

Events

- I. Stakeholder Interview Summary, Wilbur McMurray Room, May 2, 2012
 - II. Community Orientation Meeting, Council Chambers, May 4, 2012
 - III. Committee Member comments (staff notes), Sam Pipes Room, August 23, 2012
 - IV. Community Workshop, California Room- UCM, January 31, 2013, 6 PM to 8 PM
 - V. CAC Meeting/Land Use Plan Workshop and Survey, Sam Pipes Room, March 14, 2013
-

I. Stakeholder Interview Summary, Wilbur McMurray Room, May 2, 2012

On May 2, 2012, members of the consultant team (Lisa Wise, David Sargent, and Tony Perez) interviewed the following stakeholders:

1. Syd Spitler: owns a family farm on south side of Bellevue
2. Jerry Calister: with others, owns 290 acres at the northwest corner of Bellevue and Lake
3. Lee Kolligan and Rick Telespan: have substantial land holdings, primarily east of G and south of Bellevue
4. Sid Lakireddy: owns 32 acres at the southwest corner of Lake and Bellevue, across from the campus
5. Mark Hendrickson and Bill Nicholson: County of Merced
6. Glenn Villaneuva: owns 17 acres on the east side G Street, north of Bellevue, across from the new high school
7. Carol Bright and Dave Butz: Bright Homes, substantial holdings, primarily east of G and south of Bellevue

The combined comments received are summarized below and organized by topic. All interviewees expressed an interest in the profitable development of their property and a general interest in hearing recommendations that may come from work on the BCCP.

Potential Uses within the Plan Area

- College compatible/supportive uses, including housing, support retail and business incubator
- Technology-related businesses
- Environmental science
- Bio-medical research and development business
- Commercial office
- Business park
- Student housing to balance and expand the on-campus offerings (look into the on-campus policy/requirements)
- Non-student residential
- Hospital and medical school related to UCM
- Research and development (ex. Genentech)

Considerations

- Compatibility
- Balance
- Market demand
- Plan must have flexibility to react to 10-20-50 years
- Interface between UC and development west of Lake
- Enable (but do not dictate) phasing
- Priority should be from UC to town
- Development on Bellevue should provide “prestige” to the area
- The Bellevue Corridor area should be a significant regional business incubator , attractive to corporations on the scale of HP
- Plan needs to be equitable for UC and City
- Revenue sharing between the City and County will be critical to balancing fiscal impacts of development
- Services – water/wastewater
- 0 net energy by 2020 (City study)

- Solid waste
- Low-impact development
- Campus parking
- Overplan jobs - Merced should be a regional center, not be a bedroom community

Concepts/Suggestions

- Main artery street with frontage roads to reduce congestion
- Loop avenue around City, with nodes
- Nodes need to be intense to support transit
- Better connectivity is needed throughout the City – is important to prevent major arteries from overloading
- Extend the trail and greenway system that the University has begun throughout the planning area
- The “village concept” in the general plan must be carefully considered and critically evaluated for its suitability to this planning area
- Walkable neighborhoods should be a key part of the plan
- Accommodate intense development to help support light rail and regional transit
- Intensity is especially appropriate near the University
- Focusing the high school curriculum on science and medicine and linking that to a new UCM medical school could provide a strong mechanism for keeping the brightest young people in the area (35 to 45% of doctors stay where they were trained, difficult to recruit physicians in the central valley)
- The plan for this area should consider contributing to the revitalization of the Downtown
- Private investment in development could accelerate the pace of campus development in the face of State funding challenges

Precedents to Consider

- 19th Avenue in San Francisco (with adjustments)
- Stapleton Redevelopment, Denver(Calthorpe)
- Provo, Utah
- Guidelines for orderly development – Ventura County
- Downtown Modesto
- Gainesville and Eugene are college town precedents worth looking at

II. Community Orientation Meeting, Council Chambers, May 4, 2012

PART I: VERBAL PUBLIC COMMENTS

- Overwhelmingly property owners in the area attended meeting by show of hands
- Richard Presentation
 - No questions of Richard
- Bill King Presentation;
 - Emphasized funding sources between university plan and BCCP
 - Campus has completed plan BCCP has not
- **Question-Dan Homes, Hillcrest Road** – What will be the interface between city/county governance? Preferred public workshops vs. public hearings. **Answer – King;** both governance between city and county where city would adopt amendment to GP but would require county concurrence with SOI and SUDP
- **Question-Mickey Gwin, Golf Road** – existing development plans in the area with high density and retail LUs but the developers are not in the planning process. Where are the developers in this process . **Answer – King;** City has interest in guiding growth so that development can occur.
- **Question-William Stockard, Cardella Road** - concerned that developers will run process and disrupts quality of life. **Answer – King;** Plan and city planning process will ensure quality of life is maintained.
- **Question-Hub Walsh** – Explain how BCCP plan is consistent with SOI and SUDP - **Answer – King;** explained boundary areas (SUDP SOI City Limits)
- Bill continued with presentation.
- **Question- Tom Lyon, Hutchinson Road** - Will completion of existing approved plans (Bellevue Ranch/Moraga) take place prior to development to BCCP? Add requirement by developers to complete full development of plan. **Answer – King;** Acknowledged existing stock of undeveloped areas in City
- **Question- Jeff Pennington, Chambers Road-** When will sports stadium be proposed and is transit center planned in this area. **Richard answers;** planned stadium will not occur for 15 – 20 yrs and transit center is planned near stadium area.
- **Question- Mickey Gwin, Golf Road** - is ROW dedicated along G st and along Bellevue. **Answer – King;** stated that certain portions of road have ROW for full buildout to accommodate regional corridor.
- **Question- Susan Delaware, Trovare** – Problem related to Lake Road and traffic. Is planned roadway going to alleviate traffic? **Answer King;** Recognizes traffic on Lake Road and that future plans will align campus parkway to the east and Lake Road will serve local access.
- **Question- Jack Ramsey, Farmland Road** –How will community be planned in case of Dam breach (Lake Yosemite **Answer – King; Stated** issues related to timing of release (gradual vs. at once).
- **Question- Jack Dawl , Mountainview Lane-**What's the boundary along Lake Road? Farmland Road? Will the decisions on land uses be made by City Council? **Answer – King;** Yes by council. Also explained boundaries of BCCP.
- Bill continued with presentation.
- **Question- No Name;** How large is citizen's advisory committee. **Answer – King;** Stated council will make determination.
- Bill continued with presentation.
- **Question-Carol Peters, Old Lake Road;** Is presentation on web site; **Answer – King;** Yes

