

# The County of Yuba

## Community Development & Services Agency

### Kevin Mallen, Director

Phone - (530) 749-5430 • Fax - (530) 749-5434  
 915 8<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 123  
 Marysville, California 95901  
[www.co.yuba.ca.us](http://www.co.yuba.ca.us)



**BUILDING**  
 749-5440 • Fax 749-5616

**CODE ENFORCEMENT**  
 749-5455 • Fax 749-5464


**ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH • CUPA**  
 749-5450 • Fax 749-5454

**HOUSING AND COMMUNITY SERVICES**  
 749-5460 • Fax 749-5464

**PLANNING**  
 749-5470 • Fax 749-5434

**PUBLIC WORKS • SURVEYOR**  
 749-5420 • Fax 749-5424

**TO:** Board of Supervisors

**FROM:** Kevin Mallen, CDSA Director   
 Wendy Hartman, Planning Director

**DATE:** October 21, 2008

**SUBJECT:** Yuba County General Plan Update 2030  
 Board of Supervisors Study Session – Land Use Alternatives

**RECOMMENDATION:** Receive information on General Plan Update Land Use Alternatives and provide direction on the following questions:

1. *Which alternatives should staff utilize as a basis for developing the two refined alternatives?*
2. *What changes, if any, should be made to those, and are there any concepts which are represented in the other alternatives which should be incorporated as well?*

### SUMMARY

This is the second workshop/study session that the Board is holding for the purpose of ultimate selection of a “Preferred Alternative” for the General Plan Update. Staff is seeking guidance and direction in order to proceed with the preparation of two more detailed alternatives that can be analyzed further to provide the Board with the information necessary to make its ultimate selection. This session will review the five alternatives and the comments received from the public, General Plan Update Advisory Committee and Planning Commission to assist the Board in providing direction to staff for the development of the two refined alternatives. Once developed, these two alternatives will be brought back to the Board for final selection of the “Preferred Alternative.”

### BACKGROUND

Five land use alternative concepts were developed to assist in providing a range of options for future County growth which represented the varied opinions raised in the General Plan Update visioning process held throughout the County last summer and through a series of workshops with the Board earlier this year. Each alternative represents an emphasis on different priorities relating to key issues such as local economy, agriculture and open space, housing, transportation

and air quality, and incorporation viability. The following sections will provide an overview of each of the five alternatives and the relative priorities behind the vision each represents.

### ALTERNATIVE 1

Alternative 1 would focus on infill development and development near existing communities. Almost 10 percent of development under Alternative 1 would occur through development of vacant and underutilized properties in the existing developed communities of Olivehurst and Linda. Alternative 1 would emphasize new development in areas that already have access to transportation and other infrastructure and services or in directly adjacent areas.

Growth would continue to occur in the existing community boundaries in the foothills, but this alternative would mostly focus new growth in valley portions of the County.

This alternative would emphasize the preservation of agriculture and open space. Large portions of the River Highlands Community Plan would remain in an open space/agriculture-oriented use through the end of this General Plan time horizon, meaning minimum parcel sizes in the 40-80 acre range.

Alternative 1 would accommodate smaller-scale employment opportunities, such as professional offices and shops within new neighborhoods. Alternative 1 would also accommodate larger-scale employment development, such as light industrial and office parks, near the Highway 65 and 70 wye. Policy priorities under Alternative 1 include:

#### **High**

- Reduction of trip length and dependence on automobiles
- Community revitalization
- Preservation of agriculture and open space
- Efficiency of public services and infrastructure

#### **Medium**

- Improve jobs/housing balance

#### **Low**

- Rural residential growth
- Amount of development

<b>Unincorporated County Total at Buildout</b>	<b>Alternative 1</b>
Population	160,000
Jobs	58,000

## ALTERNATIVE 2

Alternative 2 would expand development opportunities compared to Alternative 1. Additional employment opportunities are provided along the Highway 65 corridor and rural residential growth opportunities are provided in undeveloped areas along Highway 20 in the River Highlands area.

Alternative 2 would still place emphasis on preservation of open space and infill development, but less so than under Alternative 1. Alternative 2 would prioritize development adjacent to existing developed areas where infrastructure and services could be extended. Alternative 2 would envision new neighborhoods directly adjacent to Linda, Olivehurst, and the Plumas lake Specific Plan. Alternative 2 allows for new development in the River Highlands area, including rural residential development and potentially a mix of other land use types.

Alternative 2 also includes employment uses along the Highway 65 corridor between Ostrom Road and South Beale Road, although no housing would be allowed in this area under this scenario. This alternative would not allow County development southeast of South Beale Road. Overall, the policy priorities under Alternative 2 are:

### **High**

- Improve jobs/housing balance
- Preservation of agriculture and open space

### **Medium-High**

- Community revitalization
- Efficiency of public services and infrastructure

### **Medium**

- Reduction of trip length and dependence on automobiles

### **Low-Medium**

- Rural residential growth
- Amount of development

<b>Unincorporated County Total at Buildout</b>	<b>Alternative 2</b>
Population	168,000
Jobs	70,000

## ALTERNATIVE 3

Alternative 3 places less emphasis on infill development in the valley portions of the County, allowing relatively more “greenfield” development opportunity in areas outside of existing communities (compared to Alternatives 1 and 2).

