixed Use category replaces the existing Industrial Park designation.
 - Commercial categories are amended to add the Neighborhood Commercial and Regional Commercial designations and eliminate the Visitor Commercial designation.
 - Added a Resource Management, Butte County Meadowfoam designation.
 - Added the Special Planning Area designation.
 - Added Urban Reserve designation for potential future growth areas.

Attachment 8 includes a complete listing of the proposed land use designations with general descriptions (and corresponding visual examples) and proposed densities and intensities for development.

3. Special Planning Areas. A new designation called Special Planning Area (SPA) was created to denote new growth areas with development/ redevelopment potential that require subsequent annexation and master planning. Illustrative or conceptual land use plans were created for each of the ten SPAs within the Chico General Plan Planning Area, which reflect site considerations, surrounding uses, guiding principles, and good planning practices. Ultimately, the General Plan and EIR will include development assumptions based on these land use concept plans and corresponding text descriptions. Subsequent development of those areas would require more detailed master planning (e.g., Specific Plan) in keeping

with the development capacity and key concepts for the SPA as outlined in the General Plan. **Attachment 9** includes a general description of each of the Planning Areas along with special considerations and key concepts for each of the illustrative plans shown in Alternatives A through C.

4. Projected Land Use Absorption and Additional Capacity. Consistent with regional and state growth projections, the City would grow at approximately two percent annually, resulting in an additional 40,262 residents and approximately 16,376 additional housing units in the year 2030. Those projections represent the anticipated amount of growth that should be accommodated in the General Plan Update.

Specific gross acreage projections by general land use type are summarized in the table below based on the Market Analysis and Land Use Absorption Projections report. At the July 15th Joint Study Session, the General Plan Team explained that the report identifies minimum land use needs based on historic patterns and existing market conditions. The projections do not take into consideration policy changes that could impact land use absorption (e.g., more jobs, changes to housing density) and do not include additional land capacity or "market buffer" to address landowner availability, site readiness, market changes, and other factors. Once the City develops key policies for the General Plan, the Project Team will provide more detailed strategies for maintaining additional capacity over the timeframe of the General Plan. In the meantime, the Project Team is recommending a market buffer of 15 percent addition in the gross acreage for new growth areas (for roads, landscape and other miscellaneous infrastructure) for the projected land use needs in 2030 as shown in the table below.

| Land Use Type | Projected Demand in Gross Acres | 15% Additional Capacity | Total Target Demand in Gross Acres |
|---|---------------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Residential ⁽¹⁾ | 2,103 - 2,671 acres | 315 - 400 acres | 2,418 - 3,071 acres |
| Retail | 349 acres | 52 acres | 401 acres |
| Office | 99 acres | 15 acres | 114 acres |
| Industrial | 208 acres | 31 acres | 239 acres |
| Health | 90 acres | 14 acres | 104 acres |
| Other | 142 acres | 21 acres | 163 acres |
| <p><i>Notes:</i></p> <p>⁽¹⁾ <i>The residential acreage range depends upon the mix of single-family and multifamily residential. The low end of the range reflects a 70% sf/30% mf mix and the high end reflects a 55% sf/45% mf mix.</i></p> | | | |

The Land Use Alternatives analysis herein provides a brief description of the existing General Plan and three alternatives, highlighting distinctions, ability to meet the projected needs in 2030, and introduces some trade offs associated with each plan.

Existing 1994 General Plan (no change to existing land plan) - See **Attachment 11**

The existing General Plan Diagram and Land Use Element constitute the physical framework established for the community in 1994. The Land Use Diagram designated the general location, distribution, and extent of land uses to ensure a balanced distribution of housing, jobs, services, and parks.

The table below includes a summary of the land use absorption projections from the Market Opportunities and Land Absorption Report and an evaluation of the ability to meet those projections under the existing General Plan. Projected land use demand for future residential (housing units and acreage) and non-residential uses (jobs) assumes the development of undeveloped or vacant properties for both infill site and Greenfield areas. Additional opportunities exist today to redevelop existing underutilized sites, but those numbers are not reflected in the table below. Rather, redevelopment would bolster the City's ability to meet projected needs above and beyond the shortfall or excess identified. See **Attachment 10** for acreage and calculations for the existing General Plan. Acreage figures listed in the table below are gross acres.

