



General Plan Update Advisory Committee Meeting Summary

June 15th, 2009

Summary

On June 15th, the General Plan Update team conducted the eighth Yuba County General Plan Update Advisory Committee Meeting (GPUAC) starting at 4:15 p.m. in the County Government Center in Marysville.

This meeting was a follow up to the June 2nd meeting, where Yuba County staff, along with consultants EDAW, Fehr & Peers, and Economics and Planning Systems provided a lengthy discussion of economic development, fiscal, transportation planning, and transportation infrastructure pros and cons of Alternatives A and B. The General Plan Advisory Committee discussed the need to reconsider the overall amount of growth provided in Alternatives A and B due to issues related to jobs-housing balance, economic development, fiscal impacts to the County, transportation impacts, air quality impacts and conflicts with state legislation, infeasibility of attracting outside funds for infrastructure projects, and other factors.

The purpose of the June 15th meeting was to:

- ✓ Review GPUAC comments from June 2nd meeting
- ✓ Review existing development, approved development, and forecast growth
- ✓ Review and discuss options for refining the alternatives
- ✓ Take Committee input
- ✓ Take public input
- ✓ Next steps in the alternatives and General Plan process

The input from the General Plan Update Advisory Committee is summarized below.

Committee Input

- ✓ Support for the alternative that reduces the cost of infrastructure, community services; support concentrated growth and infill rather than the sprawl approved in the last number of years



GENERAL PLAN UPDATE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Meeting Summary, June 15, 2009

- ✓ Support amending specific plans that are in place to focus more on concentrated growth and affordable growth; and focusing more on affordable housing;
- ✓ County should support development that would be eligible for funding under AB 32 SB 375 principles; support concentrated growth; planning housing and transportation together; looking at transportation and employment hubs.
- ✓ The alternatives do not look that much different from one another.
- ✓ Which of the 3 plans take the least amount of farmland out of production? Yes, should consider minimizing the amount of farmland out of production.
- ✓ How to encourage infill development?
- ✓ Infill is driven by fee schedule; whether works or not depends on fees
- ✓ Plumas Lake, the total project should be considered infill development; be flexible in Plumas Lake and allow more density there; but it depends on fees.
- ✓ Going down wrong path to look at areas outside Plumas Lake for development now. Need to determine how to get development in Plumas Lake now. Need to be thinking about lowering fees to induce infill development.
- ✓ Agree that they don't see many differences in the 3 alternatives. One area of similarity is that the alternatives do not really dictate IF an area would develop, but WHEN all the areas would development.
- ✓ Don't see a lot of difference in 3 options; would be in favor of developing the Hwy 70 corridor. Alternative D promotes the Plumas/Hwy 70 corridor with employment uses on the south side of Hwy 65.
- ✓ There are a couple different types of infill development. The type where you can do it in an area with odd lots and the County could serve as a "master developer" for such areas to improve development and housing in existing developed areas. Another related concept is limiting growth to already developed areas; change densities; looking at mixed use opportunity in Plumas Lake SP; developing affordable neighborhoods. Not in the Plumas Lake SP now, but could be.

GENERAL PLAN UPDATE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Meeting Summary, June 15, 2008



- ✓ All of the development along Hwy 65 could be moved along the Hwy 70 corridor instead.
- ✓ County should be looking outside just Hwy 70 corridor; image of Olivehurst is bad now; hard to attract financing; would like to see more of the Hwy 65 corridor development; have to encourage infrastructure provision from developers
- ✓ Hwy 65 corridor is going to develop; would be surprising if the Hwy 65 corridor did not develop.
- ✓ Difference is phasing in the alternatives; need a plan; have to keep in mind a couple of things; markets are difficult to time; ability to finance in certain areas can change quickly; so, flexibility is important
- ✓ There is an acknowledgement that AB 32/SB 375 is suggesting that less growth in foothills and more along highway corridors – both 65 and 70 corridors should have development that will work; how to make 65 corridor; might be 2 different flavors; one might have more basic and one more nonbasic; fundamental problems with focusing growth; unit yields in infill setting is notoriously higher than what happens; easier to work in a greenfield setting; need to have flexibility in 1.3 factor; need to respond to what happens; need not too make development difficult to develop, development would go elsewhere. Need high degree of flexibility.
- ✓ Agree that need to keep eye on Plumas Lake; need more development of a different type that is more connected; small neighborhoods that are walkable and have mom and pop stores; way it is designed now, Plumas Lake does not promote walkability or meeting needs in immediate neighborhood.
- ✓ Asking about cross hatched areas, what these areas mean.
- ✓ Answer: black cross-hatching indicates areas to be planned in coordination with the cities; gray cross hatching indicates areas in Reserve that could be developed in the future but not likely before 2030.
- ✓ How would the County change areas that are protected by entitlement rights?
- ✓ Answer: areas in pink generally have not submitted maps and do not have DAs. If have DAs, then have to agree with both parties. Only 1 project in Plumas Lake SP has a DA (Ross Ranch). DA in the ELSP, however the Edgewater has mostly built out or the properties



GENERAL PLAN UPDATE ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Meeting Summary, June 15, 2009

are in foreclosure, per DA stipulations, the DA may not longer apply to these properties.

