

**Table 1. High Priority Interim Amendments – Development Services**

PRIORITY	TOPIC	PROBLEM STATEMENT	STATUS	NEXT STEPS	USERS GROUP	COUNTY COUNSEL	PLANNING COMMISSION	BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
1	<b>Building Permit Amnesty</b>		<b>COMPLETE</b>					
2	<b>Payment of Direct Charges</b>		<b>COMPLETE</b>					
3	<b>Agricultural Re-Use (ZCA07-0005)</b> Prepare ordinance revisions to allow consideration of a conditional use permit to utilize existing conforming or non-conforming infrastructure and buildings that are located in the Agricultural areas of the County for Ag-related industrial or commercial uses.	Several locations of vacant or underutilized buildings/infrastructure within agricultural zones. These are typically non-conforming or the non-conforming status has expired. The buildings remain vacant, often not well maintained and likely will not be removed to turn the property into productive agricultural land. There is a need to have support industry related to the Agricultural community in near proximity to the user. Current codes do not facilitate re-use or re-habilitation of these buildings.	Inter-Departmental Review Committee June 4, 2008.  Review by Farm Bureau General Plan Subcommittee July 11, 2008.  Full Farm Bureau Review August 7, 2008.  <b>Final Farm Bureau comments pending.</b>	Review Farm Bureau comments upon receipt; CEQA review of additional parcels suggested through Farm Bureau.	Draft Ag. Re-Use ordinance reviewed March 26, 2008  Draft Ag Re-Use Site Inventory reviewed May 28, 2008.  Revised draft ordinance and site inventory available for Users Group Review July 30, 2008.	Draft PC package submitted to County Counsel for review 6/27/08.  Counsel provided comments 7/08/08.  Revised draft ordinance submitted to Counsel 7/15/08.  Counsel provided comments on revised draft ordinance 7/25/08.	TBD	TBD

PRIORITY	TOPIC	PROBLEM STATEMENT	STATUS	NEXT STEPS	USERS GROUP	COUNTY COUNSEL	PLANNING COMMISSION	BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
4	<b>Agricultural Buffer Applicability (ZCA08-0001)</b> Zoning Code Amendment – as directed by the BOS on June 26, 2007.	Clarify the applicability of the Agricultural Buffer Ordinance adopted February 13, 2007.	Finalized Ag. Buffer Applicability Zoning Code Amendment  Review by Farm Bureau Land Use Subcommittee July 11, 2008.  Full Farm Bureau Review August 7, 2008.	Complete Counsel review.  <b>Discuss city comments at Board GP Subcommittee September 30, 2008.</b>	Reviewed draft ordinance with Users Group June 25, 2008.		October 9, 2008 (tent.)	November 18, 2008 (tent.)
5	<b>Minimum Parcel Sizes (GPA08-0001)</b> R-2 through R-4 zones; Section 24.120.10 – (2) Establish reduced minimum parcel sizes appropriate to the densities listed in Policies LUE – 56 and LUE – 57 of the	This is related to the proposed modifications to the Land Use Element of the General Plan (see IV (1.), below), but would <u>not</u> impact the R-1 zone.  The General Plan references a zoning standard. This causes a problem for alternative subdivision design	Planning staff met with Counsel to discuss amendment and determine CEQA status.  Provided Tribal consultation offers as required under SB 18.	Revise Admin. Draft  Complete CEQA review  Prepare PC package  Counsel review	Discussed with Users Group May 28, 2008.		TBD	TBD

	<p>General Plan to remove disincentives in constructing medium and high density residential projects for ownership, rather than rentals.  <b>Combined with – 6,500 Square Foot Minimum</b>                  Amend the Low Density Residential Designation (LUE – 55), Medium Density Residential Designation (LUE – 56), High Density Residential Designation (LUE – 57) to remove reference to “Zoning allows parcel sizes of 6,500 square feet.” This statement is not a replacement for required land use intensity</p>	<p>that would comply with the General Plan density but proposes, for example, smaller lots with additional open space or common areas.</p>						
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

	<p>restrictions and is misleading as parcel sizes under zoning range from 4,000 to 7,000 square feet. Intensity of permitted development should be either through lot coverage or floor area ratios. This additional change would encourage context sensitive design through the use of provisions for "flex-lot" and Planned Unit Development subdivisions.</p>							
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**Table 1. High Priority Interim Amendments – Development Services (cont.)**