| COMPARISON TABLE OF PROJECTED DEMAND TO EXISTING GENERAL PLAN | | | | | |
|--|---------------------------------------|------------------|--|--|--|
| Land Use Demand Category | | Projected Demand | Target Demand (projected + 15% capacity) | Existing GP Vacant Land ⁽¹⁾ | Shortfall or Excess Relative to Target Demand ⁽²⁾ |
| Housing | Residential Units | 16,376 du | N/A | 10,890 du | - 5,486 units |
| | Residential Land: ⁽³⁾ | 2,103 - 2,671 ac | 2,418 - 3,071 ac | 1,715 ac | - 703 - 1,356 ac |
| | SF Residential | | | 1,500 ac | |
| | MF Residential | | | 215 ac | |
| Jobs | Retail Land ⁽⁴⁾ | 349 ac | 401 ac | 125 ac | - 276 ac |
| | Office and Health Land ⁽⁵⁾ | 189 ac | 228 ac | 61 ac | - 167 ac |
| | Industrial Land ⁽⁶⁾ | 208 ac | 239 ac | 632 ac | + 384 ac |
| | Other Land | 142 ac | 163 ac | | |
| <p>Notes:</p> <p>⁽¹⁾ The Existing GP acreage numbers come from the current parcel based vacant land analysis. Residential acreage figures exclude SMU areas (Meriam Park) and are discounted to exclude designated resource management acreage, which equates to 50% of the land area of several parcels.</p> <p>⁽²⁾ Shortfall or excess units and acreage reflect the additional units and/or land area needed to meet the projected land use absorption in 2030, including a 15% buffer or additional capacity.</p> <p>⁽³⁾ The residential acreage range depends upon the mix of single-family and multifamily residential. The low end of the range reflects a 70% sf/30% mf mix and the high end reflects a 55% sf/45% mf mix. The Single family Residential acreage includes land designated as RR, VLDR, LDR, MDR, RMU, and LW in the existing GP and/or draft land use alternatives. The Multifamily Residential acreage includes land designated as MHDR, HDR, and RMU-HD in the existing GP and/or draft land use alternatives.</p> <p>⁽⁴⁾ The Retail acreage includes land designated as MC, CC, RC, CS, VS, CMU, D, and DRMU in the existing GP and/or draft land use alternatives.</p> <p>⁽⁵⁾ The Office and Health acreage includes land designated as O and OMU in the existing GP and/or draft land use alternatives.</p> <p>⁽⁶⁾ The Industrial acreage includes land designated as M&W, IP, and IOMU in the existing GP and/or draft land use alternatives.</p> | | | | | |

As shown in the table above, the existing 1994 General Plan Land Use Element/Diagram does not include a sufficient land supply to meet the projected land use needs in 2030 for housing units and land or retail and office land. However, the existing General Plan may include an oversupply of industrial land to meet the projected demand.

The General Plan Team has heard from the community, stakeholders, and property owners that some of that land may not be ready for development (environmental, infrastructure, and access constraints) and that other areas may better attract a wider range of job needs consistent with the Economic Development Strategy. The land use alternatives introduce changes to existing industrial land and new land use designations to add job opportunities in several areas of the City. See discussion of alternatives, projected needs, and trade offs in the discussion that follows.

Land Use Alternative A - See **Attachment 12**

Land Use Alternative A provides for significant growth areas within nine Special Planning Areas (SPAs) along the north/south corridor, select areas to the southeast, and in four areas west beyond the Greenline. The nine SPAs represent previous growth areas investigated by the City in 2003 (Mud Creek, Bell Muir, MacIntosh/Estes, and Midway), areas already identified by the City to accommodate growth within the existing Sphere of Influence (North Chico, Diamond Match, and South Entler), and new areas suggested by landowners (Nance Canyon and Doe Mill/Honey Run). Conceptual land use plans for the SPAs focus on residential land use with lower densities consistent with existing development patterns. The concept plans for this Alternative reflect one of the desired land use patterns expressed by the community, and would require subsequent master planning consistent with the established development capacity for the planning area. Three large constrained areas (West of Airport, Bruce Road/Skyway, and Bruce Road/Stilson Canyon Road) are shown with the new Resource Management, Butte County Meadowfoam designation.

Alternative A also includes 13 Opportunity Sites located along key underdeveloped transportation corridors or in strategic locations that have been identified because of their infill and redevelopment potential. In an effort facilitate a mixture of uses, to increase residential density, and/or to enhance existing and anticipated land uses, new designations have been applied, landowner requests have been incorporated, and concepts identified in neighborhood plans that are adopted or under review have been reconciled. See **Attachment 7** for a detailed description of the different land use designations and strategies applied to the Opportunity Sites for each of the three Alternatives.

Alternative A has the largest development footprint area and the greatest amount of additional lower density residential acreage. In particular, growth areas in the north are primarily residential with supporting services. This development pattern is in keeping with existing development patterns and land uses and does not maximize the creation of new job opportunities in close proximity to residential areas and does not represent the most diverse mix of housing types and densities relative to accommodating future affordable housing needs. Job growth (office and industrial) in Alternative A is concentrated in the Nance Canyon SPA and along the railroad in the Midway, Diamond Match, and Macintosh/Estes SPAs. Retail growth is concentrated in the South Entler SPA, Downtown, and surrounding areas.