- **Question-No Name;** Status of Revision to Campus Community Plan and how will the 2 plans compete/ conflict. **Answer – King;** County will require entitlements for UCP and studies will take place in determining how infrastructure resources are distributed in the area.

PART II: COMMENTS WRITTEN BY THE PUBLIC:

General Comments

- o Interface with existing estate lots need to be highly controlled to minimize impacts on existing homes.
- o Bellevue Road alignment needs to be flexible to minimize loss of access to existing homes.
- o Stronger controls need to be included to make it more difficult for developers and school districts to change designated land uses.
- o Why are you planning this development on property that will negatively impact existing residents and its surrounding neighborhoods?
- o A better location would be on the Old Meyers property adjacent to UC Merced.
- o Who are the landowners or speculators that own some of the property?
- o Consider including the UC community plans area within the plan, if not included at least -coordinate with that area as transportation/infrastructure requirements will interface.
- o As UC Merced was being planned (prior to 2005), we were informed by mail that a direct entrance to UC Merced campus by way of “y”-ing off Bellevue Rd. going East into the campus was planned but has not been implemented.
- o Is there still future plan to do this by-passing the corner of Bellevue and Lake?
- o I think the plan should emphasize the competition of existing plans like Bellevue Ranch which already had infrastructure installed but was abandoned by the original developers.
- o Why does only city council get to approve this plan?
- o Much wildlife in farmland area, what are the plans for farmland area?
- o Water tables are dropping in last 20 years, what will happen when all areas are developed?
- o Will this area be annexed into the city?
- o Will the residents be eligible to vote on city issues if the area is not annexed?
- o Where is our political voice during this planning phase?
- o I would like to see the Bellevue Corridor leading up to the University develop in a cohesive planned manner with as forward an environmental and technological plan as demonstrated in the development of the UCM campus itself. I would like to see this University and the community around it serve as a beacon of pride for the San Joaquin Valley and the people of the State of California as a whole.

Building Design

- o Do not use a walled corridor blocking out subdivisions from Bellevue.
- o Should be planned for commercial/ office/ research approach to UC.
- o I would like to see some cohesiveness in the design of buildings along the corridor in order to create an awe-inspiring and eye-pleasing gateway to the Valley’s only UC campus.

Market Study

- o I have learned that there are always scarcity challenges pertaining to land uses around UC campuses. More intense based and job creation like land uses should be concentrated near the UC campus recognizing the potential of the campus to be a technological hub for the San Joaquin Valley.

Mobility

- o With the new high school – bike access is a Major safety Concern
- o How wide is Bellevue to be expanded?
- o 4 lanes to 6 lanes to Lake Road?
- o What time frame of construction?
- o What side of Bellevue Road? North? South?

- o I think that the plan needs to consider both the regional draw associated with the adjacent UC campus given the vast numbers of students coming from the Bay area and southern California, as well as connectivity to create a vibrant city center for Merced.

Transit

- o Bike lanes need to be separated from general traffic lanes
- o Speed of traffic creates cycle stability issues
- o Can we see the “village concept” for the Bellevue Area?
- o Whose plan?
- o On which properties?
- o Will current residential properties be offered access to municipal sewer & water infrastructure?
- o What development is planned AROUND El Capitan High School? I.e. commercial, retail, residential
- o How is this coordinated with the UC’s university community concepts? – they are only 2 miles apart !!
- o I would encourage expansive rights of way that lend themselves to future and forward thinking transport technologies.

III. Committee Member comments (staff notes), Sam Pipes Room, August 23, 2012

Agenda Item F: Committee Member Introductions:

Answers to: When the plan is finished, what do you hope its value will be to you?

- Callister:** A plan that results in traffic flow, not congestion, in the area near the campus.
A plan that includes economically feasible variety of land uses that are compatible with UC.
A plan that enhances the entrance to UCM.
- Woods** A plan that addresses the interface between the Plan area and UCM, making sure there is proper synergy between the plan areas.
- Ward** A plan that maintains the quality of life for Merced, while providing economic development of the area.
- Simmons** A plan that designs the corridor and entryway to UC Merced to achieve balanced growth.
- Spriggs** A plan that has an appropriate mix of uses that are anticipated to occur due to UC Merced.
- Robbins** A plan that dovetails with UC Community Plan area, and includes an infrastructure plan that is compatible with the larger planning area
- Gwin** A plan that is not offensive to existing residents
- Holmes** A plan that includes a Bellevue Road plan line that respects existing property owners, and other plan elements that provide compatibility with existing 1-acre lots. Modesto has interface guidelines.
A plan reviewed by the development community.