PRIORITY	TOPIC	PROBLEM STATEMENT	STATUS	NEXT STEPS	USERS GROUP	COUNTY COUNSEL	PLANNING COMMISSION	BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
6	<p><b>Zoning Administrator</b>                      Consider the establishment of an administrative hearing process (e.g. Zoning Administrator) to expedite the approval of routine, non-controversial projects: including, parcel maps, map extensions, lot line adjustments, certificates of compliance, and minor use permits. The idea would be to modify Code Section 24-70.</p>	<p>Too many minor projects require too much work to achieve a decision. The County could develop streamlined staff report, Environmental Review, and findings processes to save time. Such a process would still provide for appeals to the PC and BOS. It is estimated over 100 of 215 projects could be eligible for this process.</p>	<p>50% Admin. Draft</p>	<p>Complete Admin. Draft.                       GP 2030 Board Subcommittee discussion April 24, 2008.</p>	<p>TBD</p>		<p>TBD</p>	<p>TBD</p>
7	<p><b>Flex Lots</b>                      A flex lot subdivision application cannot be processed within the FEMA 100-year flood designation.</p>	<p>This means that a standard lot layout pattern can be processed for hearing but a flex lot (a provision that allows smaller lots with larger open space for avoidance of sensitive areas, common space and other amenities) cannot be processed. The ordinance does</p>	<p>Preliminary research</p>	<p>Prepare Admin Draft</p>	<p>TBD</p>		<p>TBD</p>	<p>TBD</p>

Interim Amendments Status 09/23/2008

		require protection of flood zones, however, did not contemplate a project where the whole property is in the flood zone.							
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**Table 1. High Priority Interim Amendments – Development Services (cont.)**

PRIORITY	TOPIC	PROBLEM STATEMENT	STATUS	NEXT STEPS	USERS GROUP	COUNTY COUNSEL	PLANNING COMMISSION	BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
8	<p><b>5% Adjustment</b>                      The minimum parcel sizes, particularly in the larger parcel designations, are absolute. For example in a 20-acre minimum zone, you must have 20.00 acres for each parcel proposed in a lot split. Including a provision for a 5% adjustment provided the intent of the zone is maintained subject to Director determination is one approach to consider.</p>	<p>It is not uncommon to have larger parcels that are slightly under the nominal acreage. Example - you cannot create four parcels in a 20-acre minimum designation if you are starting from 79 acres.</p>	<p>Administrative draft under review</p>	<p>Revise Admin Draft</p>	<p>TBD</p>		<p>TBD</p>	<p>TBD</p>

**Table 2. New Interim Amendments – Development Services**

PRIORITY	TOPIC	PROBLEM STATEMENT	STATUS	NEXT STEPS	USERS GROUP	COUNTY COUNSEL	PLANNING COMMISSION	BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
TBD	<p><b>Small Wineries</b> Amend the code to allow greater latitude for tourism at small wineries. On 4/08/08, the Board indicated interest in exploring opportunities to facilitate tourism at olive orchards and tasting rooms through this code fix.</p>	<p>Current zoning restricts tasting at small wineries to 3 days per week. Vans, buses, and outdoor amplified music are prohibited. Small winery owners indicate that these restrictions limit their success and the success of agri-tourism in the County.</p>	Preliminary research		TBD		TBD	TBD

Interim Amendments Status 09/23/2008

TBD	<p><b>Fence Materials</b>                  Definitions; Section 24.305.160 -                  Revise definition of "fence" to clarify the list of permitted construction materials to assist in code enforcement.</p>	<p>This was recommended by the Code Enforcement Advisory Board. Code enforcement occasionally encounters proposals to "fence the junk". With some of these cases, the property owner builds a fence out of materials such as car hoods, metal garage doors, stacked car tires and other used materials. An argument then begins about what constitutes a fence. The existing ordinance can be modified to clarify the fence standards and add efficiency to code enforcement process.</p>	Preliminary research		TBD		TBD	TBD
-----	---	---	----------------------	--	-----	--	-----	-----