Projected Need. The table below includes a summary of the land use absorption projections from the Market Opportunities and Land Absorption Report and an evaluation of the ability to meet those projections under Land Use Alternative A. The ability to meet projected land use demand for housing and jobs is derived by taking acreage by land use category (residential, retail, office, industrial, and other) proposed in the Special Planning Areas for Alternative A and adding the vacant entitled and unentitled land within the City's Sphere of Influence (discounting for land already identified in an SPA or making reductions for land with sensitive resources). The combination of this acreage is compared to the targeted demand (BAE Report assumptions plus 15% additional land capacity) to determine if there is a deficit or excess. It is assumed that any deficit would need to be satisfied through the 13 identified opportunity sites throughout existing Chico, including the Downtown. Acreage figures listed in the table below are gross acres. See **Attachment 10** for acreage calculations for Land Use Alternative A.

| COMPARISON TABLE OF PROJECTED DEMAND TO LAND USE ALTERNATIVE A | | | | | | |
|--|--|---------------------|--|---|--|---|
| Land Use Demand Category | | Projected Demand | Target Demand (projected + 15% capacity) | Land Use Alternative A New Growth Areas Only ⁽¹⁾ | Other Existing Vacant Land Capacity ⁽²⁾ | Deficit or Surplus Compared to Target Demand ⁽³⁾ |
| Housing | Residential Units | 16,376 du | N/A | 11,784 du | 9,890 du | + 5,298 du |
| | Residential Land: ⁽⁴⁾ SF Residential MF Residential | 2,103 - 2,671 ac | 2,418 - 3,071 ac | 1,840 ac | 938 ac | + 360 ac thru - 293 ac |
| Jobs | Retail Land ⁽⁵⁾ | 349 ac | 401 ac | 297 ac | 102 ac | - 2 ac |
| | Office and Health Land ⁽⁶⁾ | 189 ac | 228 ac | 221 ac | 63 ac | + 56 ac |
| | Industrial Land ⁽⁷⁾ | 208 ac | 239 ac | 380 ac | 129 ac | + 270 ac |
| | Other Land | 142 ac | 163 ac | 31 ac | | - 148 ac |

Notes:

- ⁽¹⁾ Consistent with the assumptions in the BAE Report for land use demand projections, the acreage figures reflect a 15 percent addition in the gross acreage to account for new growth areas for roads, landscape and other miscellaneous infrastructure. New growth areas include the proposed Special Planning Areas shown in the draft Land Use Alternative.
- ⁽²⁾ This column contains vacant entitled and unentitled land within the City's SOI with the following exceptions: 1) vacant acreage located within an SPA or Opportunity Site has been removed to ensure no double counting, 2) vacant acreage that falls within a RM overlay has been given a 50% reduction, and 3) vacant acreage that has been mapped during the HCP process as having Butte County Meadowfoam has been given a 100% reduction due to the unlikeliness of future development (Constrained Areas A, B, and C shown on the Alternative map).
- ⁽³⁾ The infill and/or redevelopment needed to meet the target demand is a simple calculation between the target demand or projected need (plus a 15% capacity) and the ability to meet that need through existing vacant land and new growth areas. It is assumed that the acreage need listed in this column would need to be satisfied through the 13 identified opportunity sites throughout existing Chico, including the Downtown.
- ⁽⁴⁾ The residential acreage range depends upon the mix of single-family and multifamily residential. The low end of the range reflects a 70% sf/30% mf mix and the high end reflects a 55% sf/45% mf mix. The Single family Residential acreage includes land designated as Very Low Density Residential, Low Density Residential, Medium Density Residential, and Residential Mixed Use in the existing General Plan and/or draft land use alternatives. The Multifamily Residential acreage includes land designated as Medium High Density Residential, High Density Residential, and Residential Mixed Use-High Density in the existing General Plan and/or draft land use alternatives.
- ⁽⁵⁾ The Retail acreage includes land designated as Mixed Use Neighborhood Core, Neighborhood Commercial, Community Commercial, Regional Commercial, Commercial Services, Visitor Services, Commercial Mixed-Use, Downtown, and Downtown Residential Mixed Use in the existing General Plan and/or draft land use alternatives.
- ⁽⁶⁾ The Office and Health acreage includes land designated as Office and Office Mixed-Use in the existing General Plan and/or draft land use alternatives.
- ⁽⁷⁾ The Industrial acreage includes land designated as Manufacturing and Warehousing, Industrial Park, and Industrial Office Mixed-Use in the existing General Plan and/or draft land use alternatives.