Gerhardt	A plan that provides a greater awareness of cyclists, pedestrians and users of alternative forms of transportation as a legitimate part of the community, and for their safety as it relates to other vehicles.
Lopes	A plan developed out of public outreach and input.
Tinetti	A plan that includes an off-street pedestrian/bike path that parallels Bellevue Road. Plan elements that provide compatibility with existing 1-acre lots. A plan that provides for an attractive entryway to UC Merced.
Pennington	A plan that includes a light rail easement to Castle Airport and Atwater.
Thompson	Plan elements that describe the regulatory “interface” (responsibility and obligations) between property owners and local governments.
Dicker	A plan that coordinates rather than competes with other planning efforts.
Kooligian	A 21st Century Plan looking to the future, flexibly planned to include future technological developments. A plan that addresses interface with the Community of Merced, including small-scale connectivity between City and Campus, not simply by regional improvements.
Kirby	A plan that does not detract from the quality of life of existing residents. A plan that supports business growth.
Pedrozo	Well thought out and careful planning approach for future growth that serves the City of Merced, County and property owners. A comprehensive plan, integrated with other planning efforts, for example, the Atwater-Merced Expressway effort.
Smith	Plan elements that provide compatibility with existing 1-acre lots. A plan that provides safe facilities for pedestrians and bicyclists. An infrastructure plan that provides for long-term future growth.

Agenda Item I, Part A: Committee Review of the Draft Introduction Chapter

(refer to Staff's PowerPoint presentation)

Bandoni Property

A member of the CAC asked whether or not the Bandoni Property should be included in the BCCP. Staff commented that the Bandoni site was left out respecting the work that had been completed on their annexation project at the time the City applied for the grant application for the Bellevue Corridor Community Plan. Shortly, Staff will meet with Bandoni to discuss their interest in the BCCP project.

Plan Subject Matter (1:22)

A member of the CAC asked whether or not the grant limits the plan subject matter that the City can include in the BCCP Project. Staff commented that while the state grantor will not limit the subject matter in the BCCP, the focus of the plan is guided by language in the *Merced Vision 2030 General Plan*.

Market Study (1:23.4)

A CAC member pointed out that while a developer will perform a market study to determine what is “consumable” to help drive their proposed development plan, the BCCP is different in that it has a specific boundary that includes lands anticipated to develop as a result of the growth of UC Merced and the City in general, and the City is having a market study prepared, not the land owners.

Opportunity to Plan (1:24.5)

A CAC member pointed out that given new rules and regulations for planning, for example from the air district and SB375, and given the blank slate nature of the plan area, there is a real opportunity here. Seeing what happened in the past, absent an economic viewpoint of what makes sense for the existing taxpayers for the City of Merced, (in regard to underground –sewer and water, waste being sent to southern edge of City), the BCCP is a chance to do something different (think outside the box) than what we've seen before. UC brings research about use of resources and energy, that could help define the plan and future growth models. The Plan should describe what services the City has to offer and how current residents and property owners can benefit from them.

Agenda Item I, Part B: Foundation Report (1:27.1)

Conceptual Boundaries and Meaning of BCCP Illustrative Plan (1:32.1)

A CAC member asked Staff to describe the purple circle in the middle of the BCCP Illustrative Plan, as well as the “Bellevue Mixed Use Corridor.” Staff explained that these represent conceptual designs which need to be defined in the planning process.

Support for Flexible Map/Unrestrictive Code (1:33.2)

A CAC member asked how the planning process is structured to get input to inform the City/Consultant how much of what land use, how tall the buildings would be in the “Bellevue Mixed Use Corridor.” Staff stated that the general plan emphasizes a mix of uses including future research and development. A CAC member interjected that they applaud the flexible nature of the illustrative plan and that they can adjust the land uses based on what the market dictates, for example, depending upon the type of research that comes into the community. The CAC member cautioned on the number of restrictions that are placed on users or businesses that wish to come into the community. For example, retailers do not want to be in the village block, and Merced has over-zoned for residential. He emphasized again an appreciation for the flexibility of the map, but hoped that the development code is not too restrictive, which could prevent Merced from being competitive. Another CAC member concurred with the need for flexibility due to unforeseen amounts and types of spin-off development markets from UC Merced.

Support for Defining the Land Use Bubbles & New Types of Housing (1:36.0)

A CAC member commented that while flexibility is important, the plan should include, generally, amounts of anticipated land use types, for example, office space. Another CAC member noted that the Committee is not comprised of young people, that the BCCP area will serve a large student population, and while there is a place for market studies, simply looking at the market alone could get the City into trouble (referred to recent economic conditions and state of development in Merced). The member went on to say that the plan needs to be responsive to how the new or younger population wishes to live, not everyone wants to live in single family homes. How we live today is going to be different from how they choose to live in the future. From *this* perspective, flexibility is important.

Depiction of Design Concepts (1:39.4)

A CAC member suggested that when images are shown to depict design concepts, that the phrase “one-option” or “illustrative” is used to emphasize flexibility in placement of streets, buildings, and parking areas, to avoid the plan from dictating specific form.