**Table 2. New Interim Amendments – Development Services (cont.)**

PRIORITY	TOPIC	PROBLEM STATEMENT	STATUS	NEXT STEPS	USERS GROUP	COUNTY COUNSEL	PLANNING COMMISSION	BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
TBD	<b>SMARA Update</b> The County Surface Mining and Reclamation Ordinance, Chapter 13, Article II, as adopted in 1993 needs to be updated.	The state Surface Mining and Reclamation Act (SMARA) has been amended since the adoption of the County's ordinance. The ordinance needs to be updated to address the SMARA amendments.	Draft ordinance is complete.	TBD	TBD		TBD	TBD
TBD	<b>Lighting Standards</b> The current ordinance has no standards or lacks specifics on lighting.	These issues are primarily related to ministerial/ building permit actions. There have been circumstances of urban-level lighting in rural areas casting light on adjacent properties.	Preliminary research; information exchange with several counties	TBD	TBD		TBD	TBD
TBD	<b>Setback Requirements for Communication Towers</b>	Under current code section 24-262(g), communication towers require a setback that is equal to or greater than the height of the facility, a requirement that may be overly restrictive. Applications are pending.	<b>Consultant proposal pending.</b>  The Board's preferred option will be forwarded to the Planning Commission for processing.				TBD	Informational item and discussion August 5, 2008.  BOS directed development of a Use Permit process with criteria for setback modification - August 19, 2008.

**Table 3. Other Potential Interim Amendments – Development Services**

PRIORITY	TOPIC	PROBLEM STATEMENT	STATUS	NEXT STEPS	USERS GROUP	COUNTY COUNSEL	PLANNING COMMISSION	BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
TBD	<p><b>Solar Fee and Wind Turbine Exemptions</b>                      Explore the option of creating a Fee Exemption for solar Building Permits. The goal is to create an ‘incentive’ for people to install solar panels in Butte County. This would include research of Grant Programs to provide a ‘backfill’ of lost revenue that would cover plan check and inspection services. Board direction on 3/25/08 including exploring exemptions and/or incentives to use wind turbines for power generation.</p>	<p>There is not a specific problem with this item. The current Building Permit fee is \$408 for roof-mounted solar panels. This is presented as an opportunity to highlight solar energy production in Butte County by providing a permit incentive.</p>	Preliminary research	Pending				

**Table 3. Other Potential Interim Amendments – Development Services (cont.)**

PRIORITY	TOPIC	PROBLEM STATEMENT	STATUS	NEXT STEPS	USERS GROUP	COUNTY COUNSEL	PLANNING COMMISSION	BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
TBD	<p><b>Mobile Homes</b>                      On 2/21/08, the Board directed staff to research standards among other jurisdictions for managing the visual, public health, safety, and quality-of-life impacts of allowing aging or derelict mobile homes to remain in place.</p>	<p>Standards for habitability should be explored, including age, quality, and condition. Further direction on 3/25/08 included working with Public Works to explore options for retiring or recycling derelict mobile homes or those older than 10 years.</p> <p>Information Update 9-09-08:                      The California State Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) has adopted emergency regulations which require that manufactured homes installed in California meet the exterior fire safe/ fire resistive construction standards contained in the recently adopted 2007 California Building Code. These regulations became effective September 1, 2008, and apply in all areas designated</p>	Pending					

Interim Amendments Status 09/23/2008

		as State Responsibility Areas (SRA). These regulations preclude the installation of homes that have not been constructed in the factory to meet these standards, and homes manufactured prior to January 1, 2006.							
--	--	---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**Table 3. Other Potential Interim Amendments – Development Services (cont.)**

PRIORITY	TOPIC	PROBLEM STATEMENT	STATUS	NEXT STEPS	USERS GROUP	COUNTY COUNSEL	PLANNING COMMISSION	BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
TBD	<b>Agricultural Buffer Guidelines</b> Develop guidelines for application of the Agricultural Buffer.	The Agricultural Buffer ordinance was adopted by the Board in February 2007. Board direction for further action included the development of guidelines for determining unusual circumstances and implementing the Agricultural Buffer on a parcel-by-parcel basis.	Draft provided to Farm Bureau April 30, 2008.  Review by Farm Bureau Land Use Subcommittee July 11, 2008.  Circulated draft to incorporated jurisdictions for comment.  Full Farm Bureau review August 7, 2008.	User Group review August 27, 2008.  Farm Bureau Executive Committee review and comments.  <b>Discuss city comments at Board GP Subcommittee September 30, 2008.</b>	Reviewed April 30, 2008.  Distributed revised draft to Users Group via email July 3, 2008.  Revised draft redistributed via Users Group website July 30, 2008.	Initial draft submitted to County Counsel April 18, 2008.  County Counsel additional comments August 12, 2008.  <b>DDS has had ongoing re-draft meetings with Agricultural Commissioner and County Counsel for fine tuning based on comments received from the Farm Bureau and all cities except Oroville.</b>	October 9, 2008 (tent.)	November 18, 2008 (tent.)