As shown in the table above, Land Use Alternative A, barring the "Other Land" category, generally meets or exceeds the target demand for the land use categories Residential, Retail, Office and Health, and Industrial, through a combination of acreage in the proposed SPAs and other vacant land within the City's Sphere of Influence. Infill and/or redevelopment of the 13 Opportunity Sites and other existing areas in the City would provide an additional buffer beyond the target demand. Alternative A exceeds the acreage target demand.

Trade Off Discussion. Community input (workshops, GPAC, stakeholder interviews) and the Guiding Principles informed the development of this Land Use Alternative. Below are examples of trade off considerations that the community and decision-makers need to consider as they weigh the merits of the three Alternatives.

Even though the new growth areas are generally contiguous to existing development, Alternative A has the largest footprint and therefore does not best achieve the more compact and well connected growth pattern desired by many in the community and reflected in the Guiding Principles. Further, while the new growth areas include new mixed use designations, and take a step forward with the complete neighborhoods concept, there is a heavy reliance on single-family residential development and the mix of uses is more horizontal than vertical. Also, several of the SPAs are a considerable distance from existing City services and facilities requiring significant expansion of infrastructure and services and the accompanying increase in cost.

The proposed residential densities are consistent with existing development patterns in Chico, which are consistent with retaining Chico's character and identity (defined as a small and gracious Valley community). Further, the provision of larger undeveloped areas provides a good opportunity for master planning for the community's planned growth, and for meeting regional housing allocations required by the State. And while development of the SPAs on the west side of the community would result in a shift of the Greenline and an accompanying loss of agricultural soils and viable agricultural operations, the new SPAs seek to create strong natural and man-made barriers to buffer adjacent agricultural use from further future urban development (i.e., Mud Creek, UPPR, Comanche Creek, etc.).

Development of the SPAs located east of SR 99 need to address the preservation of sensitive habitats, and significant open space has been incorporated into both the Nance Canyon and Doe Mill/Honey Run SPAs. Further, this alternative recognizes significant environmental constraints in key areas and creates several new large resource management sites to the north near the airport, and along the Bruce Avenue corridor south of SR 32 (see Constrained Areas A, B, and C on Alternative A figure). Another consideration of urban development in the foothills is potential degradation of visual resources if appropriate site planning and/or standards are not incorporated.

From an economic development perspective, Alternative A provides good opportunities for job growth, however, those opportunities are concentrated to the south and west, and are underrepresented in the northern part of the community. New retail areas identified along SR 99 would meet the criteria of national retailers looking for highway frontage and accessibility and provide an excellent opportunity to increase the City's tax base.

Land Use Alternative B - See **Attachment 13**

Land Use Alternative B identifies major growth areas in eight SPAs generally located in the north/south corridor, select areas to the southeast, and in four areas west beyond the Greenline. Unlike Alternative A, Alternative B does not include the Nance Canyon SPA located south of Butte Creek and to the east of SR 99. The concept plans for the SPAs focus on additional office and industrial job opportunities, particularly in the southern end of town, and consistently provide a wide range of housing densities. The concept plans for this Alternative reflect one of the desired land use patterns expressed by the community, and would require subsequent master planning consistent with the established development capacity for the planning area. Alternative B maintains some development potential on the three large areas constrained by Butte County Meadowfoam (West of Airport, Bruce Road/Skyway, and Bruce Road/Stilson Canyon Road).

Like Alternative A, Alternative B also includes 13 Opportunity Sites located along key underdeveloped transportation corridors or in strategic locations that have been identified for their infill and redevelopment potential. See Attachment 8 for a detailed description of the different designations and strategies applied to the Opportunity Sites for each of the three Alternatives.

Alternative B has the second largest development footprint area, and looks to balance new growth areas and infill/redevelopment potential to meet projected land needs. The development pattern attempts to maximize the creation of new job opportunities in close proximity to residential areas throughout the community and represents a diverse mix of housing densities. Industrial job growth is focused in close proximity to the existing Hegan Lane industrial area. Retail growth is concentrated in the South Entler SPA, Downtown, and surrounding areas.