Example of Local Urban Village Development (1:40.2)

A CAC member asked if there were any examples of “urban villages” in Merced. Staff noted that the downtowns of many older towns, like Merced, contain urban village concepts such as grid street

patterns, variety of size and location of uses and parking, residential over retail (the lofts), “village greens,” for example Bob Hart Square (1:43.3). Some contemporary examples exist, but not locally.

Transportation Connection between UCM and Downtown (1:47.1)

A CAC member noted that routing regional transportation into an institution such as UC Merced on the outskirts of town helped such city center decay by not having a connection directly with the City, and hopes the transit corridors envisioned in the plan would include connectivity with the City and the university, and not just provide connection to the UC via the regional loop road. The BCCP is a means to help facilitate a “UCM – City Connection” concept. Staff noted the consultants were cognizant of this issue.

Transit Planning (1:48.4)

A CAC member commented that MCAG just passed the Short Range Transit Plan (May 2012) and that there are on-going discussions about the local “Cat-Track” connection to UC Merced. The consultant should be aware of this study and the BCCP should address transit service within the plan area, and connections between the BCCP and UCM with the rest of the City.

Interagency Coordination (1:49.3)

A CAC member noted and appreciated the presence of Merced County in the audience, and is encouraged to see cross-communication between the City and County at all levels. The member also asked if there would be a County staff liaison at the BCCP Ad-hoc Citizen Advisory Committee meetings. Staff stated he would send an invitation to representatives of UCM, Merced County, and MCAG to attend these meetings.

Transit Planning (1:51.3)

A CAC member commented that an assumption is that all the traffic gets to Bellevue Road and doesn’t affect other roads in the area. The traffic study should look at traffic amounts on all roads in the plan area, and that transit priority sites and/or regular stops should be considered for other plan area roadways, for example the SE corner of Cardella Road and Campus Parkway.

Light-Rail (1:53.2)

A CAC member asked if the light-rail is planned to go from UCM and down Bellevue Road to Atwater, or down Lake Road, or other routes such as the Campus Parkway; how much thought has been given to this topic? Staff noted the consultant has begun to look at right-of way reservation and location for a future light-rail option.

Road Plan Line for Bellevue Road (1:55.4)

A CAC member noted that the centerline for Bellevue Road should be determined soon, and that it can avoid impacting existing homes along the street, and so that near-term development does not negatively affect the future design of the road. Staff noted the BCCP planning effort should address and define the location of Bellevue Road.

Land Use and Road Plans (1:56.4)

Several CAC members commented that a map showing land uses and roads (Campus Parkway) should be created to depict how the area as a whole (planned by UCM, Merced County, and the City) is being developed. The Plan should also consider the phasing of infrastructure and development to minimize traffic-related impacts, for example to Lake Road. Staff noted that Attachment D of the *Bellevue Corridor Community Plan* Ad-hoc Citizens Advisory Committee Staff Report #12-01 (otherwise known as Appendix B, “Projects and Plans”) is a text and map description of all development in and near the BCCP project site.

Urban Village Concept (2:01.2)

A member of the audience commented that the CAC consider whether or not the urban village plan is the right concept for the Bellevue Corridor Community Plan, especially since the UC plan, a strong interface with the BCCP plan, doesn’t meet the villages plan. The BCCP would be a good opportunity to assure that both plans (UCM and BCCP) work together. A CAC member noted that the consultant is constrained and not able to look at this as an open slate, and won’t be able to look at various land use ideas, and is hand-cuffed to the village concept, which will constrain the future vision for the area. Another member noted that perhaps by deviating away from the village concept, you will attract high-end job-creation type developers that are inclined to create the infrastructure (roads, etc.) that is needed in the area.

Job Creation (2:03.3)

A CAC member asked whether or not job creation means more than “research and development,” and that allowing for a very broad definition would enable development to occur as defined by the highest and best use, as opposed to restricting who can come into an area. Another member noted that would be OK so long as it is not the same types of developments based on letting the market prevail that have gotten the area in the hole it is today, vacant single-family lots and homes. This member supports looking to attract jobs first, before homes, and to look at things differently. What is the landuse/circulation model? Urban village? Strip Malls? Something else? Another member noted that the BCCP needs to create a community that connects with downtown and motivates people to live and work in the Plan area, and not migrate to other communities or into farmland areas. The plan should look 21st Century. This conversation continued at tape time 2.11.5. A CAC member noted that just because the economy crashed, does not mean the plan in place was bad. As the economy turns, the City is prepared to provide housing. What happened in the national market shouldn’t be a reason to alter local plans. A CAC member (original commenter about single-family homes in this thread above) responded that while that makes sense, the issue is to be able to provide for housing for the market of the future, and that single-family homes may not be the only product of value in the future. Trends indicate that a broader/different housing market is forming. Perhaps a larger part of the Bellevue Corridor will be devoted to job creation as opposed to the traditional single-family housing market? The BCCP needs to look at the long-term, and not react to the immediacy of the current market.

