

From: [Kelly Rodriguez](#)
To: [cityclerk](#)
Subject: Appeal of General Plan Amendment #24-02
Date: Saturday, July 5, 2025 7:11:14 PM

[You don't often get email from [REDACTED] Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

> Dear Merced City Counsel,

>

> We are writing to express our strong opposition of the appeal for the General Plan Amendment #34-02, Site Utilization Plan Revision #3.

>

> Lalo & Kelly Rodriguez

> [REDACTED]

> [REDACTED]

>

[NOTICE: This message originated outside of City of Merced -- DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.]

From: [Donene](#)
To: [cityclerk](#)
Cc: [Smith, Shane](#)
Subject: General Plan Amendment #24-02
Date: Sunday, July 6, 2025 1:53:50 PM
Importance: High

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Sir and to whom it may concern:

I am writing as a private citizen and as a local residential appraiser in regards to the proposed development of the self-storage facility and 41 home sites @ the SWC of E Yosemite Ave @ Parsons Ave.

My residence is east of this proposed development.

I **adamantly oppose** this amendment to the general plan & this development along with numerous neighbors (most are older and can't get to any meetings) as a nearby property owner. The ground is zoned RP-D (20) and this proposed re-zoning is not a benefit to neighboring properties due to the many security issues and loss of peace/quiet in this area. General plan calls for commercial offices which is a more homogeneous use with the nearby surgical center. Seems like there are at least 2 other self-storage facilities underway within the city limits and potentially one outside the city limits in SE Merced.

Maybe the developer should consider the property currently available at the SWC of Mercy Ave and Paulson Rd for the storage facility. Great piece of ground!

As an residential appraiser (30+ years locally, specialist in new home construction) I am highly concerned about the influx of additional residential properties. A quick analysis of building permits issued in the past few months shows an exorbitant number of new homes starts. My concern is none are truly "affordable" in any areas and where are the buyers coming from? Not all can be "rentals" since we have numerous new apartments underway as well.

Off the top of my head there are at least three active large builders (D R Horton, Century Communities, Stonefield Home) all building in not only Bellevue Ranch & Compass Pointe but now in SE Merced around the Campus Parkway. Additionally the "gated tract" at the NWC of Bellevue Rd and North "G" St has been underway for years and they still have no gate since not enough sites are sold in the tract to support the costs of the promised infrastructure.

I would like to know IF the absorption rate was considered for these SFRs or are we going to end up like Bellevue Ranch several years ago when the market tanked and builders walked away leaving blocks of vacant sites or partially built out houses. We did have the highest foreclosure rate in the country back then, has any analysis been given to that aspect?

How are these houses to be marketed? Will there be a full time ON SITE agent or are local agents

going to represent seller/developer on an “as needed” basis? Which then leads to the overall security issues and the attractive nuisance of a unmanned development enticing crime.

What assurances are being provided that the improvements will be consistent in quality to surrounding properties? Are the sites to be fully landscaped by the builder or as usual rear yard is left up to the buyer so surrounding properties will have added weed abatement if those things are neglected and an overgrowth of shrubbery results?

The overall appearance of the proposed SFR tract presents ingress/egress issues in my opinion as traffic continues to increase along Parsons @ Yosemite Ave.

In conclusion this is not a very well thought out project that will benefit the local citizens but a money grab by the developer (since they own the ground). There are other areas in northern Merced where this would be a great project, just not on Yosemite Ave @ Parsons.

Thank you for your time.

Donene Berry



[**NOTICE:** This message originated outside of City of Merced -- **DO NOT CLICK** on **links** or open **attachments** unless you are sure the content is safe.]

Carol Dinuzzo



July 6, 2025

City Council

City of Merced

Subject: Opposition to Rezoning of Commercial Property at 1380 Yosemite Ave – Please Uphold the Planning Commission’s Denial

Dear Members of the City Council,

We are writing to express our strong opposition to the proposed rezoning of the property at 1380 Yosemite Ave from commercial/medical to high-density residential use. This rezoning is inconsistent with smart planning and undermines Merced’s long-term growth potential.

We urge you to uphold the Planning Commission’s decision, which rightfully denied this request. Their vote reflected clear concerns raised by residents and aligned with the city’s existing zoning priorities. To overturn their decision now would ignore both community input and the careful, deliberate process the commission followed.