Projected Need. The table below includes a summary of the land use absorption projections from the BAE report and an evaluation of the ability to meet those projections under Land Use Alternative B. Ability to meet projected land use demand for housing and jobs is derived by taking acreage by land use category (residential, retail, office, industrial, and other) proposed in the Special Planning Areas for Alternative B and adding the vacant entitled and unentitled land within the City's Sphere of Influence (discounting for land already identified in an SPA or making reductions for land with sensitive resources). The combination of this acreage is compared to the targeted demand (BAE assumptions) to determine if there is a deficit or excess. It is assumed that any deficit would need to be satisfied through the 13 identified opportunity sites throughout existing Chico, including the Downtown. Acreage figures listed in the table below are gross acres. See Attachment 10 for acreage calculations for Alternative B.

| COMPARISON TABLE OF PROJECTED DEMAND TO LAND USE ALTERNATIVE B | | | | | | |
|--|--|---------------------|--|---|--|---|
| Land Use Demand Category | | Projected Demand | Target Demand (projected + 15% capacity) | Land Use Alternative B New Growth Areas Only ⁽¹⁾ | Other Existing Vacant Land Capacity ⁽²⁾ | Deficit or Surplus Compared to Target Demand ⁽³⁾ |
| Housing | Residential Units | 16,376 du | N/A | 9,962 du | 9,890 du | + 3,476 du |
| | Residential Land: ⁽⁴⁾ SF Residential MF Residential | 2,103 - 2,671 ac | 2,418 - 3,071 ac | 1,324 ac | 1,498 ac | + 404 ac thru - 249 ac |
| Jobs | Retail Land ⁽⁵⁾ | 349 ac | 401 ac | 197 ac | 102 ac | - 102 ac |
| | Office and Health Land ⁽⁶⁾ | 189 ac | 228 ac | 81 ac | 63 ac | - 84 ac |
| | Industrial Land ⁽⁷⁾ | 208 ac | 239 ac | 252 ac | 301 ac | + 314 ac |
| | Other Land | 142 ac | 163 ac | 15 ac | | - 148 ac |

Notes:

- ⁽¹⁾ Consistent with the assumptions in the BAE Report for land use demand projections, the acreage figures reflect a 15 percent addition in the gross acreage to account for new growth areas for roads, landscape and other miscellaneous infrastructure. New growth areas include the proposed Special Planning Areas shown in the draft Land Use Alternative.
- ⁽²⁾ This column contains vacant entitled and unentitled land within the City's SOI with the following exceptions: 1) vacant acreage located within an SPA or Opportunity Site has been removed to ensure no double counting, and 2) vacant acreage that falls within a RM overlay has been given a 50% reduction.
- ⁽³⁾ The infill and/or redevelopment needed to meet the target demand is a simple calculation between the target demand or projected need (plus a 15% capacity) and the ability to meet that need through existing vacant land and new growth areas. It is assumed that the acreage need listed in this column would need to be satisfied through the 13 identified opportunity sites throughout existing Chico, including the Downtown.
- ⁽⁴⁾ The residential acreage range depends upon the mix of single-family and multifamily residential. The low end of the range reflects a 70% sf/30% mf mix and the high end reflects a 55% sf/45% mf mix. The Single family Residential acreage includes land designated as Very Low Density Residential, Low Density Residential, Medium Density Residential, and Residential Mixed Use in the existing General Plan and/or draft land use alternatives. The Multifamily Residential acreage includes land designated as Medium High Density Residential, High Density Residential, and Residential Mixed Use-High Density in the existing General Plan and/or draft land use alternatives.
- ⁽⁵⁾ The Retail acreage includes land designated as Mixed Use Neighborhood Core, Neighborhood Commercial, Community Commercial, Regional Commercial, Commercial Services, Visitor Services, Commercial Mixed-Use, Downtown, and Downtown Residential Mixed Use in the existing General Plan and/or draft land use alternatives.
- ⁽⁶⁾ The Office and Health acreage includes land designated as Office and Office Mixed-Use in the existing General Plan and/or draft land use alternatives.
- ⁽⁷⁾ The Industrial acreage includes land designated as Manufacturing and Warehousing, Industrial Park, and Industrial Office Mixed-Use in the existing General Plan and/or draft land use alternatives.

As shown in the table above, Land Use Alternative B meets or exceeds the target demand for the land use categories of Residential and Industrial through a combination of acreage in the proposed SPAs and other vacant land within the City's Sphere of Influence. However, it is important to note that under this Alternative, significant industrial and residential development potential associated with the three large Butte County Meadowfoam Constrained Areas (West of Airport, Bruce Road/Skyway, and Bruce Road/Stilson Canyon Road) was retained, despite the unlikelihood that this development will occur in the future. If this acreage is backed out, the Residential category would be in deficit (-156 ac thru -809 ac), and the Industrial category would be approximately 120 acres in excess of target demand. In addition, this Alternative does not meet the target land use demand for Retail, Office and Health, and Other Land. Infill and/or redevelopment potential in the 13 Opportunity Sites and other existing areas in the City would need to be maximized in order to meet the target demand for all the land use categories.

Trade Off Discussion. Community input (workshops, GPAC, stakeholder interviews) and the Guiding Principles informed the development of this Land Use Alternative. Below are examples of trade off considerations that the community and decision-makers need to consider as they weigh the merits of the three Alternatives.