Long-Term View of UC Spin Off Growth (2:10.0)

A CAC member asked if the consultant can determine how much square-footage of office space is attributable to UC's in other communities, for example, Santa Cruz, Santa Barbara, Riverside, etc. Rates could be different due to lack of space, for example in Santa Cruz compared with Irvine and Riverside (due to greater availability of ground). This planning effort is long-term from the perspective of assuring land availability for spin-off growth from development of UC Merced. Another member of the CAC noted that market demand exponentially increases after the student population reaches 10,000, which is only 5 or so years away. Staff informed the CAC that a presentation by UC Merced students about an "innovation hub" will occur at their November 2012 meeting. Development of an innovation hub could enhance the rate of spin-off growth in Merced.

IV. Community Workshop, California Room- UCM, January 31, 2013

Oral Comments/Questions

1. Combining transit with 6 lanes of traffic seems excessive. Consultant replied that Bellevue lacks transit-friendly traits, but Mandeville does, and is more likely as a transit route.
2. Why is "M" Street a main road and why is there a large traffic circle in the Bellevue Ranch project?
3. Roads need improvement now.
4. What would be developed first?
5. Interest in diagonal bike path.
6. The BRMDP is under-populated and needs commercial services. It is nuts to invest in the BCP without first improving the Bellevue Ranch Master Development Plan.
7. Supports bike path and lanes
8. Identified "growing pains" for traffic along Lake Road and Bellevue Road.
9. Flood inundation concerns.
10. Requested better access to recreational uses at Lake Yosemite.
11. How will downtown Merced and the BCP mesh? How are these different?
12. Consider connecting Bellevue Road from UC Merced to Castle Air Force Base where other UC Merced satellite offices are located.
13. A world-class bike system should be created given the project's closeness to UC.
14. Regarding bicycle circulation system (student bicycling), consider UC Davis' system; need to make bicycle lanes as accessible as the road

Written Comments/Questions (By Topic)

Development Process

- How will area be developed? Can we develop our own property, or will larger developers be brought in to develop?
- Will the City assist current land owners to develop according to the BCCP?
- Where will the capital to finance these projects come from?
- When will construction begin?
- How will the City acquire all the land?

Land Use

- Why include all the housing; just add a business park; what is the business to population ratio?
- Parks
- Would prefer mixed-use TOD character to be above Bellevue and Lake towards Yosemite Lake (not towards Cardella) or better yet, by Bellevue and G Street.
- What demographic are you trying to attract; at what cost?

Circulation/Road Improvements

- Are there plans to finish Hatch Road to Bellevue in the near future?
- Consideration of G Street as a corridor versus M Street makes sense, as G Street has an underpass.
- Lake Road would be beautiful if it was made 4 lanes, with Eucalyptus trees in the middle.

- Six lanes (on Bellevue Road) are too much; how will pedestrians fare?
- Robust Bike Path
- Study slowing down the traffic on Lake Road; safety right now.
- Light-rail connection to downtown Merced
- Consider moving people north and south in the plan.
- Mandeville bus route as alternative is great as opposed to congesting Bellevue Road further.
- Work on bike friendly safe routes as Bellevue is dangerous for bikes, narrow and high speeds now.

Unfinished Development

- I hope that the planners do not repeat the mistake of over-development into areas that will never be developed. I am concerned that there are today too many empty houses and empty lots in development areas that are still not built.
- Develop the unfinished residential projects, such as Bellevue Ranch, first.

Terminology/Presentation Approach

- Be careful using terms (R&D, TOD, NC) that the public is unfamiliar with.
- I enjoyed the visuals, but by the time I figured out the roads, the image was replaced by the next one.
- UCM is an appropriate place to hold public outreach meetings.
- Stated interest in knowing where to access draft land use map.

Other

- What are your reactions to the recommendations in the ULI report? How would you address the growth needs of UC Merced?
- How will Merced's lifestyle be protected?
- Entire community built on sustainable, LEED certification.

V. Committee Meeting/Land Use Plan Workshop and Survey, Sam Pipes Room, March 14, 2013

At their meeting of March 14, 2013, the Citizen Advisory Committee along with members of the public was invited to share their ideas and comments about the plan through a survey and by sketching alternative land use concepts for further consideration. Though arranged by small groups, all attendees were asked the same questions and were provided with the same land-use map materials. In the pages that follow, the key below aligns with the various survey responses provided.

KEY:

- R1: Name not listed
- R2: Carol Spillman
- R3: Christie Hendricks
- R4: Justi Smith
- R5: Richard Cummings
- R6: Greg Thompson
- R7: Oksana Newman
- R8: Name not listed
- R9: Matt Fell
- R10: Diana Westmoreland
- R11: Carole McCoy
- R12: Dan Holmes
- R13: Steve Simmons
- R14: Jean Okuye
- R15: Bill Spriggs
- R16: Name not listed
- R17: Lee Kooligian
- R18: David Butz
- R19: Jerry Callister



1. **Should the BCCP include an organizing framework that establishes the general design of certain areas, however, leaves flexibility in the specific land uses?**

Examples of design character might include walkable urban center, pedestrian-oriented neighborhood, business park, shopping center, rural residential, etc.

Uses could be flexible, for instance, some R&D businesses might chose upper floor space in a transit-oriented, mixed-use district next to campus, or a more conventional business park environment elsewhere along Bellevue.

Or retail might be on the ground floor of mixed-use buildings in a transit-oriented center, but in a more conventional shopping center setting elsewhere along a major street.

R1: Yes – Should allow for overall build-out within the Plan area as for example (10% retail neighborhood; 10% regional commercial; 40% residential - of which half is single family and half is multi-family; 20% research and development; etc., with flexibility as to how it gets sited specifically.