- ✓ Which alternative is one more consistent with the Blueprint?
- ✓ Answer: Mostly C and D, but E is not too far from Blueprint.
- ✓ Have Hwy 65 development; why does it not connect to Olivehurst area.
- ✓ Answer: 2 creeks in that area that create constraints to development. Riparian corridor.
- ✓ Asking about the Yuba River Parkway. Asking about why not planning fully along the Yuba River Parkway.
- ✓ Answer: Yuba River Parkway Phase 1 is to Hammonton Smartsville Road. Not all the way to Hwy 20. Two of the alternatives do plan this entire area.
- ✓ The Yuba River Parkway is a condition of approval for the Spring Valley Specific Plan?
- ✓ Answer: yes, believe that is a requirement.
- ✓ Is this project paid for?
- ✓ Answer: yes, County has been collecting fees for this project; other roadway projects would have to be funded in the future, such as the 65 / 70 connector.
- ✓ Question about farmland mitigation. Would mitigation occur in the County?
- ✓ Answer: this is a policy question for later in the GP Update; different projects have taken different approaches; one required preservation within 50 miles, one required it to be within the County. Wanted to ensure similar farmland types.
- ✓ What ag policies are being proposed?
- ✓ Answer: not at the policy level yet, but that is to come soon.
- ✓ Asking about already approved units. SVSP has condition of approval for Marysville Bypass to be built. Are there any other of the approved units that have a significant condition of approval. Asking if there are other substantial conditions of approval that actually are not likely.

GENERAL PLAN UPDATE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Meeting Summary, June 15, 2008



- ✓ Answer: Spring Valley is the one agreement that is protected by the DA. It does technically have vested rights. No, there are not other projects with similar conditions of approval.
- ✓ One thing that should be on the maps is industrial along Hwy 65, but given that Wheatland is wanting to be so large and that County has enough residential, don't need for more new residential along S Beale Road.
- ✓ Don't think the Wheatland plans are realistic. FEMA to rezone to high risk in the spring.
- ✓ Asking about an example of mitigating greenfield development with infill?
- ✓ Answer: Not really an example of "mitigating" greenfield development with infill development. However, there are examples of cities and counties undergoing major shifts in emphasis from greenfield to infill for future growth. The City and County of Sacramento general plans are an example; much greater emphasis on infill intensification to meet future growth needs.

Public Questions and Comments:

- ✓ In 1993 GP research and development area; not shown in green; previously had proposed downzone to agriculture; policies are a part of development capacity, too; environmental constraints will affect actual development capacity.
- ✓ Alternatives C, D, E has the orange area changed; why did it change?
- ✓ Representing Entertainment zone interests; concerned in alternatives about getting industrial or employment areas need to have enough landowners involved to fund infrastructure; encourage committee to look at having all area property owners involved and plan for a larger area; don't divide Sports and Entertainment area; put very low undeveloped rate to encourage those property owners to participate. Don't divide up the area with Reserve designation.
- ✓ Funding mechanism through new development to help pay for infill development is an option that should be considered.
- ✓ Comments on Planning Reserve; concerned about encroachment on agricultural land; have given components on the landscape – 65, 70, Beale, etc; if looking at hooking 65 and 70; significant loss of agricultural land with these roads; when looking at Planning



GENERAL PLAN UPDATE ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Meeting Summary, June 15, 2009

Reserves, consider effect on agriculture; as long as have industrial, not a problem; not residential uses; south County being planned out of ag.

- ✓ Oregon House planning committee, wants to see the County take another look at Alternative 5; stating that the group has received a letter from Cal Fire supporting expansion of Community Boundary Areas; talking about wanting a draft General Plan before can react to land use diagrams.
- ✓ Features of the Magnolia Ranch project represent a great opportunity for the County; having housing next to industrial to reduce commute times would be a benefit; believes the Magnolia project could represent smart growth; discussing Wheatland bypass; Magnolia project is out of flood zone; not prime ag land; on a rail connection; next to Beale AFB; WWTP is a few hundred feet away.
- ✓ The public input is captured accurately in the GPUAC meeting summaries.