Although the new growth areas are generally contiguous to existing development, Alternative B still has a significant development footprint and therefore does not fully achieve the more compact growth pattern desired by many in the community and reflected in the Guiding Principles. However, the new growth areas fully integrate new mixed use designations, embrace the complete neighborhood concept, and support both horizontal and vertical mixed use. Like Alternative A, several of the SPAs are a considerable distance from existing City services and facilities requiring expansion of infrastructure and services and the accompanying increase in cost.

The Alternative B land use alternative proposes a wider range of residential densities than exist today in Chico, which would help accommodate future affordable housing allocations required by the State. Overall, this Alternative represents the best balance of new growth areas and focus on infill and redevelopment. The provision of larger undeveloped areas provides a good opportunity for master planning for the community's planned growth. Again, like Alternative A, development of the SPAs on the west side of the community would result in a shift of the Greenline and an accompanying loss of agricultural soils and viable agricultural operations, however, the new SPAs seek to create strong natural and man-made barriers to buffer adjacent agricultural use from future urban development.

Although significant open space has been incorporated into the Doe Mill/Honey Run SPA, development in the foothill/valley interface would need to address the preservation of sensitive habitats and the potential degradation of viewsheds. Unlike Alternatives A and C, this alternative maintains some development potential on the three large areas constrained by Butte County Meadowfoam (see Constrained Areas A, B, and C on Alternative B figure - **Attachment 13**). While these areas are located within the City's Sphere of Influence and close to existing infrastructure and services, development potential is questionable due to state and federal regulations.

From an economic development perspective, Alternative B has the best overall potential for job growth and locates those opportunities throughout the community and in each of the SPAs. However, unlike Alternative A, there are not as many opportunities for new retail along SR 99 (the location desired by national retailers), which therefore does not maximize opportunity to increase the City's tax base.

Alternative C - See **Attachment 14**

Land Use Alternative C identifies limited additional growth areas to the north and south within the City's existing Sphere of Influence, and with no expansion beyond the Greenline. Three SPAs (North Chico, Diamond Match, and South Entler) are included with this Alternative, each with a full range of uses and residential densities. These SPAs rely on higher density residential development, provide a mixed land use pattern, and would require subsequent master planning consistent with the established development capacity for the planning area. The concept plans for this Alternative reflect one of the desired land use patterns expressed by the community. Consistent with Alternative A, three large constrained areas (West of Airport, Bruce Road/Skyway, and Bruce Road/Stilson Canyon Road) are shown with the new Resource Management, Butte County Meadowfoam designation.

A significant amount of growth in this alternative would need to be accommodated through infill and redevelopment of the 13 Opportunity Sites. Like Alternatives A and B, the Opportunity Sites include mixed use designations, but Alternative C relies much more on higher density residential designations to meet projected residential needs. Job growth is concentrated to the south, in the Downtown core and surroundings, and in the North Chico and South Entler SPAs. See **Attachment 7** for a detailed description of the different designations and strategies applied to the Opportunity Sites for each of the three Alternatives.

Alternative C has the smallest development footprint area. The development pattern represents a paradigm shift for the community as it would require concentrated redevelopment of multi-story, multi-family residential and office buildings along existing transportation corridors to meet housing and job creation needs. The creation of new job opportunities is in close proximity to residential areas, and housing densities are on the higher density end of the spectrum.

Projected Need. The table below includes a summary of the land use absorption projections from the Market Opportunities and Land Absorption Report and an evaluation of the ability to meet those projections under Land Use Alternative C. Ability to meet projected land use demand for housing and jobs is derived by taking acreage by land use category (residential, retail, office, industrial, and other) proposed in the Special Planning Areas for Alternative C and adding the vacant entitled and unentitled land within the City's Sphere of Influence (discounting for land already identified in an SPA or making reductions for land with sensitive resources). The combination of this acreage is compared to the targeted demand (BAE assumptions) to determine if there is a deficit or excess. It is assumed that any deficit would need to be satisfied through the 13 identified opportunity sites throughout existing Chico, including the Downtown. Acreage figures listed in the table below are gross acres. See **Attachment 10** for acreage calculations for Land Use Alternative C.