R2: Bike path on Bellevue – enforce it.

R3: Yes. Organizing framework must be developed; however, flexibility must be allowed as we grow and change. Don't forget to have specific language included to add child care to flexible use areas; child care is a job generator.

R4: Yes. Organized Framework. Walkable urban center, pedestrian oriented neighborhood.

R5: Form-based approaches are a good way of ensuring character. The character of the Bellevue Corridor should be attractive and not a default solution.

R6: Yes

R7: Yes

R8: Yes

R9: Yes

R10: Yes

R11: Must have organized framework – retail on ground floor.

R12: Yes. Needs to be flexible.

R13: Yes. I (illegible) the BCCP should include the framework.

R14: Yes

R15: Yes. At this point in time we need to make sure that we are at the 40,000 foot level as opposed to round level.

R16: no comment

R17: An organizing framework with flexibility is important; so long as the land owner is left with a land designation that allows for the marketability of the property. Too much of an organizing



framework might be too confining for marketability of property in the real estate marketplace. A range of suggestions would be better than strict standards. Overall, this corridor needs to emphasize the establishment of sustainable job creative uses within its confines.

R18: We think that the plan should provide as much flexibility as possible for future development.

R19: Yes, I think that the BCCP should include an organizing framework that establishes the general design of certain areas but leaves flexibility in the specific land uses. I believe the type of designations shown on the current proposed plan responds to this idea sufficiently. However, I assume there will need to be some narrative designed that corresponds with the map plan.

2. **Should the development pattern include a commercial/mixed-use center/node at or near Lake and Bellevue that could support a variety of uses including residential, retail, and office/small-scale R&D?**

R1: Yes, with double thru lanes into the sites and curb cut access ¼ mile (plus or minus) from the intersection.

R2: Yes – it is close to dorms.

R3: It could be tough to locate commercial here. Seems that this would be an area that would be very congested.

R4: Should be used for transportation stop. Commercial would cause too much congestion.

R5: Yes. An attractive mixed-use node would provide a beneficial amenity for the campus community. This intersection will be the first impression of the university for thousands of people. It should reflect that important role.

R6: Yes. join planning efforts with UC Merced

R7: Yes

R8: Yes, to retail/office/R&D focus.

R9: No

R10: Yes. Business Park and Research and Development

R11: Not on the corner area of Lake and Bellevue – except maybe eating establishments.

R12: No. In direct conflict with UC.

R13: No, because it conflicts with the existing plan for the University's Town Center.

R14: No

R15: Yes. it is ideally located to support the university. Will retail become more internet-based, which will reduce the square footage needed for brick and mortar retail?

R16: no comment

R17: Yes, this would be wonderful; however, a major "Fig Garden Village" like retail establishment should be placed at Bellevue and G along with a major R & D campus to represent a proud welcoming gateway to the Bellevue Corridor and "driveway" towards UC Merced. I do believe that planning of this area is necessary because it sits along the most regional expressway of the corridor. It may develop sooner than some of the other infill areas as a result of its prominent placement within the circulation pattern.

R18: Yes- mixed use commercial should be incorporated into both ends of the corridor -- Not only at Bellevue and Lake, but also at Bellevue and G Street, which is the gateway of the project corridor.



R19: Yes, I definitely feel that development pattern should include commercial/mixed use center at or near Lake and Bellevue to support a variety of uses, including residential, retail, office/small-scale R&D, and possibly a hotel. Having mixed-used directly across from the current campus makes a lot of sense as it will enhance student life for those students living in the dormitories at the northern end of the campus and will allow visitor and businesses associated with the northern part of the campus to have access to the things they need. It will also support the multi-family neighborhood area which will exist immediately to the west. Most of these will probably be apartments and the residents of this area will need to have close access to various services.

3. **Should the development pattern include an R&D/office node at or near Bellevue Road and Gardner Avenue? If so, should the form of that development be similar to the mixed-use node at Bellevue and Lake, or a more conventional, lower rise, larger footprint “Irvine” type of pattern?**

R1: North of Bellevue (?) lower rise while south of Bellevue should allow multi-storied structures.

R2: no comment

R3: The area at Bellevue Road and Gardner Avenue seems a better location for commercial center and/or R&D.

R4: Yes, this would be less congested. I like the “Irvine” type of pattern.

R5: May have to be smaller

R6: Yes. with some transition between existing estate lots to the east.

R7: Yes

R8: Yes – conventional and on both north and south of Bellevue.

R9: No

R10: No – south off Bellevue

R11: Good Idea.

R12: Needs to be oriented at Mandeville and Gardner.

R13: This orientation should have an emphasis on Mandeville.

R14: High Rise

R15: Yes, but do we have too much R&D?

R16: no comment

R17: Yes, but remember the natural hill near that intersection that is the highest point in the vicinity. This should be used for a high rise or “higher” rise than the surrounding area to take advantage of the vista.

R18: Mixed uses should permeate the plan as it will make the ultimate development more interesting and urban. Dense development will conserve the land that is in proximity to the UC site which will be beneficial in the long run.

R19: I think it is appropriate to have R&D office node at or near Bellevue Road and Gardner Avenue and not a mixed use designation.