This property is already zoned for commercial and medical use—a designation that anticipates and supports Merced’s future needs. Rezoning it for dense residential development, including a mini storage facility, is a shortsighted move that benefits a private developer at the expense of the public good.

We cannot ignore what’s happening just a few miles away. UC Merced is currently expanding, with a \$300 million Medical Education Building—203,500 square feet dedicated to instruction, research, academic offices, and community-facing programs. That kind of investment requires smart land use planning and supporting infrastructure. This site is ideally positioned to serve that vision—with medical offices, clinics, or innovation hubs—not crammed housing and storage units.

Allowing this rezoning would permanently undermine that opportunity. It’s a decision that locks the city into a lesser version of what this space could become.

We are not against growth. We are for thoughtful, coordinated, community-centered growth. What’s being proposed here is none of those things. It’s unaligned with current zoning, incompatible with the surrounding neighborhood, and completely disconnected from the strategic direction of our city and university.

We respectfully ask that you deny the developer’s appeal, support the decision made by the Planning Commission, and keep this property zoned for the future Merced deserves.

Thank you for your attention and for listening to the voices of residents who truly care about the long-term success of our city.

Sincerely,

Carol Dinuzzo

Ahwahnee Drive Resident

June 24, 2025

Public Hearing General Plan Amendment #24-02, Site Plan Revision #3 to Planned Development #20, Minor Use Permit #24-13, Site Plan #551, Vesting Tentative Subdivision Map #13332 and Environmental Review Checklist #24-25 and Notice of Intent to Adopt a Negative Declaration

Dear Merced City Council,

We are in opposition to the approval of the above General Plan Amendment for the following reasons:

1. The proposal wants to change to Business Park (BP) and High Medium Density (HMD) residential. This is NOT consistent with the surrounding R-1-6 lots on all four sides of the site. The residential community immediately to the West and South are all single story in the highly desirable Oakmont Village. 2 story houses should not be allowed on this site. These proposed changes will lower the value of our neighborhood homes.
2. The lot sizes and roads per Site Plan drawing on page 53 are much smaller than the surrounding neighborhoods. Starting with access to the residential area from Parsons Ave. The entrance is too small to allow the Merced City Fire ladder truck easy access to the proposed 2 story houses in the event of a fire. Is this supposed to be a gated community? Looks like gates on the drawing. The main road appears to be only 35' wide and the roads to the 2 story houses appear to be only 20' wide. These narrow roadways will be a disaster just like the Moraga Subdivision on Yosemite Ave. to the East. The proposed lot sizes vary from 2,160 to 5,374 sf. The existing lots to South and West in Oakmont Village are 6,360 to 13,860 sf.
3. According to the city's own report and I quote "This Project is not consistent with the Merced Vision 2030 General Plan but generates less than 500 daily trips." The traffic study was conducted on only one day, November 19, 2024. This hardly represents a true study of the existing traffic on Yosemite Ave and Parson Ave.
4. We purchased the property in 2009 as our last home only to see a developer come in and try to rezone and ruin the continuity of our community. They purchased the site in 2022 knowing that it was zoned C-O and now want to change to Business Park and High Medium Residential. These proposed changes will lower the value of our neighborhood homes.

Tom & Debbie Clendenin


[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Robert Dinuzzo, AIA Architect



City of Merced, Merced City Council (via e-mail)
678 West 18th Street
Merced, CA 95340

RE: Agenda Item I.2, Public Hearing General Plan Amendment #24-02

Dear Members of the City Council,

I join the many residents of the Oakmont Village neighborhood and beyond in reiterating my opposition to the Zone Change application being appealed to you after a resounding and unanimous decision by the Planning Commission to deny that Application.

Assuming you were forwarded all of the citizen notes, letters, testimony, and petitions reflecting the overwhelming opposition to the Zone Change from the Planning Commission meetings, be aware that there was no one other than the developer in favor of this project.

Again, Oakmont Village residents established homes understanding a future neighbor to the north would be a commercial office. Residents moving from the neighborhood sell their homes to buyers that understand their home will retain its high value because of the commercial office zoning to the north. A mini-storage facility and high density neighborhood would diminish home values and lower the quality of life in our neighborhood.

A commercial office complex would generate more jobs and provide more services to the City and is better suited as a neighbor to a low density neighborhood. A mini-storage facility is better suited in light commercial areas away from residential neighborhoods.

