

**556TEHAMA COUNTY GENERAL PLAN REVISION PROJECT
ADVISORY COMMITTEE
CORRECTED MINUTES OF THE
MEETING JANUARY 11, 2007**

The Tehama County General Plan Revision Project Advisory Committee met in a regular session at 6:00 p.m. on Thursday, January 11, 2007 at Tehama District Fairgrounds, Tehama Room, 650 Antelope Blvd., Red Bluff, CA.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Alan Hess	Ken Robison
Anne Read	Linda Hayes
Arlo Stroing	Linda Walker
Bill Burrows	Norm Gruver
Burt Bundy	Pat Massie-Johnston
Calvin Rasmussen	Paul Mitchell
Charles Willard	Ron Warner
Gregg Werner	Wally Roney
John Roth	
John Crosby	

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Dexter Wright
Leroy Myers
Linda Jenkins

ALSO PRESENT:

Williams Goodwin, Chief Administrator
George W. Robson, Planning Director
John Stoufer, Planning Staff
Robert Halpin, Planning Staff
Scott Friend, P.M.C.
Mark Teague, P.M.C.
Kellee A. Taresh, Recording Secretary

ANNOUNCEMENTS:

George Robson, Planning Director explained the comment letters had been sent out to all Committee Members. Mr. Robson stated another meeting will be needed and tentatively scheduled for February 8, 2007, and if necessary more meetings may be held. Mr. Robson stated the website includes all the maps and Draft Background Report and Administrative Draft General Plan with the disclaimer that the plan may not be the final plan. The Committees comments are on the website as well.

CITIZENS CONCERNS:

Pat Massie-Johnston stated the Draft General Plan ignores Antelope. She stated there are no maps of Antelope detailing the zoning. The traffic on Antelope Blvd., the circulation, annexation and sewer are also not mentioned. She stated the General Plan is subject to interpretation by the Planning Department.

Mr. Robson stated she had detailed a lot of items in which PMC will address at this meeting.

No other comments were received.

CONTINUED MEETING FROM DECEMBER 7, 2006:

Mark Teague explained the process of the General Plan and Planning Documents. Mr. Teague explained the maps of certain areas can be enlarged as presented by Vestra at the last Committee Meeting. He explained that the Antelope area will require an E.I.R. of its own. Mr. Teague stated the E.I.R. for the General Plan was started when this process started. The EIR cannot be issued until this committee and County is done with the major policies of this document. He gave an overview of the process of the EIR.

Mr Robson explained the project schedules. He stated there will be as many committee meetings as necessary, then there will be five (5) meetings held for public hearings one in each supervisorial district, a final committee review of that hearing data, then the Planning Commission final hearing, then to the Board of Supervisors for approval. Then there will be a public review of the EIR which is a minimum of 45 days. Comments will be received and responded to. Mr. Robson explained in detail the process and the dates involved in completing the General Plan.

Bill Goodwin stated he has been asked when the county will start considering Development Impact Fees.

Mr. Robson explained that is another implementation measure and it could be an ordinance or resolution. It takes place after there is a determination of the want or needs list and it can only be funded by Development Impact Fees and that fee will need to be established. The Policy established the need for better roadways, the need for more parks, affordable housing component, water, sewer, fire protection, etc. The implementation will come at the end when the Policies are adopted.

Mark Teague and Scott Friend furnished a summary of the comments received since the last meeting for the committee to go over and comment on. He noted that comments regarding typos and punctuation were not included in the summary.

Pat Massie-Johnston asked when will the problems in Antelope be addressed. Her understanding was the committee was going to address the problems.

Mr. Teague stated that additional funding was being pursued. He stated there has been subsequent growth in Antelope and therefore it is going to have to be decided who is paying for what, and how is it going to be installed. The land uses in that area will need to be addressed as well as the phasing. He stated an EIR will need to be done at a cost of \$100,000 to \$150,000 over and above engineering.

Mr. Goodwin stated that when the CEQA document is done for the General Plan will it talk about growth and impacts of some of the zone changes.

Mr. Teague answered that yes it will be addressed. He stated it will address growth in great detail. He stated the EIR may change the General Plan it is an accumulative analysis of what is going to happen as a result. One comment addresses limiting growth in the county to 2%. Parts of the County are growing much faster then that, but as a whole we haven't been

averaging that growth rate. If the county adopts Impact Fees you are essentially banking on growth. He stated there are assessment districts, bonding districts and other ways to deal with growth.

Mr. Alan Hess asked if the ordinances had been addressed.

Mr. Teague stated the ordinances had been researched.

Mr. Robson stated there will be ordinances which will need to be rewritten.

Mr. Teague addressed the comment letter handout:

HANDOUT: TEHAMA COUNTY GENERAL PLAN COMMENT LETTERS
(Responses or action by the Committee are shown in bold italic)

1.0 INTRODUCTION

- A) Should correct history page to reflect Lassen's Rancho and proposed townsite in relation to Red Bluff. (1-1)

No Comment by the Committee – change will be made.