| COMPARISON TABLE OF PROJECTED DEMAND TO LAND USE ALTERNATIVE C | | | | | | |
|--|--|---------------------|--|---|--|---|
| Land Use Demand Category | | Projected Demand | Target Demand (projected + 15% capacity) | Land Use Alternative C New Growth Areas Only ⁽¹⁾ | Other Existing Vacant Land Capacity ⁽²⁾ | Deficit or Surplus Compared to Target Demand ⁽³⁾ |
| Housing | Residential Units | 16,376 du | N/A | 3,907 du | 9,890 du | - 2,579 du |
| | Residential Land: ⁽⁴⁾ SF Residential MF Residential | 2,103 - 2,671 ac | 2,418 - 3,071 ac | 404 ac | 938 ac | - 1,076 thru - 1,729 ac |
| Jobs | Retail Land ⁽⁵⁾ | 349 ac | 401 ac | 119 ac | 102 ac | - 180 ac |
| | Office and Health Land ⁽⁶⁾ | 189 ac | 228 ac | 19 ac | 63 ac | - 146 ac |
| | Industrial Land ⁽⁷⁾ | 208 ac | 239 ac | 113 ac | 129 ac | + 3 ac |
| | Other Land | 142 ac | 163 ac | 8 ac | | - 155 ac |

Notes:

- ⁽¹⁾ Consistent with the assumptions in the BAE Report for land use demand projections, the acreage figures reflect a 15 percent addition in the gross acreage to account for new growth areas for roads, landscape and other miscellaneous infrastructure. New growth areas include the proposed Special Planning Areas shown in the draft Land Use Alternative.
- ⁽²⁾ This column contains vacant entitled and unentitled land within the City's SOI with the following exceptions: 1) vacant acreage located within an SPA or Opportunity Site has been removed to ensure no double counting, 2) vacant acreage that falls within a RM overlay has been given a 50% reduction, and 3) vacant acreage that has been mapped during the HCP process as having Butte County Meadowfoam has been given a 100% reduction due to the unlikelihood of future development (Constrained Areas A, B, and C shown on the Alternative map).
- ⁽³⁾ The infill and/or redevelopment needed to meet the target demand is a simple calculation between the target demand or projected need (plus a 15% capacity) and the ability to meet that need through existing vacant land and new growth areas. It is assumed that the acreage need listed in this column would need to be satisfied through the 13 identified opportunity sites throughout existing Chico, including the Downtown.
- ⁽⁴⁾ The residential acreage range depends upon the mix of single-family and multifamily residential. The low end of the range reflects a 70% sf/30% mf mix and the high end reflects a 55% sf/45% mf mix. The Single family Residential acreage includes land designated as Very Low Density Residential, Low Density Residential, Medium Density Residential, and Residential Mixed Use in the existing General Plan and/or draft land use alternatives. The Multifamily Residential acreage includes land designated as Medium High Density Residential, High Density Residential, and Residential Mixed Use-High Density in the existing General Plan and/or draft land use alternatives.
- ⁽⁵⁾ The Retail acreage includes land designated as Mixed Use Neighborhood Core, Neighborhood Commercial, Community Commercial, Regional Commercial, Commercial Services, Visitor Services, Commercial Mixed-Use, Downtown, and Downtown Residential Mixed Use in the existing General Plan and/or draft land use alternatives.
- ⁽⁶⁾ The Office and Health acreage includes land designated as Office and Office Mixed-Use in the existing General Plan and/or draft land use alternatives.
- ⁽⁷⁾ The Industrial acreage includes land designated as Manufacturing and Warehousing, Industrial Park, and Industrial Office Mixed-Use in the existing General Plan and/or draft land use alternatives.

As shown in the table above, Land Use Alternative C only meets the target demand for the land use category of Industrial through a combination of acreage in the proposed SPAs and other vacant land within the City's Sphere of Influence. This Alternative is significantly below the target land use demand for the categories of Residential, Retail, Office and Health, and Other Land. This is predominantly due to the fact that this Alternative does not propose new growth areas outside of the City's existing Sphere of Influence. Infill and/or redevelopment potential in the 13 Opportunity Sites and other existing areas in the City would need to be promoted, subsidized, maximized, and streamlined in order to meet the target demand for all the land use categories.

Trade Off Discussion. Community input (workshops, GPAC, stakeholder interviews) and the Guiding Principles informed the development of this Land Use Alternative. Below are examples of trade off considerations that the community and decision-makers need to consider as they weigh the merits of the three Alternatives.

The Alternative C land use concept includes limited new growth areas, and instead focuses on infill and redevelopment of existing areas within the City Sphere of Influence. This Alternative, which has the smallest footprint of the three Alternatives, achieves the compact and well connected growth pattern desired by many in the community and reflected in the Guiding Principles. While the number of new growth areas is limited, they do include new mixed use designations, embrace the complete neighborhood concept, and integrate both horizontal and vertical mixed use. However, two of the three SPAs identified in Alternative C (Diamond Match and North Chico) are redevelopment sites, and master planning for infill and/or redevelopment areas is often more difficult than it is for Greenfield areas. The third SPA - North Chico SPA, would require annexation to the City, which again can be difficult. It is important to note that as all the SPAs in this Alternative are already located within the City's existing sphere, phased extension of City services and facilities has already been anticipated and planned.