Alternative 3 allows for more rural residential development in the valley portions of the County, as well as some expansion of foothill community boundaries. This alternative would allow greater development in the Highway 65 corridor and southeast of Olivehurst and Linda. County

development southeast of Best Slough would be precluded. This alternative would allow additional development near the Feather River, along the western boundary of the Plumas Lake Specific Plan.

Although this alternative would allow for an increased amount of rural residential development in some portions of the foothills, most of the River Highlands area would revert to open space, similar to Alternative 1. Development priorities under this alternative would be as shown here:

**Medium-High**

- Improve the jobs/housing balance
- Reduction of trip length and dependence on automobiles
- Community revitalization
- Amount of development

**Medium**

- Efficiency of public services and infrastructure
- Rural residential growth

**Low-Medium**

- Preservation of agriculture and open space

Unincorporated County Total at Buildout	Alternative 3
Population	185,000
Jobs	65,000

ALTERNATIVE 4

Alternative 4 provides for more “greenfield” development opportunity in the valley and foothill portions of the County than any of the previously described alternatives. Alternative 4 envisions substantially more population and employment growth than would be anticipated for Yuba County through 2030 based on projections from regional and state agencies. Alternative 4 would allow more development than alternatives 1 through 3 in areas currently without public services and infrastructure. As a result, the County might experience less infill development or development near existing communities such as Linda and Olivehurst..

Alternative 4 would not allow additional development toward the Feather River. Alternative 4 also provides for more growth along the Highway 65 corridor and in the foothills. Priorities for policy emphasis for this alternative are shown below:

**High**

- Improve the jobs/housing balance
- Amount of development

**Medium-High**

- Rural residential growth

**Low-Medium**

- Community revitalization
- Efficiency of public services and infrastructure

**Low**

- Reduction of trip length and dependence on automobiles
- Preservation of agriculture and open space

Unincorporated County Total at Buildout	Alternative 4
Population	202,000
Jobs	85,000

ALTERNATIVE 5

Alternative 5 accommodates the most development within Yuba County compared to the other alternatives, both in the valley and in the foothills and is a compilation of the 200 landowner requests received earlier this year. Alternative 5, like Alternative 4, envisions substantially more population and employment growth than would be anticipated for Yuba County through 2030.

Major growth would occur along Highways 70, 65, and 20, and in areas not near these transportation corridors. Alternative 5 envisions development in River Highlands area similar to what is described in the existing General Plan. This alternative envisions expansion of Community Boundary Areas to accommodate additional rural residential growth in foothill portions of the County. This alternative includes new rural residential development in addition to new neighborhoods distributed throughout the County.

Under Alternative 5, there is less emphasis on infill and redevelopment of existing communities and preservation of agricultural and open space lands. Priorities for policy emphasis for this alternative are shown below:

**High**

- Rural residential growth
- Amount of development

**Medium**

- Improve the jobs/housing balance

**Low**

- Reduction of trip length and dependence on automobiles
- Community revitalization
- Preservation of agriculture and open space
- Efficiency of public services and infrastructure

Unincorporated County Total at Buildout	Alternative 5
Population	267,000
Jobs	94,000

## PUBLIC INPUT ON ALTERNATIVES

In an effort to receive as much input as possible, staff held a series of public workshops on the land use alternatives, as well as provided for a variety of ways for the community to provide comments. These methods included the county web site, email submittals, written communications and surveys. This process also allowed for the opportunity for residents and other stakeholders, the General Plan Update Advisory Committee (GPUAC) and the Planning Commission to identify their two most preferred alternatives and two least preferred alternatives. Since this by itself can sometimes be incomplete, in order to get the whole picture of public sentiment, they were also provided an opportunity to provide feedback on why a particular alternative was chosen as a favorite/least favorite and what they would change about those alternatives if anything. A summary report of this feedback is attached (Attachment 1). Due to the need for sufficient time to analyze the comments for the report, they are separated into two categories: 1. Comments received in time to be incorporated into the report (Attachment 2), and; 2. Comments received after the cut-off date (Attachment 3).

## DISCUSSION

On October 14<sup>th</sup>, the Board provided staff with direction on key principles that would inform the development of the updated General Plan, as well as a growth projection scenario which will provide a framework for the development of the two refined alternatives. Additionally, the attached Summary Report provides a synopsis of public sentiment on the land use alternatives and the alternatives each illustrate varying policy priorities. Given the Board's previous direction, community, GPUAC, and Planning Commission input and policy emphases presented in the various alternatives, staff is looking for direction regarding the following:

Question: *Which alternatives should staff utilize as a basis for developing the two refined alternatives?*

Question: *What changes, if any, should be made to those, and are there any concepts which are represented in the other alternatives which should be incorporated as well?*

## CONCLUSION

The direction provided will allow staff to develop two refined alternatives which will include a preliminary circulation plan, major infrastructure needs assessment, economic and feasibility studies. In order to facilitate timely processing of these alternatives and ultimate completion of this phase of the General Plan Update, staff will develop draft land use concepts and bring them back to the Board for review before proceeding further.

Attachments:

1. Conceptual Alternatives Outreach and Input Report
2. Comments received for report on CD-Rom (A hard copy is available in the Clerk of the Board's office and the Planning Department)
3. Comments received after August 29, 2008 on CD-Rom (A hard copy is available in the Clerk of the Board's office and the Planning Department)