The planned high density neighborhood would not be compatible with Oakmont Village. Other high density neighborhoods in Merced see crime, vandalism, poorly maintained homes and other negativity that would clash with Oakmont Village.

Again, I ask for your consideration and respect for our neighborhood residents, against the wishes of a developer that does not share the same vision of the area as the previous owners of the property and previous City elected and appointed officials who originally zoned the property as Commercial Office. Please join our neighborhood and your colleagues of the Planning Commission to deny this Appeal of the Zone Change.

Sincerely,

Robert Dinuzzo, AIA Architect

From: [Smith, Shane](#)
To: [Parsley, Jennifer](#); [Medina, Alejandra](#)
Subject: Fw: General Plan Amendment # GPA 24-02
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 5:19:13 AM

From: Vikas Garcha [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, July 6, 2025 9:50 PM
To: cityclerk <cityclerk@cityofmerced.org>; Serratto, Matthew <Mayor@cityofmerced.org>; Dupont, Darin <DupontD@cityofmerced.org>; De Anda, Ronnie <DeandaR@cityofmerced.org>; Harris, Michael <HarrisM@cityofmerced.org>; Smith, Shane <SmithS@cityofmerced.org>; Boyle, Sarah <BoyleS@cityofmerced.org>; Xiong, Fue <XiongF@cityofmerced.org>
Subject: General Plan Amendment # GPA 24-02

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Mayor and All Members of Merced City Council,

I strongly oppose the rezoning initiated by Eric Gonzalez, on behalf of Yosemite 1380 LLC from Commercial Office to Business Park and High Medium Density residential.

I am in favor of keeping the zoning as commercial office or modifying the zoning to single family homes similar to currently in Oakmount Village (around 8,000 to 12,000 sq ft lots). We need more commercial office spaces in Merced like University Surgery Center currently next to this property. My house will be badly impacted by this rezoning.

The whole community including myself is opposing this rezoning for the following reasons:

Traffic and Safety: The rezoning will lead to increased traffic congestion or pose safety risks to pedestrians or cyclists etc

School Capacity: The rezoning will lead to overcrowding in schools.

Property Values: The rezoning will affect the property values in the area.

Environmental Concerns: The rezoning negatively impact the environment including cutting almost more than 100 years old trees which provide shade, fresh air, privacy and many more things.

Community Character: The proposed development does not fit the character of the neighborhood as it is a quite neighborhood with most of the older and retired residents.

I strongly request the Mayor and City Council not to rezone this property.

Best Regards,

Vikas Garcha
Resident of Oakmount Village

[**NOTICE:** This message originated outside of City of Merced -- **DO NOT CLICK** on **links** or open **attachments** unless you are sure the content is safe.]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [cityclerk](#)
Cc: [Serratto, Matthew](#); [Dupont, Darin](#); [De Anda, Ronnie](#); [Smith, Shane](#); [Boyle, Sarah](#); [Xiong, Fue](#)
Subject: Merced City Council meeting July 7, 2025 Project Denial of Item #1.2 25-645
Date: Thursday, July 3, 2025 6:23:50 PM

You don't often get email from schuttent@aol.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

To all City Council Members and Mayor Serratto,

My name is Linda Farnsworth Schutt and I was born and raised in Merced County. The years spent living and working there have created many ties to this community. The city of Merced is where I chose to retire in 2006, specifically purchasing a home on Ahwahnee Drive in the Oakmont subdivision. My decision was made because I was looking for a home in a quiet, established, safe, respected neighborhood and that is exactly what I have experienced. You can only imagine how appalled I was when I learned about the proposed zoning change by Yosemite 1380 LLC to re-zone approximately 8 acres near East Yosemite Avenue and Parsons Avenue. After spending many hours researching the various issues I AM ADAMENTLY OPPOSED TO ITEM 25-645.

