



CITY OF MERCED ZONING ORDINANCE UPDATE FOCUS GROUP

MINUTES

Merced Civic Center
First Floor Sam Pipes Room

678 W. 18th Street
Thursday, March 12, 2015
8:15 a.m.

Mission of Focus Group

Update the Zoning Ordinance to be more user-friendly and easier to understand for the Community.

A. CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson LOGUE called the meeting to order at 8:20 a.m.

B. ROLL CALL

Members Present: Ann Andersen, Adam Cox, Loren Gonella, Bruce Logue, Elmer Lorenzi, Guy Maxwell, and Joe Ramirez

Members Absent: Jim Abbate, Christina Alley, Todd Bender, Kenra Bragonier, Tony Dossetti, Flip Hassett, Des Johnston, Jack Lesch, Carole McCoy, Michelle Paloutzian, Mike Salvadori, Stan Thurston, Brandon Williams, and Jim Xu

Staff Present: Director of Development Services David Gonzalves, Planning Manager Kim Espinosa, and Recording Secretary Lucas

C. APPROVAL OF ACTION MINUTES

M/S RAMIREZ-COX, and carried by unanimous voice vote (14 absent), to approve the Minutes of February 26, 2015, as submitted.

Zoning Ordinance Update Focus Group Minutes

March 12, 2015

Page 2

D. ITEMS

1. Questions/Comments on Focus Group Review Draft of Zoning Ordinance (Questions #9 through #20 outlined in Memo of December 19, 2014)

The Focus Group continued their review and comments on the questions outlined by Staff in the December 19, 2014, memo.

Urban Village Zoning Districts (Chapter 20.16).

Question #9: The Group Members unanimously agreed that the three new Urban Village zoning districts were an appropriate option or tool for staff and developers.

Question #10: The Group Members also concurred with staff recommendations on the Land Use Table (Page 53).

Question #11: Planning Manager ESPINOSA explained that staff may make some adjustments to the height restrictions, such as allowing 35-40 feet in the Outer Village Residential areas. Group Member MAXWELL suggested eliminating the height restriction in the Inner Village Residential area.

Public Use and Agricultural Zoning Districts (Chapter 20.18).

Question #12: Following a brief discussion regarding Public Use and Agricultural Zoning districts, Group Members concurred with staff and recommended no change.

Question #13: The consensus of the Group Members was that there would be no changes to Table 20.18-1 (Page 60) except to height restrictions so they are consistent throughout the Zoning Code.

Special Use Zoning Districts (Chapter 20.20).

Question #14: The Focus Group agreed that the changes proposed to the Planned Development requirements (Page 66) would allow more flexibility and recommended no further changes.

Overlay Zones (Chapter 20.22).

Question #15: Planning Manager ESPINOSA explained that the Airport Overlay Zone is currently used in practice but this would add it to the Zoning Code. She also explained that it would provide a placeholder for the High Speed Rail. Group Member COX suggested that it shouldn't be limited to High Speed Rail and should just refer to "Rail" in general since in the future, there will be other types of rail systems (light rail, etc.).

Walls and Fences (Chapter 20.30).

Question #16: The consensus of the Group Members was to remove the procedures for allowing higher than 6-foot fences in residential zones and simply allow fence height in Residential Zones to be seven feet. Anything higher would have a negative visual impact and may cause concern for emergency responders.

Question #17: The Focus Group agreed to the changes to Section 20.30.040 (Page 104) to allow barbed wire fences in residential zones, razor wire fences in all zones, and electric fences in only non-residential zones, all with a Minor Use Permit.

Parking and Loading (Chapter 20.38).

Question #18: The Focus Group concurred with the changes proposed to Table 20.38-1 (Page 120) regarding parking requirements for various land uses.

Question #19: The Focus Group discussed the recommendation of the Bicycle Advisory Commission and concurred that bicycle parking should mirror the State Green Code requirements and that the market would dictate the need for additional long term bike spaces without requiring it in the Zoning Code.

M/S MAXWELL-COX, and carried by unanimous voice vote (14 absent) to recommend that the bicycle parking requirements in all zoning districts be the same as required by the State of California and not be any greater.

E. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:30 a.m. The next meeting will likely be the final Focus Group meeting and will focus on Questions #20 through

Zoning Ordinance Update Focus Group Minutes

March 12, 2015

Page 4

#25 and a final recommendation on a public review draft of the Zoning Code.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Kim Espinosa (for)

David Gonzalves, Secretary
Zoning Ordinance Update

APPROVED:

Bruce Logue, Chairperson
Zoning Ordinance Update