

CAC Meeting #4 Initial Zoning Code Recommendations

| DIFFERENCES | OVERALL RECOMMENDATION | ADDITIONAL ZONING CONSIDERATIONS | OTHER CAC INPUT | COMMITTEE MEMBER NOTES |
|--|--|--|---|------------------------|
| 1. Land Use Allocation - Housing | The Moraga Center Specific Plan (MCSP) allows for residential uses at specifically designated densities in Areas 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 13, 14, 15, 16, and 17. The Zoning Code should be consistent with the MCSP. | Consider stipulating required public amenities that must be included in the housing development. | - Important to provide housing affordable to teachers, police, firefighters, and other public service providers. - Increase the distance between residential units as building height increases. | |
| 2. Land Use Allocation - Retail | The MCSP allows retail uses and office space as part of mixed-use development in Areas 1, 2, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11. The Zoning Code should be consistent with the MCSP. | | - Concern that there is not enough demand for the permitted amount of retail development. - Ensure that Town design regulations will result in high quality design. - Retail should be concentrated along School Street, including allowances for public gathering places and amenities. | |
| 3. Land Use Allocation – Congregate Care | The MCSP allows for congregate care in areas designed for residential densities at 12-20 du/ac, mixed office/residential use, and planned development, located in Areas 5, 7, 13, 14, and 17. The Zoning Code should be consistent with the MCSP. | CAC did not believe Area 7 is an appropriate place for congregate care. | - Design review should thoughtfully plan building siting and parking to reduce the impact to the nearby residences. -Most CAC members believe that Area 7 (which was illustrated in one of the scenarios) is not appropriate for congregate care use, even though it is allowed in the MCSP and was illustrated in Scenario 1. However, staff and consultants believe that issues and concerns about congregate care could be addressed through design review, and that there is not a need to narrow the allowances in the adopted Specific Plan. | |
| 4. Land Use Allocation – Town Square | <p>The MCSP calls for a “Town Square focal point” with a fountain or other prominent visual element. It does not require one, but specifies that it should be located at the intersection of School Street and the new roadway that crosses Laguna Creek.</p> <p>Although not required by the MCSP, the Zoning Code should require a Town Square along School Street and/or inside of the existing Moraga Shopping Center.</p> | -Exact location and amenities should be flexible, to be determined through developer proposal and design review. | -Some people felt there should be flexibility in the Town Square location. -Consider including a threshold of development that would “trigger” construction of the Town Square. | |
| 5. Upper Story Stepbacks | Require 8 foot stepbacks on the second and third stories along scenic corridors (i.e. Moraga Way, Moraga Road, and Canyon Road). Require stepbacks of 2 to 3 feet along School Street. | -Consider requiring stepbacks in high density residential areas (Areas 5 and 14). -It may be possible that stepbacks not be included on 100 percent of the building frontage, subject to approval during the design review process. | -CAC members opined that stepbacks would help break-up massing and prevent a “wall-like” feeling along the road. | |
| 6. Creek Corridor/Public Access | The MCSP does not require a trail along Laguna Creek. The Zoning Code should allow for a pedestrian trail along either or both creek banks but not make the trail a requirement. | Consider requiring the pedestrian trail as a condition of approval if the developer applies for a conditional use permit. | -Most groups felt the pedestrian trail should be a requirement and would provide important connections to Moraga Commons and School Street. -Some CAC members stated that there should be incentives provided for construction of the pedestrian trail. | |
| 7. Creek Bridge | The MCSP calls for a vehicular and pedestrian roadway connection to cross Laguna Creek to connect the residential area to the future Town Center. The Zoning Code should be consistent with the MCSP. | -Consider adding regulations to ensure bridge comfortably accommodates pedestrian, bicycle, and vehicular uses. -Consider specifying what level of development would trigger the construction of the bridge. | -Some CAC members supported a pedestrian/bicycle only bridge and no vehicular bridge. | |
| 8. Scenic Corridor Setbacks | Require a 40 foot building setback along scenic corridors (i.e. Moraga Way, Moraga Road, and Canyon Road). The 40 foot setback would be primarily, if not entirely, for landscaping. | | - Consider linking building setbacks to building heights, requiring larger setbacks for taller buildings. - Consider varying the setback requirement to create visual relief. - Requiring large setbacks could impact the development feasibility. - Consider larger setbacks on MCSP boundary near single family residential. | |
| 9. Hotel Location | Although it states a preference for a hotel in Area 1, the MCSP allows a hotel in Areas 1, 12 and 13. The Zoning Code should be consistent with the MCSP. | | - Hotel should be located along School Street. - Preference for only one hotel. | |