The proposed residential densities in both the SPAs and the Opportunity Sites are significantly more dense than Chico's past development pattern, which raises some considerations related to retaining Chico's character and identity. Infill and redevelopment in Chico has often been defined by community conflict related to neighborhood compatibility. This Alternative relies on both multi-story development and redevelopment to achieve the densities needed to meet targeted land use demand goals, which in turn has the potential to create concerns regarding compatibility with and impacts to existing adjacent neighborhoods. There would need to be a shift in the City's regulatory environment that is inviting and supportive of this type of development. Further, new land for single-family residential development is much reduced under this Alternative, which poses a conflict with the desire of many community members to live in a reasonably priced, detached single-family home. Limiting the availability of land for this housing type could in turn increase the price of homes.

This Alternative does not propose any development on the agricultural side of the Greenline, and therefore prime agricultural soils and viable agricultural operations along the community's western edge would remain intact. However, many of the areas considered for new growth on the agricultural side of the Greenline in Alternatives A and B have been identified because the agriculture operations have already been compromised. Retaining the existing City limits on the eastern edge of the community would help preserve sensitive habitats found along the valley/foothill interface, and would also protect the foothill viewshed.

From an economic development perspective, Alternative C does not provide as many opportunities as Alternatives A and B for job growth. A paradigm shift towards investment in vertical redevelopment along key City corridors could offset this limitation, but as compared to the other Alternatives there are significantly reduced opportunities for investment in industrial, retail, and office development. Again, there is uncertainty regarding the level of redevelopment that might occur along existing underdeveloped corridors. All of these factors weaken opportunities to increase the City's tax base when compared to Alternatives A and B.

Limiting the City's ability to meet the growth demand to the existing Sphere of Influence as provided in Alternative C would limit the City's control over development at the community's edges, instead deferring to Butte County. In other words, if the City is not able to accommodate the growth within the City boundaries and SOI, that need may be met just beyond those boundaries under the jurisdiction of Butte County. Historically, this has led to conflict due to the County's rural development standards, generally large lot/low density housing that is inconsistent with urban-type development, reduced requirements for utilities and services, and ultimately increased burdens on City services. Areas that the City intended to be left in open space or agricultural production, could in turn be developed by the County that is aggressively looking for economic development opportunities. The City needs to consider its ability to influence development at the community's edges, and also the implications of lost tax revenue.

A concept to keep in mind as the Land Use Alternatives discussion moves forward is the Urban Reserve category that has been developed specifically as part of the General Plan Update process. A possible use of this new category could be as a holding place for growth areas not identified on Alternative C --- both in the event that vacant land becomes scarce and infill or redevelopment is not occurring as anticipated, but also as a notice to the County that the City intends to retain jurisdiction over areas on the community's edges. This approach would also support the concept of orderly phasing of development as it would reserve land until a time when it is needed.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW:

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines, Section 15260, this item involves only planning studies for possible future actions which the agency has not yet approved and is exempt from CEQA. An Environmental Impact Report will be prepared to evaluate the 2030 General Plan.

PUBLIC CONTACT:

Large display ad notices for the joint workshop were published in both the Chico News & Review and the Enterprise-Record. An e-blast highlighting the meeting topic, place and time was sent to a distribution of over 10,000 recipients. Finally, the Land Use Alternative maps are available on the City's dedicated General Plan website (www.chicogeneralplan.com), and their availability has been made known through both a general e-blast and through focused noticing to interested parties.

Reviewed by:

Approved by:

Steve Peterson, Planning Services Director

David Burkland, City Manager

DISTRIBUTION:

City Clerk (18)
Planning Commission (7)
General Plan Advisory Committee (12)
Pacific Municipal Consultants (2)
Property Owners List (12)
PP-Keeler/SP-Vieg

ATTACHMENTS:

1. Stakeholder Interviews
2. Property Owner Land Use Map Suggestion Form
3. Landowner Suggestions for Changes to General Plan Land Use Diagram
4. Landowner Suggestions Map
5. Chico General Plan 2030 Guiding Principles
6. Summary of Land Use Changes for Chico 2030 General Plan Draft Land Use Alternatives
7. Opportunity Site Land Use Change Descriptions
8. Land Use Designations/Corresponding Descriptions
9. Special Planning Areas Descriptions
10. Land Use Totals for Existing General Plan, Alternative A, Alternative B, and Alternative C
11. 1994 General Plan Land Use Diagram
12. Land Use Alternative A
13. Land Use Alternative B
14. Land Use Alternative C
15. Constraints Map
16. Luvaas Letter
17. List of Comments on concept Land Use Alternatives A, B, & C

FILE: P-GP-22.E