

**TEHAMA COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTES OF THE  
SPECIAL MEETING OCTOBER 11, 2007  
GENERAL PLAN STUDY SESSION**

The Tehama County Planning Commission met in a special session at 9:00 am. On Thursday, October 11, 2007 at the Courthouse Annex, Conference Room E, 444 Oak Street, Red Bluff, California, with the following members present: Commissioners Tony Turri, Don Jones, Linda Walker, and Delbert David. Commissioner Kim Tipton was absent.

Chairperson Tony Turri presided. Present were Director of Planning George Robson, and Recording Secretary Kellee A. Taresh.

**CITIZEN'S CONCERNS:**

Chairperson Turri called for public comments. None were received.

Discussion followed regarding the Commissioners review of the projects scheduled for the October 18, 2007 Planning Commission meeting.

Chairperson Turri opened the Special Meeting of the Tehama County Planning Commission.

**WORK/STUDY SESSION:  
Chapter 9.0 Noise**

**9.1 Introduction – Legal Basis and Requirements (Page 9.0-1)**

Paragraph 2 reword as follows:

***“Government Code requires that noise contours reflected in the tables be shown for the above noise sources based on noise monitoring and accepted noise modeling techniques. The noise contours are to be used as a guide for designating land uses within the land use element that minimizes the exposure of community residents to excessive noise.”***

**9.2 Overview – Roadways (Page 9.0-4)**

2<sup>nd</sup> Bullet

This bullet does not include State Route 99 “West”.

***Response: Correct to reflect State Route 99 West.***

**Table 9-2 (Page 9.0-5)**

Clarify this table as “County Roadways”

Discussion followed regarding Calif. Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL).

***Response: It was decided to add additional tables which include 65 MPH and 70 MPH.***

**Table 9-3 (Page 9.0-6)**

Review of the Table by the Commissioners pointed out some clarification for the following:

**Response:**

- **Interstate 5 (table shows 45 MPH) This speed limit needs to be changed to reflect correct MPH.**
- **99 West appears on the table – However 99 East does not - Needs to be added.**
- **Chestnut Avenue (check speed limit – table shows 55 MPH) Possible typo on MPH**
- **Jellys Ferry Road (table shows 350 ADT – Major Collector) Consultant to verify**
- **Bend Ferry Road (table shows 1,230 ADT – Minor Collector) Consultant to verify**

**Table 9-4 Airport/Land Use Noise Compatibility Criteria (Page 9.0-8)**

Discussion followed regarding the table and the reflection of Airport Noise on the different Land Use Categories. There was a question as to the Title of the Table is confusing.

**Response: Rename the Table “Impact of Airport Noise On Land Use” or just remove the “/”.**

**Figure 9.0-2 – TCACLUP Noise Policies (Page 9.0-12)**

Discussion followed regarding the change of “Airport/Land Use Noise Compatibility” to match the name of Table 9-4 on Page 9.0-8.

**Response: Change 1) 3) and 4) to match title given to Table 9-4**

**Policy N-2.4 – Implementation Measure N-2.4a**

Commissioner Walker read the implementation measure and noted a letter from Mr. Kelley at one of the public hearings requesting construction time to begin at 5 a.m. during the hot months.

**Response: Consensus was to change the implementation measure to read:**

**“Restrict construction activities to the hours as determined in the Countywide Noise Control Ordinance.”**

**Policy N-5.1 – Implementation Measure N-5.1a (Page 9.0-19)**

Commissioner Walker stated that the reference to “Airport/Land Use Noise Compatibility” be changed to reflect the table name change in Table 9-4 (Page 9.0-12).

**Response: Change (a) and (c) to reflect the new name of Table 9-4 (Page 9.0-12).**

**Chapter 2.0 Land Use Element**

Mr. Robson explained to the Commissioners that the maps within the Land Use section will not be addressed at this time, they will be discussing policies and implementation. They will be discussed after the Commission gets through the policy documents, then the maps will be reviewed by geographic area, which also includes the alternative at the back of the policy.

Mr. Robson also explained that staff is in concurrence with not having the Conceptual Development Plans within the body of the plan. It was a good idea to begin with, from a Professional Planning standpoint it is illustrative and a good tool for planners, it became problematic and confusing as to commitments that really aren't there and don't need to be there. He stated this was a decision by Administration, Public Works, the Consultant, Staff and Mr. Robson.

Discussion followed with consensus from the Commission that it was a good idea to remove the Conceptual Development Plans/Special Planning Areas from the Draft General Plan.

**Table 2-1 (Page 2.0-3)**

Commissioner Walker questioned the acreage noted for Lassen Volcanic National Park; acreage for Native American; acreage for Other; and the acreage for State, County and Municipal.

***Response: PMC will consult with Vestra and make appropriate changes if necessary. Acreage for "Other" will be better defined as to what it actually includes. Mr. Robson pointed out the Native American acreage should probably be increased by approximately 1,000 acreage due to a recent purchase of land.***

**Table 2-2 (Page 2.0-4)**

It was discussed that the figures shown on this table would be double checked before the Draft is finalized to make sure the acreages are reflective of any changes made to the lines on the maps.