- B) Addition to Section 1.3, Legal Basis, end of second paragraph on page 1.6: Should add "All new Property Owner Associations and New Developments, over 50 units, must also have a Specific Plan or General Plan." This would make these developments responsible for all elements, including roads and highways within T.C. (1-6)

"General Plan needs to be changed to Area Plan". Mr. Friend stated no change on this until the committee discusses the Special Plan area in more detail. Hold over for further discussion.

Discussion: Alan Hess questioned the clustering issues. Mr. Robson explained that would be a Development Plan Ordinance, it would not be in the General Plan it would be a Zoning Ordinance or Zoning Designation and could include that zoning for El Camino does not allow the use of clustering.

- C) Add Agricultural and Timber Element as #7 in Element List, changing the following element numbers thereafter.

No Comment by the Committee – change will be made.

2.0 LAND USE

- A) The table on page 2-4 states that there are 318.24 acres of Open Space in Tehama County. However, under 2.0, there is no mention of open space. (2-4)

Discussion that open space be described. Mr. Robson stated there is no open space designation currently. Mr. Friend stated the 318.24 acres will be located and figure out what it is.

- B) In the North Planning Area, how would croplands in Bend be protected given the existing proximity of housing to small-acreage croplands? Development pressure is likely to target these farming parcels. (2-6)

This is an observation and no change to General Plan is needed.

- C) BLM has been expanding holdings along the Sacramento River in anticipation of establishing a national recreation area. As yet, there has not been much expansion of public use because public access and amenities have not been established. Some of this land is adjacent to residential development. Assuming that these improvements are in the works, *how will the BLM buildout impact communities in Bend, Jelly's Ferry, Surrey Village, and Lake California?* (2-7)
Question is outside the scope of the General Plan. Not a General Plan Policy question. Mr. Robson stated that addressing Federal Lands Issue is to ask that the Federal Land Planning Process and the county Land Process include Tehama County.
- D) The East Planning Area section should include a discussion of commercial and residential parcels east of Morgan Summit along Hwy. 36E. This area is likely to receive development pressure as Almanor area grows. (2-7)
General Plan did not expand on any land uses outside of the Development Community Areas. Mr. Robson explained there probably are not any properties out there that can be reclassified at this place and time. Mr. Friend stated that pretty much everything is already in a commercial or residential designation and is currently in private holdings today.
- E) In Table 2-3 – Community Types – there is no mention of Rancho Tehama as a community. (2-10)
This table is not intended to mention specifics of individual communities, its inclusive of topology of an area. Rancho Tehama will be added as Rural Community Center.
- F) Definition and Purpose of Upland Ag – Change “promote” to “accommodate” the use of land for non-agricultural purposes...” (2-11)
Wording will be changed from “promote” to “accommodate”. Compatible will be added to definition.
- G) On page 2-12, there are three references to “gross acres”. What does this mean? Should we eliminate the word “gross”? (2-12)
Gross and Net will be added to the glossary for clarification.
- H) It should be noted that not all lands owned by industrial timber companies have been zoned TPZ by the County. Transitional parcels, which are small residential and commercial parcels that have not been fully converted to non-timber growing use but are still defined as timberland by the Public Resources Code, exist in the Manton, Mineral, Paynes Creek, and Tehama-Cohasset areas. (2-12)
Comment noted.
- I) Include outdoor recreation as a land use. (2-13)
Covered as a use in a zoned district rather than in the General Plan.
- J) On page 2-13; “General Uses: Additional uses may be determined by the *planning director*.” This should be the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors. (2-13)
Mr. Teague explained this pertains to Timberland only. Mr. Robson explained that the Planning Director is to interpret the general plan pertaining to Timberland only. Mr. Scott stated that the word “determined” could be changed to “interpret”

if necessary. A vote was taken to leave as “determined” or “interpret”. The wording stays with “determined” by a show of hands.

- K) Lands that are not designated as Natural Resource Lands will still have key resource amenities. Land use designations such as timber, agriculture, or water also support recreation and critical habitats. These resource benefits may be formally recognized or unrecognized by the land manager/owner. (2-16)
Comment only.
- L) How do Conservation Easements fit into the NR designation? (2-17)
Easements are placed over the top of property. Nothing to amend in this section. Conservation Easements can be handled with a Use Permit.
- M) Conservation elements are not limited only to Scenic Easements. Conservation easements could be cropland or any other property with resource values. Conservation easements may also not be permanent, but may be a temporary status. (2-17)
“Elements” should read “Easements”. This is a comment only.
- N) Non Jurisdictional Public – Add BLM and Fish & Wildlife lands. Particularly along the Sacramento River, these properties add recreational focus and thereby affect adjacent private land use. (2-18)
It was noted that BLM and Fish & Wildlife lands should be included in Public Designation.
- O) Include Lassen Volcanic National Park in the list of examples. (2-19)
Comment noted.
- P) The maps of Dairyville and Mineral are reversed (page 2-23 through page 2-27). These maps need to include the agricultural designation around the towns instead of just a white background. (2-23)
Comment noted.