Yosemite 1380 LLC, property owners, are seeking a General Plan Amendment to two parcels which will have a detrimental, harmful and adverse impact on numerous single-family, low density residential homes in the Oakmont subdivision. The application involves a request to establish a self-storage facility and to create a High Medium Density (HMD) subdivision consisting of 41 single-family residential lots, appr. 2,160 sq. ft. to 5,374 sq. ft. Although the developer has yet to submit building designs for the 41 residential lots, the plan is that 17 of the lots would be single-story homes and the remaining 24 would be two-story homes. (See Site Plan-SP1 The Cirrus Company-24-048 04/30/2024) and (Initial Study #24-25 Page 1 of 48 paragraph 2). The proposed buildings range in height, between 16 and 27 feet. The entire document(s) regarding this case is available at <https://www.cityofmerced.org/home/showpublisheddocument/22408/638765982153707159> The Merced City Planning Commission heard testimony regarding this matter on March 19, 2025, and again on April 9, 2025. At the April hearing, the Planning Commission considered this matter and directed staff to prepare a resolution of **DENIAL of Vesting Tentative Subdivision Map #1332 Site Plan #552 and Minor Use Permit #24-13.**

There are many issues of concern which need to be addressed.

- **SELF-STORAGE UNITS:** The proposed change from Commercial Office (CO) to Business Park (BP) for 2.72 Acres creates many problems. What will the hours of operation be IF this facility is approved? If it is a 24-hour accessible storage building, it will bring traffic and related activity through our neighborhood for all days of the week and night. It also gives "unsavory" people a cover to be in the neighborhood claiming they have a storage unit. This would not happen if the (CO) commercial office zoning remains in place.
- **COMMERCIAL OFFICE TO HIGH MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL:** Initial Study #24-25, Page 30, "The existing land use designations for this site does not allow for residential uses such as single-family homes, duplexes or high-density residential uses which include the former and multi-family residential." The proposed land use amendment would transition the southern 4.48 acres of the proposed site into 41 lots designated (HMD) Residential. The existing planned development standards would be revised to allow the uses and residential density currently allowed under the (HMD) Residential. However, the "Planned Development would allow the developer to create and then propose unique development standards throughout the site, for the 41 separately identified lots located within the southern portion of the subject site." The concerning issue for the subdivision is that 24 two-story homes on significantly smaller lot sizes are proposed to be plunked adjacent to an area of single-family homes. The developer has yet to submit substantive building designs for the 41 residential lots. However, the objectionable self-storage facility has drawings, elevations, etc. available.
- **ENTRANCE/EXIT:** As proposed (Site Plan 1) there is only one road for entering and exiting via Parsons Avenue which is where the (HMD) high medium density homes are planned. Is that adequate? Is it adequate in the event of an emergency? Can our local fire trucks maneuver easily? Each lot is supposed to have two parking spaces located within a garage. Does that mean visitors will be parking on the street? How will that impact accessibility? The absence of substantive design and the developers' apparent unrestricted capacity to create and then propose "unique" standards creates a strong impression of predatory development.
- **FLOOD ZONE:** Ahwahnee Drive was inundated several times with water during heavy downpours. The homes are built significantly higher than the road so they did not flood. How will flood water be handled? How and where will water be diverted?
- **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT:** The Environmental Impact Report [EIR (SCH# 2008071069)] were certified in

January 2012. As a resident living in view of these empty lots, I have had the opportunity to view Swainson's hawks. How will they be affected?

· **NEIGHBORING PROPERTY VALUES:** A home is often the largest asset people have. The Oakmont subdivision has attracted many buyers who want privacy, safety and a quiet low-density environment. Oakmont will be negatively impacted. We have great concern for the substantial devaluation of our property should this zoning change be approved. Will the developer compensate property owners for this? Of greatest concern are the people who bought a home on the northern side of Ahwahnee Court. Was this information revealed to them by anyone before they purchased their home? They will have a concentrated development of two-story buildings looking right down into their back yards—losing all sense of privacy—in a subdivision that does not have two-story homes.

CONCLUSION: Based upon these significant and serious issues, I oppose both

1) the seven day a week self-storage facility and

2) the extreme density (for Merced) two-story homes right next to Oakmont.

Please leave the zoning as is: Commercial Office.

[NOTICE: This message originated outside of City of Merced -- DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.]

June 25, 2025

Dear members of the city council,

I am writing to express my strong support for the planning departments decision to deny the proposed rezoning amendment #24-02 at 1380 East Yosemite Ave and 3595 Parsons Ave from low density commercial property to medium to high density residential, within our established low density neighborhood.

Our community was built with thoughtful planning that ensures a peaceful, safe, and cohesive environment for families. Allowing a high-density residential development would significantly disrupt the balance. It introduces a dramatic increase in traffic, noise, and population density-factors that are inconsistent with the character and design of our area. Moreover, the introduction of such a project would likely lead to a decline in existing property values. Homeowners have made significant investments in their properties with the understanding that the zoning and surrounding land use would remain stable. Changing that now undermines the confidence and trust that residents have in the city's planning process.

We welcome responsible growth, but it must be compatible with the existing fabric of the community. This proposal is not. Upholding the Planning Department's denial is not only a matter of protecting current residents' investments-it is a decision in favor of thoughtful, sustainable development.

I respectfully urge you to support the Planning Department's decision and protect the character, value, and integrity of our neighborhood.

Sincerely,

David and Kathy Miller

From: [Strong Towns Merced](#)
To: [cityclerk](#)
Subject: Public Comment: Mintier Harnish and Urban Diversity Design Scope of Work
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 10:49:36 AM

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

More resources went into law this last week to put Merced on a sustainable urban design roadmap for updating the General Plan and revitalizing Downtown Merced with a visionary Station Area Land Use Plan.

Per CalMatters, California Assembly Bill 130 (Committee on Budget) and SB 131 (Committee on Budget and Fiscal Review) went into law: urban “infill” housing developments — *housing built in and around existing development* — are no longer subject to CEQA. “Saying ‘no’ to housing in my community will no longer be state sanctioned,” said Assemblymember Buffy Wicks, an Oakland Democrat who introduced the CEQA law. The bill is limited to projects under 20 acres, but that cap is only relevant to the biggest multi-block-spanning mega developments. A certain level of density is required; it precludes using the policy for single-family home construction.

- We are calling on the City Council to agendize during the July 21st session a discussion on how city staff will align this new law with the General Plan Update Consultant, Mintier Harnish, and Station Area Planning Consultant, Urban Diversity Design scope of work
- In the best interest of the community, we are calling for a transparency dashboard capturing metrics on the following: Targeted Mixed-Use Zoning, Value per acre, Floor to Area Ratios for form-based codes, Corridor Sprawl Corrective Action, GreenHouse Emissions Analytics, Leapfrog Development Prevention, Population Growth Rate Analysis, Risk Management of Low-density sprawl, Smart Growth, Urban Footprint, Urban Growth Boundary, Vehicle Miles Traveled, Contiguous Development Assessment, Active Streets evaluation

In the event City Staff and/or City Council are not familiar with these concepts, [The Sustainable Urban Design Handbook](#), Nico Larco and Kaarin Knudson, 2024 offers an easy to read and easy to understand resource with inspiring graphics for all the impactful legacy planning ahead.

Jerry Perezchica

Strong Towns| Merced

[**NOTICE:** This message originated outside of City of Merced -- **DO NOT CLICK** on **links** or open **attachments** unless you are sure the content is safe.]

July 7, 2025

Honorable City Council Members
VIA Email

Dear City Council Members,

I am writing to express my deep frustration and concern regarding the appeal by the Developer of the Planning Commission's decision to deny the General Plan Amendment #24-02 and Minor Use Permit #24-13. We own the property located at [REDACTED] Ahwahnee Drive and are united with our neighbors over the opposition of this proposal. We urge the Council to uphold the April 9, 2025 Planning Commission decision.

When I chose to invest in this home, I did so based on the character, zoning, and long-term planning vision of this neighborhood. At no point during the construction of my home was there any indication that such a significant and impactful development be constructed on the adjacent parcel, zoned as commercial office. The proposed mini storage facility and high-density residential complex are completely out of alignment with the existing residential nature and aesthetic of the area.

My concerns are numerous:

1. **Property Value and Aesthetics:** A mini storage facility directly abutting a residential property inevitably impacts property values, visual harmony, and neighborhood appeal.
2. **Traffic and Safety:** Increased traffic from high-density housing and frequent activity associated with storage access raises real safety concerns for families, pedestrians, and schoolchildren in the area.
3. **Noise and Light Pollution:** Both types of development often bring increased noise and light that diminish quality of life, particularly for immediate neighbors like myself.
4. **Inadequate Community Input:** I question whether there was sufficient outreach to affected residents before this development was planned. If there was, I did not receive adequate notice or opportunity to voice my concerns, prior to submission to the Planning Commission.

I strongly urge the council to deny this appeal. It is imperative that decisions made at the city level consider the impact on existing homeowners and the long-term vision for our community. Thank you for your time and attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Steven D. Stout