4. **Should the BCCP encourage a wide range of housing types with more intense housing types near Bellevue/Mandeville Road to less intense housing near Yosemite? Should a mixture of housing densities be encouraged in some neighborhoods?**

R1: More intense (higher density) usage on both sides of Mandeville to take advantage of Transit Priority Projects (TPP). Less intensive along Bellevue to discourage multiple curb-cuts

R2: Yes

R3: Yes, a mixture of housing densities must be encouraged. Don't forget to co-locate child care for these families.

R4: Yes. High Density near Bellevue and Mandeville would be appropriate. A mixture of housing densities should be encouraged in some neighborhoods. There will also be a need for child care centers in the area. Families will need to be able to have easy and efficient access.

R5: (illegible)

R6: Should be appropriate mixed use radiating from commercial/retail/business uses.

R7: Yes

R8: no comment

R9: Yes. In almost all.

R10: Yes

R11: We need mixed density

R12: Yes. High density needs to be near employment centers.

R13: More multifamily facilities should be closer to the Business Park center of influence.

R14: Need higher density

R15: Yes. We need to develop to a similar density as Orenco Station.

R16: no comment

R17: Yes, I would emphasize a greater need for higher density housing and a small allotment for low density housing. We already have Bellevue Ranch to fill with low density.

R18: Yes on encouraging a wide range of housing types. A mixture of types would be compatible in some neighborhoods. Higher density housing should also be north of Bellevue Road.

R19: I am not sure where Mandeville Road is located. However, I support a wide range of housing types with intense housing types between Bellevue Road and Lake Yosemite. The reason for this is that the present UC campus, including many classroom facilities, student life and support services are located at the northern end of the campus. If we want to encourage pedestrian access from off-campus housing to classes and work, there needs to be large multi-family neighborhood areas north of Bellevue Road.



5. **What types of uses are appropriate north of Bellevue Road between G Street and Golf Road?**

- a. Leave as rural residential
- b. Mixed-density residential
- c. Neighborhood serving retail
- d. Regional retail
- e. Business park/R&D
- f. Other

R1: Commercial at the northeast corner of G and Bellevue (20-40 acres), and use the existing creek as a natural boundary. Business Park between commercial at G and office (CO) at northwest corner of Golf and Bellevue. Single family north of existing creek.

R2: Mixed Use Density Residential.

R3: Rural Residential, mixed use density; neighborhood serving retail; regional retail

R4: Mixed use density, neighborhood serving retail, and regional retail.

R5: Mixed use density residential

R6: no comment

R7: Mixed density residential, neighborhood serving retail, business park/R&D.

R8: Leave as rural residential (near other existing rural areas); mixed-density residential (none except close to campus); regional retail (40 plus acres); business park/R&D (both north and south sides of Bellevue with access to AME).

R9: Leave as rural residential

R10: combination of rural residential and parks and open space

R11: Mixed density could be considered; definitely neighborhood serving retail; regional retail could be considered; need medical emergency facility.

R12: Low density. 6-8 on single family lots/

R13: Low density 4-6000 foot lots.

R14: $\frac{1}{4}$ A (interpreted to mean: one-quarter acre residential lots)

R15: Business Park/R&D; Mixed density residential.

R16: regional retail

R17: Regional retail at the corner with office or R&D alongside it with reducing density until reaching the one acre lots.



R18: Mixed-density, Neighborhood serving retail, regional retail and Business Park/R&D

R19: I believe it is appropriate to keep the area at the northeast corner of Bellevue and ■G• Street and between ■G• Street and Golf Road primarily residential in nature. While rural residential is nice, it may be appropriate to have some smaller sized lots. It would not be appropriate to have commercial and retail uses in the area of the new El Capitan High School.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
Leave as rural residential	●		●			-		●	●	●				-					●
Mixed-Density Residential		●	●	●	●	-	●				●			-	●			●	
Neighborhood Serving Retail			●	●		-	●				●			-				●	
Regional Retail	●		●	●		-		●			●			-		●	●	●	
Business Park/R&D						-	●	●						-	●		●	●	
Office	●					-								-			●		
Parks and Open Space						-				●				-					
Low Density Residential						-						●	●	●			●		●

SCORES

Mixed-Density Residential	8
Regional Retail	8
Leave as rural residential	6
Neighborhood Serving Retail	5
Business Park/R&D	5
Low Density Residential	5
Office	2
Parks and Open Space	1

6. **Should the development pattern throughout the BCCP area support (and be supported by) significant transit service? Key elements of such a pattern would generally include:**

A street network with a clear block structure and relatively closely spaced cross streets on the transit corridor that connect to adjoining neighborhoods.

Relatively narrow, low speed neighborhood streets that make a comfortable walking/biking environment and require cars to slow down a bit.

A mixture of uses in many places, with neighborhood-serving commercial near some (but not all) transit stops.

R1: Yes, along Mandeville.

R2: Yes

R3: Parking space is concern to me. No single story parking! Underground or rooftop?

R4: Yes, it has to be a mixture to accommodate residential and commercial.

R5: Yes, transit will reduce emissions.

R6: Definitely need to incorporate a significant transit system throughout the west to east alignment.

R7: Yes

R8: no comment

R9: Yes to all

R10: Yes. Mandeville – tap into incentives to meet environmental requirements.

R11: Yes!!

R12: Yes.

R13: Of course. Yes to all the above.

R14: Yes

R15: Yes. As population increases and fuel costs rise, more people will utilize transit.

R16: no comment

R17: Transit stops along Mandeville and maybe high speed rail along Bellevue.