Discussion: Mr. Goodwin asked that in areas where a specific map has had requested changes, it be highlighted for easy reference. Mr. Friend stated that at the next Committee meeting they will be presenting the entirety of the maps and matrix that highlight all the comments that have been received, which ones were considered favorably and which ones were not considered by the committee. This would not be in the plan, however they would be included in the big maps but not in the book.

Discussion followed regarding Specific Plans and how they work.

- Q) Policy LU-1.4 conflicts with the 20-acre Valley Floor Ag, non-contracted, which states under General Uses: “Residential...” (2-30)
On page 2-12 where Valley Floor Agricultural is discussed “residential uses – add “accessory to an agricultural use” rather than just residential.
- R) Implementation Measure LU-2.1c: “All lands classified as agricultural lands shall be considered eligible to enter into a contract...” *Should strike*, “to be placed within the Agricultural Preserve, and shall be...” (2-31)
Correct Typo - replace “places” with “placed”.

- S) Implementation Measure LU-2.2 – Require the establishment of a 100-foot buffer zone between any new residential subdivision developments and existing agricultural lands. Should require a 300-foot buffer zone. 100 feet is not enough to safely use orchard spray equipment or aerial chemical application. (2-31)

Discussion followed regarding the 100 ft. buffer –vs- 300 ft. buffer and discussion changing the wording to “Residential Building Setback”. Mr. Teague explained this is a buffer zone between Agricultural use and a residential subdivision. He explained the buffer zone should be worded clearly as to whether the 300 ft. would be on the agricultural side or the residential side or if this would be for a residential building only. The word “buffer” zone would need to be defined.

MOTION: A motion was made by Alan Hess, seconded by Linda Walker and carried by a vote of 10:0 unanimous vote of those committee members present to change 100 ft. buffer zone to 300 ft. “Residential Building Setback”.

Mr. Friend explained that the General Plan can be amended four times a year, and there is no limit on how many things can be amended within those 4 times.

Meeting recessed at 8:12 p.m.

Meeting reconvened at 8:24 p.m.

- T) Implementation Measure LU-2.2a: “Require the establishment of a minimum 100-foot buffer zone.” What reference document will state what can or cannot occur in a buffer zone? Can it be farmed? Is it open space for anyone to use for recreation, etc? (2-32)
This was included in the discussion of item (S).

- U) Implementation Measure LU-5.1d: Where does requirement for 15-year supply come from? (2-33)
This is the inventory of land and how often the county would review the General Plan. This is a starting point, 15 years is referenced in the development community. Housing Element is 5 years.

- V) Policy LU-5.4: How is “agricultural viability” determined? This determination could be subjective considering that a one-acre strawberry field or organic vegetable garden may be viable, but a 10-acre irrigated pasture could be part of a hobby farm. (2-34)
Discussion followed regarding in-fill development, longer term viable operations. Mr. Friend stated they would rewrite this policy to get the “in-fill” concept included and they will bring it back with word changes.

- W) Policy LU-6.1: This policy should include small minor land divisions which have a cumulative impact on the surrounding area, and its districts. An implementation measure needs to be added to address this. (2-34)
Remove the word “large”.

- X) Policy LU-7.2: Valley Floor Ag district, 20-acre minimums next to 40-acre contracted lands. (2-35)
This only implements Valley Floor Ag.

- Y) For Figures 2.0.7 and 2.0.8, provide a key to the color designations of the maps.
All maps will have a color key designation.

- Z) General Plan should impose a specific growth limitation, such as two percent, as other counties within California have done.

General Plan does not put a growth cap on it. Some counties do have this because of infrastructure limitations. There must be physical reasons.

- AA) Minimum parcels sizes in Contracted and Non-Contracted lands in “Upland Agricultural” should be changed from 160 acres to 640 acres.
Discussion followed regarding the reasons for and against 640 acre minimum.

MOTION: A motion was made by Linda Walker, seconded by Anne Read and carried by a vote of 6:6 to change minimum parcel size to 640 Acre Minimum in Upland Agricultural Zoning District. Motion died due to tie vote.

MOTION: A motion was made by Anne Read, seconded by Linda Walker and carried by a vote of 6:6 to change minimum parcel size to 320 Acre Minimum in Upland Agricultural Zoning District. Motion died due to tie vote.

Therefore the minimum parcel size remains at 160 acre minimum.

- BB) “Valley Floor Agricultural” should be changed so that the all yellow area outside the grazing line be designated as “Upland Area; Grazing.”

The color designation on the map will be changed – color is too close to adjoining zoning color.

- CC) 160-acre Jelly Ferry Road should be designated with 10-acre parcels because the Jelly Ferry Road’s topography lends itself to Rural Large Lot Zoning. Together with the availability of ample domestic water and soils suitable for septic and sewage disposal, this area would be ideal for 10-acre parcels.
This request was made by a non-committee member and should not be included. Comment removed.

- DD) Valley Floor Agriculture – Definition and Purpose are missing.
Definition is missing and will be included.

Next meeting was scheduled for February 8, 2007, 6:00 p.m.

Meeting was adjourned at 9:05 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted, Recording Secretary
Kellee A. Taresh