City of Merced

BCCP – CAC Meeting March 14, 2013

Discussion/Survey Questions/Responses

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: ¼ 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 raining 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.

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