

## City of Merced

### BCCP – CAC Meeting March 14, 2013

#### Discussion/Survey Questions

---

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.

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?
3. Should the development pattern include an R&D/office node at or near Bellevue Road and Gardner Avenue?
  - a. 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?
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?
  - a. Should a mixture of housing densities be encouraged in some neighborhoods?
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

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.

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

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