**Table 4. High Priority Interim Amendments – Public Works**

PRIORITY	TOPIC	PROBLEM STATEMENT	STATUS	NEXT STEPS	USERS GROUP	COUNTY COUNSEL	PLANNING COMMISSION	BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
1	Postponement/bonding of onsite or offsite improvements.  <i>Combined with item 2 -</i>		<b>COMPLETE</b>					
2	Postponement/bonding of onsite or offsite improvements.  <i>Combined with item 1 -</i>		<b>COMPLETE</b>					
3	Cul-de-sac design		<b>COMPLETE</b>					

**Table 4. High Priority Interim Amendments – Public Works (cont.)**

PRIORITY	TOPIC	PROBLEM STATEMENT	STATUS	NEXT STEPS	USERS GROUP	COUNTY COUNSEL	PLANNING COMMISSION	BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
4	<p>California Subdivision Map Act Section 66462.5 is entitled; <u>Approval of Final Map Cannot Be Refused Because of Offsite Improvement Requirements on Land Not Belonging to Subdivision or Local Agency.</u> Staff is looking for Board policy on how the County treats subdivision map applications where either the subdivider proposes or staff will be recommending offsite improvements to accommodate either traffic and/or drainage improvements to the project.</p>	<p>Subdivision Map Act Section 66462.5(a) states, "A city, county, or city and county shall not postpone or refuse approval of a final map because the subdivider has failed to meet a tentative map condition which requires the subdivider to construct or install offsite improvements on land in which neither the subdivider nor the local agency has sufficient title or interest, including an easement or license, at the time the final map is filed with the local agency..." In such cases, unless city, county or city and county requires subdivider to enter into an agreement...(to construct improvements after</p>	<p>Staff developing administrative draft of policy options and recommendations.</p>		<p>Reviewed March 26, 2008.</p>			<p>TBD</p>

Interim Amendments Status 09/23/2008

		city or county acquires interest in land) A) The city or county has 120 days to acquire by negotiation or condemnation an interest in the land necessary for the improvements to be constructed, or B) All offsite improvements shall be deemed to be waived.						
--	--	---	--	--	--	--	--	--

**Table 4. High Priority Interim Amendments – Public Works (cont.)**

PRIORITY	TOPIC	PROBLEM STATEMENT	STATUS	NEXT STEPS	USERS GROUP	COUNTY COUNSEL	PLANNING COMMISSION	BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
5	Grading Ordinance Revision: Amend Article I of Chapter 13 of the Butte County Code to establish standards, plan review and permit processes for grading and earthwork including the control of erosion and sedimentation.	Existing County Code requires a grading permit for earthwork exceeding 1,000 cubic yards that is located above 300 feet mean sea level as well as for building permits and other County discretionary permits such as subdivisions, Use Permits, mining etc. However, County Code is silent on all other grading activities not associated with the permitted activities discussed above.	The Board Committee (Supervisors Josiassen and Connelly) and the User Group have reviewed a number of drafts and revisions. The User Group had a 1-hour workshop on this subject on February 27, 2008.	Based on comments from Users Group and Committee, staff is making revisions to the proposed ordinance.				TBD
6	Issuance of development permits on parcels that were initially created in violation of the County Code but can now be shown to meet code requirements	Undeveloped parcels, created more than 30 years ago, technically in violation of the County Code cannot obtain permits for development without first obtaining a Certificate of	Staff preparing administrative draft Ordinance.					TBD

Interim Amendments Status 09/23/2008

		Compliance although many can currently show compliance with County standards.							
--	--	---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**Table 5. Interim Amendments – Public Health<sup>1</sup>**

PRIORITY	TOPIC	PROBLEM STATEMENT	STATUS	NEXT STEPS	USERS GROUP	COUNTY COUNSEL	PLANNING COMMISSION	BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
1	Animal Control Regulations	Amendment to incorporate a program to address chronic barking dog problems and cat welfare issues.	<p>Animal Control Advisory Board reviewed on 3/11/08 and recommended adoption.</p> <p>Discussed at public meeting June 4, 2008.</p> <p><b>Final public review concluded on September 5, 2008.</b></p> <p><b>Board subcommittee review completed.</b></p>	Will be returned to Board for further discussion.				<p>April 8, 2008 Reviewed by Board.</p> <p>Returned to Board on May 6, 2008.</p> <p>Board considered final adoption of ordinance May 20, 2008.</p> <p>Returned to Board for further discussion June 24, 2008.</p> <p><b>October 21, 2008 (tent.)</b></p>

<sup>1</sup> On-site Systems is not included in the table. The timing of this code amendment will depend upon the length of the environmental process.