



# FORT ORD REUSE AUTHORITY

## REGIONAL URBAN DESIGN GUIDELINES TASK FORCE REGULAR MEETING NOTES

12:00 p.m., August 18, 2015 | FORA Conference Room  
920 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue, Suite A, Marina, CA 93933

### 1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

RUDG Task Force Chair Michael Houlemard called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m. The following were present:

Members:

John Dunn, City of Seaside  
Victoria Beach, City of Carmel-by-the-Sea  
Layne Long, City of Marina  
Carl Holm, Monterey County  
Elizabeth Caraker, City of Monterey  
Anya Spear, CSUMB

FORA Staff:

Michael Houlemard  
Jonathan Garcia  
Josh Metz  
Steve Endsley  
Ted Lopez

Others:

Bob Schaffer  
Jane Haines  
Kathy Biala  
Steve Matarazzo  
Tim O'Halloran  
Bob Schaffer  
Hernan Guerrero and Jason King,  
DKP (via phone)  
Lisa Brinton  
Beth Palmer  
Wendy Elliott

### 2. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS, ANNOUNCEMENTS AND CORRESPONDENCE

Chair Michael Houlemard and FORA Economic Development Coordinator Josh Metz thanked County of Monterey staff for their in-depth review / written comments of the draft RUDG. Ms. Wendy Elliott noted for the record, the draft RUDG cover page photo depicting multi-family housing is incorrect and should not be used because the property is zoned for single-family housing.

### 3. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

a. June 25, 2015 Meeting Minutes.

MOTION: John Dunn moved, seconded by Carl Holm, to approve the June 25, 2015 minutes as presented.

MOTION PASSED: Unanimous.

### 4. PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

None.

### 5. BUSINESS ITEMS

a. Receive updated RUDG completion Strategy

Chair Houlemard discussed the format to review the draft RUDG. A page-by-page review of the draft would be conducted by RUDG task force members to identify changes / additions needed. The task force goal is to finalize the draft RUDG and release it for public comment. In addition, the project review objective is to complete RUDG in time for the December 11, 2015 FORA Board meeting.

FORA Economic Development Coordinator Josh Metz reviewed a power point presentation which provided a project timeline for draft guideline presentation to the FORA Board, comment periods, and

final RUDG presentation. Mr. Metz emphasized the importance of task force members to complete their review of the draft RUDG to recommend changes, corrections and clarifications. The intent is to release the draft RUDG for a 30-day public review / comment period.

b. Review draft RUDG v3.0

There was extensive discussion on the draft RUDG by task force members and community participants present. General consensus revolved around clarifying language in the draft RUDG to describe the purpose, applicability and consistency with the Base Reuse Plan (BRP). The task force reached a consensus to recommend the following draft RUDG changes, corrections and clarifications:

- Clarify the Introduction Section:
  - Expand/broaden the description.
  - Use lay terminology where possible to aid public understanding.
  - Include key terms definitions (such as “design-related measure”).
  - Reference the BRP and Master Resolution and LINK to the listed principles.
  - Include Decision Tree/Flow Chart for where/when the Design Guidelines apply.
- Strengthen connection between BRP language and nine (add principles if necessary to be inclusive of the BRP standards) reuse guideline principles that make up the RUDG to consist:
  - p.61 ““Urban design guidelines will establish standards for road design, setbacks, building height, landscaping, signage, and other matters of visual importance.”
    - Road Design.
    - Setbacks.
    - Building Height.
    - Landscaping.
    - Signage (relate this to TAMC’s Wayfinding Plan process).
    - Other matters of visual importance.
- Highlight the connection of each of the recommended RUDG principles to these 6 required elements (i.e. bullet points beneath each RUDG title).
  - See page 21 in Hwy 1 Design Guidelines for example of sidebar footnotes linking content to BRP language.
- Remove the Applicability Matrix.
- Define/describe how/why street neighborhood connectivity is “regional” issue. Relationship of street network form and traffic flow/movement patterns.
- Change “Requirements” to “Guidelines” or “Principles,” “shall” to “should,” and “must” to “should be” or use action words like “design,” “permit,” “connect,” etc.
- Use active voice in description of “Principles” i.e. “Connect all new neighborhood streets to adjacent streets where connecting stubs are available” vs. “All new neighborhood streets **must**...” And “Permit secondary entrances on side rear facades...” instead of “Secondary entrances shall be permitted on side rear facades...”
- On page 2.11 section “1. Park,” add italicized text to second to last sentence: “Parks often have a minimum of 8 acres, *or may be smaller to meet city or county requirements.*”
- On page 2.15, TF asked what does “Sensitive Drives” mean? Can you find a better term?

- Clarify connection between Walkable Streets cross-sections and existing FORA street design standards.
  - Clarify criteria for on-street vs off-street parking.
  - Run lane width recommendations by public safety officials.
- Eastside Parkway design review discussed. The BRP Program Environmental Impact Report (EIR) evaluated certain assumptions about standard roadways on Fort Ord. FORA has yet to complete an Eastside Parkway project specific California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) process. Eastside Parkway roadway widths may change in the future through the CEQA process. (Note: FORA staff will research the pro's and con's of reducing draft Eastside Parkway cross section travel lanes to 11').
  - Generally agreed to reduce lane widths to 11' in RUDG renderings. Initiate contact with TAMC to receive input on lane widths reduction to 11' (and to include TAMC approval for any changes to road designs, new criteria).
- Plain English term for "legible" – i.e. identifiable.
- Select and finalize cover page (no picture depicting multi-family housing).
- Provide a description using examples how the design guidelines are to be used by either a developer, regional agency, organization or local government jurisdiction. Incorporate examples.

The RUDG task force will continue their review of the draft RUDG beginning with page 2-22, Legible Centers. The next RUDG meeting will be held Thursday, August 27, 2015 at 10:00 a.m.

## 6. **ITEMS FROM MEMBERS**

None.

## 7. **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 2:30 p.m.