R18: Yes to transit. Locate on Bellevue and put all types of land uses on both sides of the road. The land will be (illegible) valuable to maintain rural residential. Bellevue should be the focal point.



R19: I feel strongly that it is advisable to have a pattern of street networks that include major roads every one-half mile and smaller neighborhood streets in between. I realize that some people like to spread all the traffic throughout a large network of streets. However, people do not like to have their homes facing streets where commuters are going back and forth. Families prefer to travel to their neighborhood on a major road and then enter the neighborhood through a network of streets that only support the neighborhood and discourages traffic within their neighborhood.

7. Should the development pattern and corresponding infrastructure improvements support effective bicycle and pedestrian circulations systems? Should these modes of transportation be given consideration on par with the automobile?

R1: Yes

R2: Yes – Bike paths enforced.

R3: Yes, we need to encourage a walkable community.

R4: Yes. Absolutely.

R5: Yes. Students use bikes and would make an attractive community.

R6: Yes, but of lessening importance nearer to the Atwater-Merced Expressway.

R7: Absolutely. The UC and multifamily residential are nearby (also important considerations for GHG impacts).

R8: Yes. Should be on par with cars in order to accommodate bike friendly campus i.e. Davis.

R9: Yes and Yes

R10: Yes – tap into incentives to meet environmental requirements.

R11: Should be given priority consideration, strictly enforced.

R12: Yes, and no (auto is still king).

R13: I like the integration of bike pathways.

R14: Yes

R15: Yes

R16: no comment

R17: Yes, I would like to see these uses accommodated along Mandeville and other connecting streets.

R18: Yes, alternative modes of transportation enhance the urban experience you are trying to create. Biking, and walking are a key part to a healthy vibrant area. Use Mandeville for bike path, Bellevue for transit and auto.

R19: I think the development pattern should support some good bicycle lanes and some pedestrian paths as well. However, pedestrian paths should not be on par with automobile traffic except in the areas real close to the UC campus.

8. Should the open space network be planned to include a number of continuous “greenways” that follow existing draining courses or other natural features?

These might generally continue some of the ideas of the canal greenways in the campus plan – or of the neighborhoods along Bear Creek, at a different scale – and might include:

Some stretches of “creek” alongside a street, but some stretches where development can directly front the greenway.

Some places where the greenway widens out to form an actual park or green as a focal point.

Class 1 bikeways.

Or should each developer provide green space as he sees fit on a project by project basis?

R1: no comment

R2: no comment

R3: Yes! Green space must be planned not left to a developer to determine how to or what to provide.

R4: We need greenways throughout; Developers should not be allowed to put in green space as he/she sees fit.

R5: Yes. use the topography.

R6: Both

R7: Yes. All of the above.

R8: On a master plan level. Yes. Follow drainage and provide on City level, not left to developer because it would create a potential uncohesive network. Only in some sections of would it make sense to leave it up t the developer. So, a combination of both makes sense.

R9: Yes to a planned network. No to developer driven project-by-project.

R10: Yes to a planned network. No to developer driven project-by-project.

R11: Definite need of green spaces and park areas. I think as a whole this plan (consultant’s plan) looks good to me.

R12: Once the canals are no longer needed they should be placed in pipelines to carry the storm-drainage that has been designed to flow into them.

R13: I like the idea of eliminating irrigation canals that will no longer serve the areas as this Plan unfolds. Provision should be made for funding basins.

R14: Yes, Yes.

R15: Yes.

R16: no comment

R17: The city should plan for parks and encourage greenways at part of the overall BCCP where most appropriate; however, I would leave the green space planning on a project by project basis.

R18: Enhance the open space wherever possible so that people will be inclined to get out and about. The plan should enhance the minimal natural features within the site, such as Lake Yosemite.

R19: I generally support a greenway that follows existing drainage courses or other areas which are not compatible for residential neighborhoods. Stretches of greenways along existing creeks along with bike or pedestrian paths are nice. However, in some areas the green spaces need to be incorporated in the development plans developed by a landowner. For example, on the property just to the west of the Yosemite Lake Dam, there is a low drainage area. While this should be shown in green I do not think the City should specify the exact use of the property. I believe that a developer may wish to carve out for example five acre parcels that include part of the green area for residential use. Homes can be located on the high area of each parcel and they can have pasture land for horses, etc. extending into a lower green area. The fact that it is marked green doesn't necessarily mean that it should be a public park or for general public use.

Other Comments.

R3: Child care must be located close to housing and transportation and could be connected to schools and/or community centers. Child care is also a job generator and should be considered as both a potential business and as the important piece of livable communities we want in our community.

R11: As per Mr. Kooligian's remarks. Merced is a close-knit community where the small town concept is important to it's citizens. The importance of growth and ability to have quality of life continue to expand is certainly an upmost consideration. But, for a community of our size, you have two large age factors: senior citizens and students/children (many with one family member raising them). Having the ability of easy shopping, community activities within walking /easy access and safety is very critical to the family make-up here. Large is not always better. Small shopping areas, groceries, (illegible), retail is very important. People who do not have to rely on walking or commercial transport (illegible) can go anywhere, but students (freshman cannon have cares, lots of teens must walk to where they need or want to go) and seniors --- need and appreciated the village concept within the City. The large "box" centers along 99 will come when 99 gets the additional lanes and added off ramps. But we need gov. (money and help there) then we'll see more "big-box areas.