CAC Meeting #4 Initial Zoning Code Recommendations

| | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|--|
| 10. Development Potential | The MCSP allows for 510 market rate units, or 630 units with density bonuses required by State law for affordable housing projects. The Zoning Code should be consistent with the MCSP. | The Zoning Code will limit residential development to 510 units. However, the number of residential units could increase to 630 units if the developer provides affordable housing that meets the California State Density Bonus Law. | |
| 11. Historic Preservation | The MCSP calls for the preservation of “historic architecture to the extent possible at the Moraga Ranch and incorporate it into the overall design of the area.” The Zoning Code should be consistent with the MCSP and encourage the preservation of historic structures, but not require any specific buildings be preserved. | | -There was diverging opinions about the value of the historic architecture in the MSCP area. Some CAC members felt the buildings did not hold historic value, while others felt it important to preserve Moraga Ranch, the Barn, and Cub Scout Shack to the extent possible. |
| 12. School Street | The MCSP calls for the extension of School Street to Moraga Road. The Zoning Code should be consistent with the MCSP. | The Zoning Code could add specificity about the timing and funding of the School Street construction. | - Consider requiring a roundabout at the intersection of School Street and Moraga Road. |
| 13. Sidewalk Width | The MCSP does not specify a required sidewalk width. The Zoning Code should establish standard street sections, including sidewalk widths, for key streets in the planning area. Minimum sidewalk widths in commercial and mixed-use areas should be 8 feet, not including bicycle facilities. | Although not discussed by the CAC, the Zoning Code should specify minimum widths for sidewalks in residential areas. | - One group felt that bicyclists and pedestrians cannot use the same path. - Many CAC members desired wide sidewalks, some specifying a minimum of 8 feet for all sidewalks and a minimum of 15 feet for the Lafayette/Moraga Regional Trail. - One group requested major streets include uniform sidewalk widths. |
| 14. Building Height | The MCSP allows mixed retail-residential (Areas 2 and 8) and mixed office-residential (Areas 13 and 17) buildings to be up to 45 feet tall. All other uses have a maximum building height of 35 feet. The Zoning Code should be consistent with the MCSP. | Generally favor allowances for higher building heights within the Core area along and near School Street, with standard residential densities in the hillside areas. | - Require taller buildings be sited behind single story buildings. - Only allow single-story buildings along scenic corridors. - Concern that restricting building height could impact the ability to provide affordable housing. |
| 15. Creek Setback | The Zoning Code should follow County Zoning Code requirements that call for a 30 to 50 foot setback depending on the depth of the creek channel plus any areas where significant riparian vegetation exists. | | |
| 16. Lafayette/Moraga Regional Trail | The MCSP calls for the Lafayette/Moraga Regional Trail to run along the School Street extension to Moraga Road. The Zoning Code should be consistent with the MCSP. | The Zoning Code could specify that the Lafayette/Moraga Regional Trail be located on the north side of School Street (adjacent to Moraga Ranch). | - All groups supported including the Lafayette/Moraga Regional Trail along School Street. |
| 17. Topography | <p>The Zoning Code should align with General Plan policy that prohibits grading on slopes with a predevelopment average of 25 percent or more, unless Town Council provides for an exception. In accordance with the MCSP, the Zoning Code should also specify that accessory dwelling units are not allowed on slopes 20 percent or greater.</p> <p>The Zoning Code should also require preservation of the hillside slope of the orchard that faces Moraga Way, as shown in Scenario 1.</p> | | <p>- Most groups preferred higher density at the lowest elevations and low densities at the higher elevations.</p> <p>- Some CAC members requested the berms at the top of hillsides be preserved as open space or be limited to single-story buildings.</p> |
| OTHER: | | | |