**2.4 Land Use Issues and Values (Page 2.0-5)**

Commissioner Walker asked about the bulleted items. It was noted they reflected feedback from the 2005 Comment Period.

***Response: It was noted that should be referenced here "2005 Comments Received".***

**2.5 Planning Areas – North I-5 Corridor Planning Area (Page 2.0-6)**

(Page 2.0-6) (Paragraph 2)

Commissioner Walker stated this should not go into detail with the Special Planning Areas, just note there is a Special Planning Area located here.

Mr. Robson explained that each of those developments listed are already entitled, except Morgan Ranch. He noted this is just describing what is "proposed" in the North I-5 Corridor Planning Area.

(Page 2.0-7) (Paragraph 1)

Commissioner Walker stated this paragraph is descriptive.

Mr. Robson stated that if it is removed from the Circulation Element then this statement would be removed from the General Plan also.

**2.5 Planning Areas – West County Planning Area (Page 2.0-8)**

Commissioner Turri noted that Corning Road is not mentioned as a major roadway.

***Response: Add Corning Road***

**2.7 Land Use Designations – Upland Agriculture (UA) – General Uses. (Page 2.0-15)**

Paragraph 1 – Line 2)

Commissioner Walker noted a typo "diaries" should be "dairies".

***Response: Correct to "Dairies".***

**2.7 Land Use Designations – Valley Floor Agriculture (VFA) – General Uses. (Page 2.0-15)**

Mr. Robson stated we may want to rectify the general description of uses a little more consistent with Ag and track the ordinance a little bit closer.

**Response: Scott Friend stated we can rephrase the intent to be consistent.**

Commissioner David asked about whether the Commission should address El Camino at this point.

Mr. Robson explained that any changes to El Camino will be addressed later in the Study Sessions and then if any changes are made, they will be changed in the document as appropriate.

### **2.7 Land Use Designations – Timber – General Uses. (Page 2.0-15 & 16)**

Discussion regarding the correct name for Timber, Timber Production, or Timber Preserve Zone.

**Response: Scott Friend stated he would research the correct terminology.**

Minimum Parcel Size: Should be 160 not 80.

**Response: Change 80 gross acres to “160 gross acres”; the reference to “or 40 gross acres,” should be removed; “eighty (80) acres of contiguous” should also be rewritten.**

Maximum Dwelling Density: Commissioner Walker asked about the wording.

**Response: Rewrite to read:**

***“Only those dwelling units that existed on the parcel prior to being identified in a TPZ district are allowed, or new dwellings determined by the Planning Commission to be compatible with the management, growing, harvesting or processing of forest products.”***

### **2.7 Land Use Designations – Residential (Page 2.0-16)**

Commissioner David questioned this section regarding “the number of people per dwelling unit”.

**Response: Scott Friend stated this statement is pretty much irrelevant. He stated it should be rewritten to read:**

***“Residential uses can vary widely in development intensity. Characteristics of development intensity are: the number of dwelling units per acre; and dwelling height and dwelling coverage per acre. These and other factors combine to create distinctive living environments.”***

Mr. Robson stated the reference to CA Government Code 65852.2 be added to Suburban Residential and Urban Residential “Maximum Dwelling Density” as well.

### **2.7 Land Use Designations – Neighborhood Center (Page 2.0-17)**

Location Requirements:

Commissioner David questioned the comment “250 to 500 persons within approximately two to three minutes”. He stated he is hesitant to reference driving time.

**Response: Scott Friend stated a comment could be added to “Definition and Purpose” which states:**

***“Additional uses as deemed appropriate by the Planning Commission shall be allowed pursuant to a Use Permit”.***

**Scott Friend pointed out a sentence could be added at the end that preintroduces the topic of the policy.**

Discussion followed regarding “driving time” references within the policies.

**2.7 Land Use Designations – General Industrial – Size and Scale (Page 2.0-19)**

Mr. Robson stated wording be added which states:

***“Structures within areas designated with the General Industrial land use designation shall not cover more than 75% of the site and shall provide adequate areas for on-site parking, waste disposal and storm drainage (as applicable). Outdoor storage areas shall be screened from public view.”***

**Site Planning Requirement.**

Commissioner David questioned the word “shall” instead of using “should”.

Commissioner Walker pointed out the wording could be read many different ways.

***Response: Scott Friend the way this is worded was not the intent and therefore needs to be rewritten.***

**2.7 Land Use Designations – Other - Special Planning (Page 2.0-20)**

Mr. Robson stated this section will be readdressed due to the discussions on Page 21 referring to “Appendix A”.

***Response: Re-write this section. (Page 2.0-20, 21, 22)***

**Consensus reached in all above responses for change in Policies and Implementations.**

Meeting was adjourned at 11:55 a.m.

Next meeting scheduled for Thursday, October 18, 2007, immediately following the 9:00 a.m. Regular Session of the Planning Commission held in the Board of Supervisors Chambers, 633 Washington St., Red Bluff, CA.

---

GEORGE W. ROBSON, SECRETARY  
TEHAMA COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

---

TONY TURRI, CHAIRPERSON  
TEHAMA COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION