

**BELLEVUE CORRIDOR COMMUNITY PLAN  
AD-HOC CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

**MINUTES**

SAM PIPES CONFERENCE ROOM  
678 W. 18<sup>TH</sup> STREET  
MERCED, CALIFORNIA

MONDAY  
AUGUST 25, 2014

**(A) CALL TO ORDER**

Chairperson SPRIGGS called the meeting to order at 1:40 p.m.

**(B) ROLL CALL**

Present:      Committee Members:

Susan Gerhardt  
Melbourne Gwin, Jr.  
Dan Holmes  
Sharon Hunt Dicker  
Bill Hvidt  
Lee Kolligian  
Carole McCoy  
Ken Robbins  
Steve Simmons  
Justi Smith  
Bill Spriggs  
Steve Tinetti

Absent:      Committee Members:

Jerry Callister (excused)  
Walt Lopes (unexcused)  
Richard Kirby (excused)  
Diana Westmoreland Pedrozo (excused)  
Jeff Pennington (unexcused)  
Greg Thompson (unexcused)

Staff Present:

Bill King, Principal Planner  
David Gonzalves, Director of  
Development Services

Consultants Present:

None

**(C) APPROVE MINUTES OF JUNE 12, 2014**

M/S SIMMONS-TINETTI and carried by unanimous voice vote (six absent), to approve the Minutes of June 12, 2014, as submitted.

**(D) ORAL COMMUNICATIONS**

Committee Member GERHARDT informed the group about the 8<sup>th</sup> Annual Ride/March against Methamphetamines.

**(E) REVIEW AND VOTE ON UPDATED DRAFT PLAN**

Director of Development Services GONZALVES introduced the topic and expressed his appreciation of the Committee member's effort and input. Committee Member KOLLIGIAN asked about the next steps, whether this was a project under CEQA, and if it would be a part of the General Plan. Mr. GONZALVES said the BCP relies on the General Plan EIR and for that reason, needs to be consistent with the General Plan. With regard to next steps, he noted that creation and adoption of the *Bellevue Community Plan* (BCP), per the General Plan, is the next step. Principal Planner KING noted that the BCP is a project subject to CEQA. The next steps would be to bring a recommendation forward to the Planning Commission concerning the BCP and a General Plan Amendment, along with an addendum to the EIR that was prepared for the *Merced Vision 2030 General Plan*. This package would then be considered by the City Council. In response to a question from Committee Member ROBBINS, he stated that the addendum finds that the BCP is consistent with the General Plan and that there are no significant changes in the BCP.

Mr. KING gave an overview of the past meetings and progress in development of the BCP, noting its review by the public and City commissions and committees. He noted that updates were performed and the staff report summarizes the changes and where no changes were made, and that these can be discussed in this meeting. He highlighted the effort to adjust the draft language concerning the urban design features of the plan, notably its uniqueness as compared to the "Urban Village Concept." He opened the floor to discussion of the draft plan, to be followed by a vote on the plan.

Mr. KING started the discussion by walking through six points made in a letter submitted by Mayor THURSTON. Committee Member TINETTI informed the group that the West Hills Subdivision was developed as a rural residential neighborhood and that development surrounding it has access to both Golf Road and

Bellevue Road and should not have to include road connections to and through it from adjacent higher intensity development. Mr. KING summarized the Committee's action in June 2014 that addressed through a BCP policy, the potential for high levels of traffic to impact existing rural residential neighborhoods and the measures to reduce those impacts. Committee Member KOLLIGIAN brought up a point raised in the Mayor's letter concerning the urban village, notably that it refers to the classic urban village design as described in the General Plan. Mayor THURSTON noted that the first item in his letter is part of the cleanup needed to clarify the intent of the BCP. Committee Member GWIN asked if the Bellevue Ranch Project is a classic urban village. Mr. KING confirmed it is and went on to describe the classic image of an urban village in the General Plan. Several committee Members commented that that form of urban design should not be developed in the BCP area.

Mr. KING re-started the discussion of walking through six requests made in a letter submitted by Mayor THURSTON. Requests: **Request #1:** Figure 3 of the BCP, which is the illustrative plan of the *Bellevue Corridor Community Plan*, should be removed. Mr. KING noted that this illustrative plan is not representative of the classic urban village land-use concept, but did concur that it could be confused with one. Committee Member DICKER asked if the Figure can be removed and Mr. KING said yes. Committee Member DICKER asked if the BCP will affect other areas of the General Plan that are subject to the classic urban village concept. Mr. KING replied that the BCP applies only to the geography within its boundaries. **Request #2:** Requests that BCP language summarizing the General Plan guidelines to development community plans, notably the language that says, use of urban village concepts should be used where feasible, be removed. Mr. KING recommended that in lieu of removal of this language, that the BCP include language that notes how the BCP is different than the classic model. Mayor THURSTON asked if the clarification could be as was done in the executive summary, and Mr. KING replied yes. **Request #3:** Requests that the table marked as Table A-1 on page A-8 (Appendix A of the BCP) be removed because the density described is contrary to the flexibility the Committee wants and was never discussed as a zoning issue. Mr. KING explained that this table refers to the *Bellevue Corridor Community Illustrative Plan*, not the BCP, but that this table could be removed if desired. **Request #4:** Requests that Section C-2 of Appendix C regarding urban design be removed because it refers to the urban village concept. Mr. KING handed out a copy of that policy section so that meeting attendees could see the policies, and noted that there are some policies that are not related to the urban village, specifically pointing out the set of recommended policies from UC Merced students of Professor S.A. Davis concerning the development of an innovation hub in the BCP. Committee Members DICKER

and GWIN asked about the formatting of Appendix C. Mr. KING noted that Appendix C includes both adopted *Merced Vision 2030 General Plan* policies, with proposed BCP policies “nested” within it, noting that indents and shading of BCP policies distinguish them from General Plan policies. Committee Member ROBBINS inquired of the Mayor what his concern was with the narrative as compared to the classic urban design model. Mayor THURSTON responded that future interpretation of the BCP in the future could be misinterpreted if the reader views the numerous citations back to the General Plan as indicators that the BCP was to follow the classic model of the urban village. Committee Member KOLLIGIAN noted that these references to the classic urban village model create confusion and that the plan needs to focus on the different concepts presented in the BCP. Committee Member MCCOY commented that the term Urban Village was creating confusion, and pitched the use of the term “New Urban Design” instead. Committee Member GWIN stated that the place to start is to define what is meant by “the village.” Mr. KING noted that the intent Staff had in nesting the BCP policies with the General Plan policies wasn’t meant to strengthen the urban village ideas that originate from the General Plan as a way to subvert the efforts of the Committee. Rather, the intent is to make it clear to a reader that these policies are consistent with General Plan. From that perspective, Appendix C is a handy tool. If the Appendix is creating unintended consequences or links back to an idea that may not be valid in the BCP, then there is no requirement that the policies be presented this way and that the Chapters contain the policies in any case. Committee Member DICKER noted that the BCP does not need to give homage to the Calthorpe diagram of urban design that doesn’t work for several communities, and to simply remove all references to that concept. Mr. KING noted that the BCP includes several statements that sets it apart from the classic urban village model. Committee Member HOLMES noted that challenge to remain consistent with the General Plan needs to be considered. Mr. LAKIREDDY noted that the BCP needs to include mention of the classic urban village or be subject to an extensive environmental review process and related documentation preparation, which would be costly and take years, derailing any projects in the area. He noted that the BCP needs to work within the framework of the General Plan and some level of compromise is needed, and that the current draft may be the maximum amount of flexibility that can be achieved. Mayor THURSTON noted that his letter is not intended to trigger what was described by Mr. LAKIREDDY. **Request #5:** Requests to remove an existing General Plan policy concerning density. Mr. KING noted that such a request is beyond the scope of the Committee and its effort to help craft the BCP. **Request #6:** Requests that the “Findings Report” for the BCP (Appendix I) be amended to remove specific references to Form-Based Code and the Urban Village Concept.

Committee Member MCCOY commented that the description of the urban design is very good. Committee Member TINETTI asked whether or not the BCP would support the siting of a research and development related business looking for a 300-acre site. Mr. KING replied yes. Committee Member HVIDT commented that the Committee should focus on the outcome rather than the label. He noted that the UC is happy to be part of this effort and supports efforts to create a transit-oriented development next to the campus. He asked where and how will 6,500 students be housed off-campus (3,500 will be housed on-campus). He noted that the Committee has identified the basic building blocks or outcomes of the plan. What you call it shouldn't interfere with designing the essential aspects of creating a prototype development next to the UC campus. Mayor THURSTON agreed, but wants to assure flexibility by assuring that the BCP isn't misconstrued by future planners by requiring application of the classic urban village to the BCP. Committee Member ROBBINS noted that the BCP would not trigger extensive CEQA review if conceptual outcomes are the same. He stated that the narrative in the plan achieves the outcome by allowing a mixture of uses and would not result in hard boundaries between singular land use types which are located in predefined models. He supports the request to remove Figure 3 in request #1 described above. Mr. KING commented that if all requests described above were followed (other than removing current general plan language), then that would be OK, because the outcome of the plan still retains the concepts of mixed-used, soft boundaries, and consistency with the General Plan. Committee Member HOLMES suggested that the policy consistency review be part of the Environmental Review and not the BCP.

Committee Member HOLMES commented that it is critical not to show Hillcrest Road connecting straight to Farmland Avenue, as it would be used as a cut-through road, as opposed to use of G Street or Golf Road. Hillcrest Road from Old Lake Road to Farmland Avenue isn't a collector, but a road with slow traffic enjoyed by pedestrians. Instead of a straight route with traffic calming, the design should include a circuitous road network, and the image of a straight road should not be shown. Mr. TELEGAN brought up the idea to have collector spacing every 1/3 mile instead of the 1/4 mile spacing, and that the elevation challenge at the 1/4 mile site (Paulson extended) could be avoided. Mr. KING noted that the Callister plan already includes the 1/4 mile spacing. Committee Member KOLLIGIAN noted that page 97 discusses retail and gateway designs on both corners, but does not mention which corner. Mr. KING noted that the BCP includes language noting the Committee's support for retail on the north, and that page 97 can be updated to reflect this. Committee Member KOLLIGIAN also asked about the image on page 67 as it pertained to critical habitat.

KING responded that the image on that page does not refer to critical habitat, but to conservation easements. Although the BCP states there is critical habitat in the planning area, there are no images in the BCP that mark the location of critical habitat.

**M/S ROBBINS- KOLLIGIAN and carried by unanimous voice vote (six absent), that Figure #3, Bellevue Community Plan “Illustrative Plan,” located on page 10 of the July 2014 Draft BCP, be removed from the plan.**

Committee Member HOLMES moved to recommend approval of the BCP subject to changes to make sure we are talking about the BCP concept and not the GP Concept (Mr. KING – add to executive summary), which is not concentric circles, but soft edges with transitions between land uses. Seconded by Committee Member SIMMONS. Committee Member TINETTI asked for clarification on the meaning of soft boundaries as it applies to different uses in a building. Committee Member HOLMES stated that the intent of the motion would support that arrangement. Mr. KING noted that it would be more important to say that the BCP does not follow the concentric ring model as opposed to trying to define a soft boundary. Mayor THURSTON asked if the executive summary rule over other sections. Mr. KING said it doesn't rule, but summarizes the plan's elements. Committee Member ROBBINS offered that it is a statement of intent. Committee Member KOLLIGIAN asked if we should first vote on any amendments before voting on the plan. Committee Member HOLMES rescinded his motion.

Committee Member KOLLIGIAN motioned that the executive summary contains language that differentiates the BCP urban village as a mixed use transit-oriented use as opposed to the concentric circle that is part of the historic classic urban village model. This was seconded by Committee Member HOLMES. Committee Member KOLLIGIAN asked if the differentiation can be named. The Committee offered varied names, and the group agreed to call it “Bellevue Urban Design.” **The original motion was modified as follows: M/S KOLLIGIAN - SIMMONS and carried by unanimous voice vote (six absent), that the executive summary and throughout the BCP document, that we call this the “Bellevue Urban Design” as opposed to the classic urban village.**

Committee Member HOLMES motioned that staff evaluate the use of 1/3 mile collector intersections in the area north of Mandeville Lane, Farmland Avenue, G Street, and Golf Road. Committee Member SIMMONS seconded the motion.

AUGUST 25, 2014

Committee Member GWIN asked what the criteria would be. Committee Member HOLMES noted it would be shown as an option. Mr. KING noted that staff would not support it being shown as an option, but that an assessment of factors and considerations, such as satisfying the function of a collector road. Committee Member HOLMES also noted the need to consider grade and excavation issues. Committee Member HVIDT suggested that a traffic study be conducted to determine impact within an area. Mr. KING noted the assessment would cover the area previously described by Committee Member HOLMES. Mr. KING described his understanding of the motion that a study would be performed, and based on those findings, that a future decision as to the use of 1/3 mile spacing would be made. Committee Member ROBBINS commented that this would most likely be part of a mitigation of a future Specific Plan project. **The original motion was modified as follows: M/S by HOLMES-TINETTI and carried by a majority voice vote (six absent), for staff to evaluate use of 1/3 mile collectors on Bellevue Road in the area described above and evaluation criteria would include traffic flow and terrain grade.** Committee Members HVIDT and ROBBINS dissented.

**M/S HOLMES- KOLLIGIAN and carried by unanimous voice vote (six absent), for removal of as much of Appendix C as possible and that it be moved to the environmental review document instead.** Mr. KING noted that the whole document would be moved.

**M/S HOLMES- TINETTI and carried by unanimous voice vote (six absent), to recommend approval of the BCP subject to the modifications of the earlier motions.** Though not included in the motion, Mr. TELEGAN suggested that the road be named Bellevue Parkway. Committee Member HOLMES noted the Council would need to make such change. Mr. KING noted that the Campus Parkway ends at Yosemite Avenue.

Mr. KING requested Mayor THURSTON to present certificates of appreciation to the Committee, which he did.

**(F) COLLECTION OF FORM 700 FROM COMMITTEE**

Staff collected 700 Forms from the Committee.

**(G) ADJOURNMENT OF THE COMMITTEE.**

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS, CHAIRPERSON SPRIGGS ADJOURNED THE MEETING AT 2:50 P.M.

AUGUST 25, 2014

BY:



BILL KING  
COMMITTEE SECRETARY

APPROVED:



BILL SPRIGGS, CHAIRPERSON  
BELLEVUE CORRIDOR COMMUNITY PLAN  
AD-HOC CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE