

**Pierce Macdonald**

---

**From:** Deborah Leland <redacted>  
**Sent:** Monday, January 08, 2024 5:09 PM  
**To:** City Council; planningcommission@piedmont.ca.gov; Rosanna Bayon Moore; Kevin Jackson; Daniel Gonzales  
**Subject:** Comments on the Transportation Element

[EXTERNAL] This email originated from an **external source**. Please use judgment and caution when opening attachments, clicking links, or responding.

Dear Planning Commissioners, City Council members, and City staff,

In reviewing the proposed changes to the Transportation Element in advance of the Planning Commission Study Session this evening, I would like to call two items to your attention:

1. Figure 4.2 of the Transportation Element shows Maxwellton Road in orange, indicating a road width of 20' - 25'. However, I believe Maxwellton Road should be depicted in red, indicating a road width of less than 20', per the description of Maxwellton Rd as 12' - 16' wide in the sidebar entitled "Narrow Streets" on the page following Figure 4.2.
2. Figure 4.4 and Table 4.4 omit Spring Path (from Moraga Ave just above Red Rock Rd to Abbott Way) from the City's inventory of pedestrian paths.

Thank you for your attention to these items, and I hope there is opportunity to make the necessary corrections before adopting the amended Transportation Element.

Thank you,  
Deborah Leland

**Pierce Macdonald**

---

**From:** Emily Nakashima <redacted>  
**Sent:** Sunday, January 14, 2024 7:56 PM  
**To:** Pierce Macdonald  
**Cc:** office@plymouthoakland.org; Susan Ode  
**Subject:** Re: Piedmont Planning Commission Public Hearing

[EXTERNAL] This email originated from an **external source**. Please use judgment and caution when opening attachments, clicking links, or responding.

Hi Pierce,

Thank you so much for letting us know. We are glad to see the reduced parking requirements for affordable housing and the additional permitted uses in Zone A being considered!

Since we last spoke, I've started attending the Planning Commission meetings remotely and following along with the planning & building and fair housing email lists, and I really appreciate all that you, Kevin, and the Piedmont planning staff do to make planning news and Planning Commission proceedings easily accessible to the public. Thank you!

-Emily

Emily Nakashima  
Chair of Planning & Development  
Plymouth UCC, the Jazz & Justice Church

On Fri, Jan 12, 2024 at 12:20 PM Pierce Macdonald <[pmacdonald@piedmont.ca.gov](mailto:pmacdonald@piedmont.ca.gov)> wrote:

Dear Reverend Matthews, Susan Ode, and Emily Nakashima,

Happy new year! The purpose of this email is to provide public notice to community members who participated in the preparation of the Piedmont 2023-2031 Housing Element.

The attached notice describes the Planning Commission public hearing scheduled for January 29, 2024 in the City Council Chambers at Piedmont City Hall. The Planning Commission will consider a recommendation to approve the Housing Element Implementation Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and amendments to the General Plan and City Code.

If you have any questions, Director Kevin Jackson and I would be happy to meet with you to discuss.

Thank you,



**Pierce Macdonald**

**Senior Planner**

**City of Piedmont**

**120 Vista Avenue, Piedmont, CA 94611**

**[pmacdonald@piedmont.ca.gov](mailto:pmacdonald@piedmont.ca.gov) | (510) 420 - 3063**

Effective February 28, 2022, the Piedmont Planning & Building and Public Works Departments will be open for counter service, including unscheduled inquiries via walk-in, telephone and email, during the following hours:

- Monday through Thursday: 8:30 a.m. to 5 p.m. (open including the lunch hour)
- Friday: Closed to members of the public.

Receive Planning & Building Department news emails by subscribing at:

<https://lp.constantcontactpages.com/su/rMGm1oM/PiedmontPlanBuild>



**Pierce Macdonald**

---

**From:** Marjorie Blackwell  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 03, 2024 2:47 PM  
**To:** Pierce Macdonald  
**Subject:** Re: Moraga Ave. traffic reports

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

[EXTERNAL] This email originated from an **external source**. Please use judgment and caution when opening attachments, clicking links, or responding.

Yes, definitely! Thank you for asking.

-Marj

On Jan 3, 2024, at 9:44 AM, Pierce Macdonald <[pmacdonald@piedmont.ca.gov](mailto:pmacdonald@piedmont.ca.gov)> wrote:

Hello Marj Blackwell,

Would you like these materials to be distributed to the Planning Commission?

Sincerely,

Pierce Macdonald  
Senior Planner  
(510) 420-3063

Effective February 28, 2022, the Piedmont Planning & Building and Public Works Departments will be open for counter service, including unscheduled inquiries via walk-in, telephone and email, during the following hours:

- Monday through Thursday: 8:30 a.m. to 5 p.m. (open including the lunch hour)
- Friday: Closed to members of the public.

Receive Planning & Building Department news emails by subscribing at:

<https://lp.constantcontactpages.com/su/rMGm1oM/PiedmontPlanBuild>

---

**From:** Marjorie Blackwell  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 02, 2024 12:02 PM

Attachment H

**To:** Kevin Jackson <[kjackson@piedmont.ca.gov](mailto:kjackson@piedmont.ca.gov)>; Pierce Macdonald <[pmacdonald@piedmont.ca.gov](mailto:pmacdonald@piedmont.ca.gov)>

**Subject:** Moraga Ave. traffic reports

**[EXTERNAL]** This email originated from an **external source**. Please use judgment and caution when opening attachments, clicking links, or responding.

Hello Kevin & Pierce,

Attached are copies of 2 traffic reports from past and proposed Moraga Ave. developments:

1. 1985 LSA report regarding development of Coaches Field
2. 2010 Emmett Creason report regarding the proposed sports field in Blair Park.

I would appreciate your assurance that both of these reports have been — or will be— provided to the consultants preparing the Moraga Ave. Specific Plan.

As you can see, these reports — from 38 years and 13 years ago — both reference high volume traffic on Moraga Ave. and the danger to pedestrians trying to cross the road. Since then, Moraga Ave. traffic, if anything, has increased in volume and speed. In my and many others' opinions, this is a primary issue that must be addressed before any development can occur in Moraga Canyon.

Thank you for your consideration, and I look forward to your response..

Regards,  
Marj Blackwell

EMMETT CREASON Traffic Engineering Technical Services  
P.O. Box 1386 Novato CA 94948 (415) 892-3918

---

---

→ June 30, 2010

Randolph Wedding  
911 Moraga Avenue  
Piedmont, CA 94611-3443

Thank you for inviting me to review and briefly comment on the LSA Traffic Impact Analysis for the Moraga Canyon Sports Fields. Please remember that this report constitutes a only a cursory review of the document you provided and that there may be other significant traffic issues for the project which are not included in my review.

#### SIGHT DISTANCE

As the report mentions, there will be a significant lack of sight distance for the current driveway placement. There is no mention of "safe stopping distance" for the existing speeds for the worst case scenario, this should be determined in the report. Any sight distance analysis should include potential pedestrians preparing to enter the roadway.

The report describes a mitigation measure, TRAFF-2A, for inadequate sight distance, "The City shall provide additional enforcement of the speed limit using enforcement methods... to reduce the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speed to below 35 MPH". While admirable in intent, this possible mitigation does not state the level to which speeds are to be reduced (important to know this to see if the sight distance provided is adequate). Traffic enforcement alone would require a large full time commitment from the agency responsible for enforcing traffic laws and would have to continue into the future. I should mention that if the intent is to use radar speed enforcement to reduce existing prevailing speeds, the enforcement effort would be limited, if not excluded, by section 40801 (speed trap) of the California Vehicle Code. Lacking radar enforcement or extensive "traffic calming" improvements instituted with the project to physically reduce speed on Moraga Avenue, it is unlikely that speeds will be successfully reduced without additional measures.

#### GAP ANALYSIS

While the report notes that there are many 7.5 second gaps in existing traffic flow, it does not address the duration of the gaps which will be present during the times when peak flow into and out of the new driveways be occurring. The presence of right and left turns to and from the driveways and particularly pedestrians crossing the roadway at or near the driveways would certainly negatively impact the availability of available gaps and 7.5 second gaps may not be sufficient for pedestrian crossings or for vehicular traffic exiting the proposed new driveway locations. The report indicates LOS E & F for vehicles exiting the proposed driveways. This raises some concerns as motorists not easily able to enter the traffic flow on Moraga Avenue in a timely manner may well result in some

drivers making bad decisions on what constitutes a safe gap in traffic (i.e. forcing their way into traffic) which over time will have the potential for an increase in traffic collisions or near collisions. LOS E & F at a recreation site are typically considered inadequate particularly when there may well be additional pedestrians and / or bicyclists present in close proximity.

#### PEDESTRIAN BRIDGE

There are certainly financial and operational concerns with the pedestrian bridge concept. For example the bridge may be a substantial percentage of the project cost and there is every possibility that some users of the Sport Fields may still choose to cross Moraga Avenue at grade. The report lists the installation of an "illuminated crosswalk with an activated pedestrian signal" as an alternate to the pedestrian bridge. Normally I would recommend against any "mid-block" pedestrian crosswalks but a "full pedestrian traffic signal" should take care of pedestrian safety. However if the cost of a traffic signal is to be included in the project, I would recommend that the geometry of the project driveways be revised to create a four legged intersection (driveways on either side of Moraga Avenue directly opposite each other) where the traffic signal can handle both the vehicular and pedestrian traffic generated by the project.

The wording of this section of the LSA report may need some clarification, if the crosswalk proposed by the project is in fact only flashing lights in the pavement and possibly some flashing yellow lights with some signing then what is proposed is not a pedestrian signal. If this is the case, I would recommend against the installation. The "activated pedestrian" language may only mean that the pedestrians will activate the flashing yellow lights. If this is the case then "more than adequate" sight distance is a must and the possibility of the flashing yellow lights causing a false sense of security to the pedestrians could result in very unsafe conditions and increased collision rates.

#### PEAK and OFF-PEAK HOUR LINK ANALYSIS

While the project may not reduce LOS on Moraga Avenue to an unacceptable level, the additional driveways and all forms of traffic associated with them will have a slightly negative impact on LOS.

#### SIGNAL WARRANT ANALYSIS

I will not comment on the off site signal analysis. However the lack of discussion of the "illuminated crosswalk with an activated pedestrian signal" at the project site further concerns me that the proposed "pedestrian signal" mentioned in the Pedestrian Bridge section of the report is not a traffic signal at all but instead is really a simple mid-block crosswalk with some sort of enhancement. I find the language present in the report unclear (perhaps misleading?) and would like to see further details before finalizing any action on the Traffic Impact Analysis.

#### PARKING

It appears that the report identifies a short fall in parking which will be addressed on only one side of Moraga Avenue. This raises the possibility that this solution will result in additional pedestrians crossing Moraga Avenue. All of the concerns for the pedestrian

and vehicular safety will be exacerbated by not being able to supply the parking at the site where it is needed.

#### ACCIDENT DATA

Existing area collision history does not appear to be a severe problem. However the report's conclusion that the project will not increase the "accident" rate and that most of the collision history in the area involves "driver behavior" seems to not address the facts raised in the report. I believe it is reasonable to expect that if driver behavior in the area is the cause for most of the "accidents" then the new Sports Fields facility with increased traffic including vehicles, bicycles and pedestrian will present additional traffic conflicts which will certainly increase the potential for incidents. Even if the new users of the sports facility have excellent "driver behavior" there is still a demonstrated possibility of increased collisions related to the new facility.

#### General notes on the remainder of the Traffic Impact Analysis

Sidewalks – The report indicates the lack of sidewalks in the area. Even if Piedmont does not have a policy designed to increase walking and bicycling, a recreational project of this type should at least provide sidewalk access to the immediately adjacent neighborhoods. Also bicycle lanes or paths should be considered.

LOS concerns – While it appears that the surface streets will not have significant reductions in LOS, there should still be consideration given to left turn storage lanes for the driveways to the facility. If at all possible the driveways for the project should be located opposite from each other instead of offset for safety as well as future LOS considerations.

Sight Distance - This is the single most critical issue associated with this project in my opinion. Given the nature of the facility, generous, i.e. greater than the minimum, sight distance should be provided. This is because of the mix of parents / children which the facility will attract combined with the existing area motorists (a portion of which the report identifies as having "driver behavior" problems) would clearly benefit from extra sight distance. Unfortunately, the analysis concludes that sight distance provided is more than 100 feet below recommended minimums. As this is a new facility, now is the time to address the sight distance issues fully, including more efficient roadway design and maintenance in perpetuity for such things as plant trimming. I see this as the biggest potential issue which could result in incidents and due to the wording of the report may well result in increased liability for the City of Piedmont.

Parameters – I noted some measurements (such as 4 ft. per second pedestrian speed and 3.5 / 4.25 object heights) which, while not in violation of standard practices, don't incorporate a margin of safety and may present problems, particularly when combined with less than adequate sight distance or drivers with "driver behavior" issues. It seems to me that at the very least, a neighborhood park/recreation facility deserves to be designed with generous parameters used where safety is concerned.



Overall I feel that as proposed this project has some very important issues which appear to be not addressed adequately in regards to safety issues. I would recommend additional design work or at least effective mitigation of the problems raised in the LSA document.

Thanks for allowing me to discuss this with you,

**Emmett Creason, Principal Technician**



---

**ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY  
HAMPTON/LA SALLE SPORTS FIELD  
INITIAL STUDY**

**CITY OF PIEDMONT**

**NOVEMBER 1985**

**PREPARED BY  
Larry Seeman Associates, Inc.  
2606 Eighth Street  
Berkeley, CA 94710  
(415) 841-6840**

Left turn INTO site from Moraga Avenue	LOS "A"
Left turn OUT of site onto Moraga Avenue	LOS "D"
Right turn OUT of site onto Moraga Avenue	LOS "A"

This indicates that the service levels would be excellent, except for the relatively few vehicles making the left turn out of the site at the end of events. Right-turning vehicles will be able to pass around those vehicles waiting to make their left turn onto Moraga Avenue.

Parking requirements for the Moraga Sports Field have been determined from the total number of people expected on the site and the average vehicle occupancy of those vehicles. An occupancy factor of 2.0 persons per car was used.

Parking requirements have been calculated by dividing the total number of people on the site at any given time by two. If a total of 80 attend or participate in an event (see Table 1) the parking requirement will be 40 spaces. If this many spaces cannot be provided, in no case should the number of people on site exceed twice the number of parking spaces, at least until actual experience with the parking demand vs. events is determined. Christmas tree lot parking requirements have been based upon the City's estimate of 55 trees per hour sold during the highest daytime hours. 27 parking spaces are necessary to supply the needs of the lot, assuming the average buyer spends a half hour on the lot and allowing for a 15 percent reserve.

Due to the limited sight distance, moderately heavy traffic volumes, and the average speed of vehicles (34 MPH in the downhill direction) on Moraga Avenue, DKS Associates recommends locating all parking for the Sports Field on-site. The site plan proposes an overflow lot of 20 parking spaces across the street on Moraga Avenue. This overflow parking lot would require pedestrians to cross Moraga Avenue in order to reach the Moraga Sports Field creating a potential safety hazard. Given the topography, sight lines, and grades involved, all parking should be provided adjacent to the sports field, with no overflow parking across the street.

**Mitigation Measures.** The following mitigation measures are suggested in order to minimize traffic safety impacts:

1. The current site plan should be redesigned to accommodate all parking on-site. This would require approximately 4,000 square feet of additional parking area.

**From:** [Pam Hirtzer](#)  
**To:** [Pierce Macdonald](#)  
**Subject:** Re: Homeowners on Scenic Ave losing home insurance.. wildfire  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 03, 2024 5:15:47 PM

---

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

**[EXTERNAL]** This email originated from an **external source**. Please use judgment and caution when opening attachments, clicking links, or responding.

Yes please. Thanks Pierce.

Pam

On Jan 3, 2024, at 3:02 PM, Pierce Macdonald <pmacdonald@piedmont.ca.gov> wrote:

Thank you, Pam. Would you like this information shared with the Planning Commission?

---

**From:** Pam Hirtzer  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 02, 2024 12:39 PM  
**To:** Kevin Jackson <kjackson@piedmont.ca.gov>; Pierce Macdonald <pmacdonald@piedmont.ca.gov>  
**Cc:** Marjorie Blackwell  
**Subject:** Homeowners on Scenic Ave losing home insurance.. wildfire

**[EXTERNAL]** This email originated from an **external source**. Please use judgment and caution when opening attachments, clicking links, or responding.

Hi Kevin and Pierce,

Just letting you know that my neighbors a few doors down on Scenic Ave have just had their home owners insurance dropped due to severe wildfire hazard. Like myself they live above Moraga Canyon. I happen to have State Farm insuring my house, and I know that State Farm is no longer providing new policies to home owners in California deemed to be residing in high fire risk areas. Hopefully I will remain grandfathered in. This unwillingness to insure homes at risk of wildfire in California has been announced by many other insurance companies this past year.

Please consider this information in the development of the Moraga Canyon Specific

Attachment H

Plan.

Thank you,  
Pam Hirtzer,  
Scenic Ave.

**From:** [John Cheney](#)  
**To:** [Kevin Jackson](#); [Pierce Macdonald](#)  
**Subject:** EIR Comments from John Cheney -- Moraga Canyon Plan  
**Date:** Monday, December 18, 2023 4:51:38 PM  
**Attachments:** [Piedmont\\_send EIR\\_Moraga Canyon Thought Piece 12182023.pdf](#)  
[Moraga Canyon EIR- Piedmont Res#2 Comments 121823\\_1.pdf](#)

---

[EXTERNAL] This email originated from an **external source**. Please use judgment and caution when opening attachments, clicking links, or responding.

Hi Kevin and Pierce,

Attached are two separate comments on the Moraga Canyon EIR plan.

I am open to meet anytime. Currently our groups have met with the PUSD to propose the general approach to the City.

Thanks,

John

# Pathway to Piedmont Parks & Affordable Housing Joint Development

To: Piedmont Planning EIR Comments

Date: December 18, 2023

FM: John Cheney

Re: EIR Moraga Canyon Comments: REZONING PIEMONT  
RESERVOIR #2 for Housing, Parks and Fields of Play

Opportunity: The existing EBMUD Reservoir #2 has been mothballed for 30 years.

The Reservoir #2 could easily support affordable housing for over two hundred (200) units for Teachers, City Employees and general affordable housing.

Piedmont residents support the fast track integration of RHNA housing goals and 3 acres public park with dual access is from an industrial driveway above from Blair Avenue and ROW to Moraga below.

## Ask:

#1 Sports and Housing groups request that the City of Piedmont lead with EBMUD by rezoning the Blair Reservoir for high density housing and open public space for parks and playing fields, ahead of permission to sell from EBMUD.

#2 That Piedmont Reservoir #2 be integrated with the Moraga Canyon plan for long term public development, linking from the top of open space to Moraga Canyon via ROW owned by EMBUD, for a long term Open Space and Housing Element integrated Master Plan.




# Location: Mothballed EBMUD's Piedmont Reservoir #2

Provides an opportunity to fast track RHNA and quality of life goals for all citizens




# Unique RHNA housing and park expansion

Connecting EBMUD's mothballed Reservoir to Piedmont's Blair Park



# Placement support for 224 units



Example 28 Units @ 150ft x 45ft award winning modular housing



Satellite map shows the Reservoir is primed for continued open space use at the top of Blair Avenue, with housing up to 200 Units below Blair with primary access from Moraga Avenue



The field use atop the location can provide easy access to water tanks if needed in the future.

# Mothballed restricted open space can become the new accessible commons...



# Integrated fields of play, parks and housing increase quality of life in Piedmont and region



# Restricted space can become common public use



With Par Course fitness stations and much more...





# Mature vegetation helps integrate housing and park to the existing neighborhood




# Explore the possibility of the new affordable Teachers Housing and Commons



# A new Piedmont Master Plan can help guide our community's search for quality.





# EIR Moraga Canyon Educator Housing and Strategic Options for Piedmont PUSD

Moraga Canyon  
Educator Housing

**Q4 2023**

# Current Conditions Impacting PUSD Educator Housing in Piedmont

Current market conditions are placing downward pressure on school quality and PUSD financial resources

Market Condition	Explanation
<b>Accelerating Unaffordable Housing</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <i>Increasing housing costs = teacher turnover, uncompetitive offers with fewer strategic solutions for PUSD</i></li></ul>
<b>Competing Districts are Creating Solutions</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <i>Top Tier School Districts are building educator housing &amp; growing = more competitive offerings than PUSD</i></li><li>• <i>PUSD's shrinking student body = systemic risk</i></li></ul>
<b>Fewer PUSD Options Drive New Playbook</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <i>Traditional tools used by PUSD are at their limit. Several market conditions have combined to force strategic change at PUSD or face long term deterioration</i></li></ul>

# One Time Strategic Opportunity to Transform Piedmont

The City of Piedmont, Tax Payers and PUSD are aligned in fundamental community goals

Market Condition	Explanation
<b>Assembly Bill 2295 is Law in 2024</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <i>AB 2295 establishes the right of districts to build housing up to 3 stories on School property under local review but exempt from State Architect rules.</i></li></ul>
<b>The City is Allowed to Trade or Sell Land to PUSD</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <i>Affordable housing built by PUSD for educators qualifies for RHNA requirements</i></li><li>• <i>PUSD can drive lower housing costs, design, earmark housing for educators, work with Public-private partnerships</i></li></ul>
<b>New Options Drive New Playbook</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <i>PUSD can act without risking credit ratings or financial damage to the City or PUSD</i></li><li>• <i>PUSD can move faster than the City or private developers</i></li></ul>

# Opportunity: Educator Housing as a Core Strategy for Piedmont

Current Piedmont and PUSD can housing to transform Piedmont and community culture

<b>Market Condition</b>	<b>Explanation</b>
<b>Piedmont sell/trades land to PUSD</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li><i>PUSD can buy or trade land &amp; build housing matching City's plans in Moraga Canyon. PUSD (&amp; City) can control design esthetics, public commons using PUSD's exempt status to speed building time to market.</i></li></ul>
<b>Public-private partnership</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li><i>PPPs allow PUSD to stay in control. Funding and risk management drives affordable housing quality while reducing headwinds of rising interest rates and educator's affordable housing costs.</i></li></ul>
<b>Risk Mitigation &amp; Public Values</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li><i>PUSD/PPP housing can retain educators, first responders and civic employees to live and work In Piedmont, making a positive impact on community culture, the public commons of parks, playing fields and open space.</i></li></ul>

# Opportunity: The Real Value of Public-private partnerships

Current PUSD can capitalize on risk-management capabilities of the private sector

Market Condition	Explanation
<b>Public-private partnerships (PPPs)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <i>PPPs can boost the efficiency and effectiveness of projects from development to end of operation.</i></li><li>• <i>PPPs should not be seen as magic instruments for public sector financing gaps</i></li></ul>
<b>Public-private partnerships</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <i>PPPs can spread financing costs over a more extended period and thus free up public funds where private sector cannot (e.g. PUSD operating budget shortfalls).</i></li></ul>
<b>Risk Mitigation &amp; Public Values</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <i>Transferring specific risks of a project from PUSD to PPPs - including development, construction, operation to private sector investors (and lenders) - leverages risk-management capabilities of the private sector and markets</i></li></ul>



## Contact

**John Cheney**

415-425-7180

Johnacheney@gmail.co

m





# MEMO

To: MCSP Team  
From: Civic Edge Consulting  
Date: November 2023  
RE: Moraga Canyon Specific Plan Community Workshop Report



## Community Workshop Overview

- Date: Thursday, November 30, 2023, 7:00-9:00 PM
- Location: Piedmont Veterans Memorial Building
- Meeting Purpose: Provide information about the Moraga Canyon Specific Plan to community members. Receive feedback from community members on the pros and cons of the presented alternatives, as well as overall improvement concepts (mobility, recreation/civic events, public works, and housing).

## Meeting Summary

The Moraga Canyon Specific Plan Community Workshop was the first time that the public was able to learn about and comment on potential land use alternatives for housing, Public Works corporation yard facilities, recreation facilities, mobility improvements, parking, and other amenities. Approximately 82 people attended the meeting, not including City staff and consultants.

## Feedback summary

Attendees left approximately 190 written comments on the exhibit boards, detailing their suggested additions to the existing conditions report and feedback on various alternatives for land use. Attendees were encouraged to comment on the specific features of each alternative, giving the project team and eventually the City Council insight into which features might be pulled from each alternative - and what could be left behind - to create a preferred option.

## **Key themes:**

- Attendees were broadly supportive of creating housing in Moraga Canyon. Comments expressed a strong concern that market-rate and affordable housing be combined in a meaningful way and questioned if there were other locations being considered for the two single-family home sites.
- Traffic and pedestrian and cyclist safety were key concerns for many attendees. Comments reiterated over and over the need for better pedestrian and cyclist access in Moraga Canyon. Similarly, a large number of attendees cited the need for traffic calming and congestion smoothing measures along Moraga Avenue. The addition of hiking trails received a lot of positive feedback, particularly if the trails could connect Maxwellton Road, Echo Lane, and/or Abbot Way to the Coaches Field area.
- Preserving both the recreation spaces, particularly Coaches Field, and the open space in Blair Park were priorities for many attendees. Option 4, which places all the housing and amenities on the North side of Moraga Avenue and leaves Blair Park undeveloped, received the most comments, with many people praising the preservation of open space in the canyon. Some

comments questioned the financial viability and impact of building a pedestal structure for the playfield.

### Meeting Structure

The MCSP Community Workshop began with a presentation about the project work thus far, including:

- Project background
- Existing conditions
- Community outreach and feedback
- Site improvements
- Plan element options and alternatives
- Feasibility and fiscal study

The purpose of the presentation was to provide attendees with background and context to orient them to the project and the options being presented for feedback.

Following the presentation, attendees were invited to engage in conversations with staff and consulting team representatives who were placed at stations around the room with exhibit boards showing key elements of the Moraga Canyon Specific Plan study. The intention of this open house or gallery walk format was to allow people with differing levels of knowledge about the Moraga Canyon Specific Plan to have meaningful conversations with staff and team representatives at the level of detail that best met their needs. This worked very well to meet the needs of most attendees. Those with a strong interest in project details could discuss them with staff, while those more interested in the big picture simultaneously had conversations with other staff members and representatives. There was concern expressed by a few attendees that would have preferred a public meeting format where all attendees would hear all of the questions asked and a few asked for the open house to be live-streamed and recorded. Overall, the November 30, 2023, Community Workshop resulted in many positive comments, including constructive feedback, and very little negative feedback about the Workshop event. As shown in the attached photographs of the feedback on the exhibit boards and comments listed below, Workshop attendees were thinking very constructively about how to configure the elements of the Moraga Canyon Specific Plan to address community members' goals.

### Photos

- [Photos of Feedback Boards](#)
- [Photos of Community Workshop](#)

### Station Feedback Notes

Existing Conditions:

- It's very close to Oakland and will affect its residents. They need to be included.
- Moraga Rd is a main thoroughfare. Already carries a lot of traffic.
- Concern about building on Corp Yard. Specifically, the environmental soil contamination (plus expense of moving Corp Yard?)
- Please no single-family homes on Maxwellton - unfair impact on those that live there
- Please no use of fire road as access road - our home borders it

### **Recreation/Civic Events are important to you?**

- Even though field over parking is very space efficient, that type of structure seems very urban and out of place in this location
- Can recreation space be more used to satisfy the population
- I'm concerned about the expense of the field on top of structured parking
- Thanks for all the work that went into these 4 options
- Native landscaping for native plants & pollinators

### **What Public Works Improvements are important to you?**

- If it will be near housing, I would like to see nicer public works buildings
- Can solar panels be placed if the project is on the north side of Moraga
- I think there is a way of placing the Corp Yard on Blair Park that could be very nice. Thanks for the examples here!

### **What Housing features are important to you?**

- This is much needed housing. Thank you for planning so thoughtfully
- Integrate, don't segregate. It is better socially for all. Would really prefer one mixed income development - don't separate "Affordable"
- Be nicer for all if Corp Yard is not next to Housing except option 4 where it is integrated + improved
- Would love to see more than 132 homes
- Please phase the housing separately from public infrastructure so that phases can be independent
- I don't care as much about the style. Any style can be well designed
- Style is not important - good design is
- Spanish style seems to blend with existing aesthetic
- Other location ideas for single family homes
- Hillside Modern
- Ensuring the aesthetic of the housing matches the quality and standards of the rest of Piedmont
- Making sure low-income housing is not sub-standard
- Mix of housing affordability, high level of design aesthetics in all levels of housing
- I hope affordable housing is feasible. I hope you consider adding more density + reducing parking

### **What are your concerns regarding project feasibility or fiscal impact?**

- That the estimated costs are realistic + include projections for cost increases over time. City has history of underestimating project costs
- Separate phases - Please don't make housing reliant on public infrastructure
- Option1 seems the most affordable and safest
- I want to make sure that the housing can actually get built
- Option 1 is not financially feasible
- We need more ideas on single family house locations
- I hope the affordable housing is feasible I hope you consider adding more density + reduce parking
- Is there any way to get even more housing and some personal outdoor space for residents
- Option #3. The Corp Yard needs to be on the South Side. There's no feasible way to get pedestrians to the south side. The housing should be on the north side

### What features of Option 1 are important to you?

- I like the simplicity of the option 1
- Placing housing close to street probably declares attractiveness to buyers/renters
- Pedestrian access please!!
- Option 1 is best because it's the easiest to access to Moraga, least disruption to current infrastructure and natural open space
- Is there a way to have a single access/egress from the housing and circulation off of Moraga
- New affordable housing. I like seeing the new housing on the north side of Moraga and am very concerned about safe, multimodal access
- I like that the hills around the Coaches fields are not compromised. It seems safer. also, it seems like the most affordable
- This will bring a lot of extra traffic on a two lane road
- Traffic coming out of Maxwelton into Moraga - it will be very difficult to leave
- Preserves coaches yard minimal uses of underutilized Blair Dog/Park
- Access to sun/lighting for new units will be terrible in this option
- This is obscene
- I think this is the best use of space. There is completely unused space in Moraga that can be utilized
- Love this option. Minimal disruption, cost effective, preserves space
- These buildings are huge
- I worry about the implication on wildlife. This option seems to leave more open space for deer, turkeys, and coyotes
- Consider marking a senior community at market-rate. People might be willing to sell their homes and bring in more open space to the program
- Market units should maximize the land value on uphill + affordable should be on Blair Park to minimize cost
- The housing is in the least desirable location. Did you do sun/shade studies?
- What about an option that splits the units. ½ in the North and ½ in the South of Moraga

### What features of Option 1 are NOT important to you?

- In all plans the single-family homes are in same location - what about placing them on Blair Park
- Minimal disturbance to Coaches field area is a positive
- Loss of open space w/units south of Moraga. But the best to develop space on the level lot
- Dislike the 14 buildings right along Moraga. Better on the other side. Keep Blair Park
- I like the idea of keeping the larger lot
- It feels suboptimal to have 132 households right off/basically on top of one of the busiest fields in Piedmont
- Preserving location of Corp Yard
- These units on Moraga would eliminate a highly used open space and create an eyesore
- Isn't 1 a lower cost to develop a plan than the others?
- The skatepark is too unused and removed from its current location - we should move it
- Destroys precious open space
- Housing in Moraga feels cramped. Too close to traffic
- Very inefficient to waste space above ground for Corp Yard. Bury it and leave space open for future development
- The idea of two market-rate places on the north is offensive
- Best plan in terms of cost effectiveness, maintaining current sports field+ Corp Yard. Likely to be more cost effective, attractive to developers

### **What features of Option 2 are important to you?**

- What would be the minimum height of the structures
- Thanks for keeping and enhancing the sports fields as part of the project
- Massive wall necessitated by location is a huge negative impact
- Impact of building on a slope. What don't homes to side of and above slope
- Mixing housing + Cory yard use seems like bad combination
- Getting out of Maxwellton will be tricky
- I like that the housing is in a more private space with views
- How will Moraga Avenue be widened for traffic?
- No new road connecting to Maxwellton!
- How will people get to work, schools, and shops?
- Ugly to put housing on top of a parking structure
- I like the two single-family housing units. I wish they were affordable
- It'll block view on Abbott Way
- Erosion? Due to existing loss of vegetation on the slope.
- Noise studies needed. Significant impact on home on/above slopes
- This is the best housing option. The soccer field was rejected in this location 7 years ago

### **What features of Option 2 are NOT important to you?**

- Preserving the location of the Corp Yard
- Keeping the Corp Yard above ground is a shameful waste of open space. Better if the space is saved for future development
- The ball field is not a good fit south of Moraga
- Spectators will hate watching games here. Not enough room on the sidelines
- Soccer field next to busy road can be unsafe for the kids
- I like that new road because it helps reduce Red Rock traffic congestion
- How will the market rate and affordable folks interact
- Don't like cut into hill for soccer field
- I don't think we need a skate park. This trend has really died down
- Sports field on Blair Park is not safe for kids crossing Moraga
- Single family homes block fire road access
- The Blair Park may not be wide enough for the U14 soccer field. Please don't cut into the hillside to widen the flare area for safety reasons.
- This layout separates new residents from the field - introduces tons of risk for kids crossing the road to use it

### **What features of Option 3 are important to you?**

- Option 3 is the best for parking structure + great set back and light for units
- Public works will be an eyesore coming down from Moraga
- The housing units shouldn't be so close to the soccer/basketball field. It will be too loud for the new residents
- There should be noise studies to see how it will affect our neighbors on the slopes
- Concern about how the homes on the slope can be supported
- I like Corp Yard moving across to Blair - easier access
- Is having the soccer field so close to housing be a deterrent to filling housing?
- The housing units shouldn't be so close to the soccer/basketball fields. It will be too loud for the new residents
- Keeping Corp Yard separate is a huge plus for new residents
- I like that housing and recreation are together here. Creating a small neighborhood feeling

- Thanks for keeping and enhancing the sports fields
- The oak/forest is more protected on this scheme
- All pedestrian uses on one side of Moraga are great. We wouldn't need a sidewalk on the south side
- Erosion from loss of vegetation on slope
- The stop or lighted intersection allow people to walk across the street

**What features of Option 3 are NOT important to you?**

- Not a fan of Corp lot south of Moraga
- Why would we want to move the corp yard, which is an eye sore, to such a visible spot?!?!
- I like the use of Blair Park the least in this plan
- Plan 3 seems to make the best use of the space compared to Plans 1 +2
- Building on Blair Park sets a bad precedent! Parkland is open space
- Please no single-family home blocking fire road access
- The 4-story housing units seems too close to the field

**What features of Option 4 are important to you?**

- Safe multifunctional access for current and future residents
- Housing additions + affordability
- Where will Moraga traffic go? How do we protect our kids crossing the street
- This plan makes best use of the available space with the least disruption to space in Blair Park
- Can the Blair Park portion be made more attractive to users than just a dog park which we already have?
- All new traffic can be controlled by the new signals
- If this is the most expensive option, it could impact whether funds run out before project finishes
- I like preserving + improving Blair Park
- Smallest scale functions of corp yard lend themselves to discussion in Blair Park site
- Good plan to elevate spot field + create covered parking
- There should be no new road that connects to Maxwellton. It will create too much traffic!
- This plan seems to be the best all round but I'd like to make Blair Park nicer for everyone. Not just dog walkers
- Concern! Why are there two single family home sites added back? These were eliminated
- Loss of vegetation - erosion
- This configuration can maximize use of public transport since all residents and visitors would get on/off at a single nearby stop
- Blair Park is needed for the dogs. Otherwise they will crap on the kids' ball field! (I am not a dog owner)
- Most important to me is affordable & market value homes be completely integrated and mixed. These efforts to build community ongoing diverse groups
- I love all these options! Very creative. I like the housing set back
- I like the double use of the sports field
- Noise studies needed
- Placing the Corp Yard underneath is brilliant idea - very efficient use of space
- This option maintains the green space beauty of canyon
- What is the cost of undergrounding the parking
- This plan makes best use of available space with least disruption to open space in Blair Park
- What is the economic cost of this compared to the rest

- Not sure why someone said the dog park isn't used. It's used constantly. I see it all day from my home office
- How will noise be for units next to the field
- Can Red Rock handle all of the traffic?
- What's the impact of the building sitting on a slope? I'm worried for the homes currently on the hills
- Option 4 sounds expensive, artificial turf vs natural grass is bad for kids, too concentrated on the north side
- This is the best car/pedestrian parking spot. Best building aesthetics for all incomes. It leaves Blair Park available for needed rec space
- Move single family homes to different neighborhoods
- Please no single-family home blocking fire road access

**What features of Option 4 are not important to you?**

- This plan serves Blair Park for future housing requirements from the state
- Keeping Blair as is not important to my mind
- All meetings must be on zoom for the elderly folks traveling. Thank you
- The opinions of seniors in their 90's should be ignored as they will be gone before this is all built
- The dog run never seems well utilized
- Be there to convert like in options 1-3
- I like ball fields over parking
- Option 4 feels like it unevenly spreads the development with it very weighted away from Blair Park. A more even-handed distribution of the improvements would be less impactful in the aggregate

**What else should the project team know about the site?**

- The hill behind the corp yard seems underutilized. Is there a way to get more housing up behind the current state park
- Duplex at upper sites
- Native oak trees on Blair Park site
- The two sides of the street on Moraga should be better connected for pedestrians safety
- Traffic on Moraga is dangerous for pedestrians currently
- Housing in Blair Park area seems most appropriate for fire safety

**Additional Questions/Comments:**

- Erosion? Due to existing loss of vegetation on the slope here
- Could the Corp Yard program be located elsewhere in the city?
- How will Moraga Avenue be widened for traffic?
- Did you do sun/shade studies?

**What Mobility features are important to you?**

- Pedestrian access to/from the west end of the plan area and vehicular access too if possible
- Sidewalk safety from traffic. We need a light at Harbord + Moraga
- Slow traffic speed on Moraga - too many speeders
- Signals create safety challenges. Add roundabouts instead
- Better designed sidewalks for higher safety for kids
- Add transit down Moraga heading directly to Bart
- Pedestrians need to feel safe walking Moraga and crossing Moraga
- Better bus service to Montclair and Bart



- Not sure a bike path can be safe on Moraga unless traffic was already slow
- Hiking/walking path trails
- Uphill biking path
- Walking paths are important!

What Road Improvements are Important to you?

- Very concerned about safety
- This road in Moraga is already unsafe
- Also, water flows rapidly here during rainstorms
- Adding signal will significantly enhance pedestrian safety
- Safe egress for everyone
- Speed bumps/ stop lights on Moraga at Maxwellton
- Consideration of traffic including ingress + egress of emergency vehicles
- Really excited about trails with views
- Stoplight at Moraga + Maxwellton
- Traffic analysis should include signal analysis that includes consultation with the City of Oakland!
- Improved vehicular safety a Maxwellton
- Signalized intersection is a critical component for any options proposed
- Bike safely coming up hill - love that you are addressing it
- Creating pedestrian access to area so new housing residents can easily get into the heart of Piedmont by foot or bike

Attachment H  
Public Correspondence

Date	Name	Moraga Canyon Specific Plan Comments
10/27/2023	Todd Sotkiewicz	If you really wanted survey input, you should have solicited all of the homeowners in Piedmont through the mail (you have all of our addresses after all; we all pay thousands of dollars in taxes to the city) rather than posting your survey availability on Piedmont Exedra. We all don't read that online newspaper regularly. This just seems to be another example of the City of Piedmont doing what they want to do rather than listening to the citizenry on this topic.
11/16/2023	Matt Derrigo	Dear Recreation Commission, First and foremost, I would like to extend my sincere gratitude for your commitment and dedication to advancing Piedmont's recreational opportunities. As a resident of Piedmont and a parent of a 10 yr old girl who actively participates in several PRD programs, I found last night's meeting both enlightening and inspiring. Your passion and engagement in these matters are commendable. On my way home, reflecting on your discussions, especially in relation to the Moraga Canyon Specific Plan (MCSP), I believe there is a crucial aspect that warrants further attention. This is the need to proportionally grow our recreational spaces in tandem with the entire densification plan of Piedmont, as defined in the Housing Element. The MCSP certainly brings new families and demands within the study area, but it is just a part of the broader mandate of densifying our entire community. The stated goal of the MCSP on the website is merely to maintain existing amenities. However, from the presentation, it appears this might actually result in a reduction of facilities, notably by downsizing the skate park to a smaller "skate spot". To my knowledge, there is currently no mandate or expectation set for growing our recreational spaces in line with this overall growth. During the meeting, it was astutely noted that new housing will lead to increased demand, which was then translated into anticipated population growth within the Moraga Canyon. While considering facility capacity for this new demand is essential, I urge the Commission to advocate for expanding our recreational areas in response to the entire Housing Element. Without such proactive planning, we risk facing challenges in providing equitable and adequate recreational facilities for our growing population. The challenges of such planning are undoubtedly complex. However, given the imminent changes and the state's overarching densification plans, our strategies must be visionary and comprehensive. I am planning to attend the community workshop on Nov 30th and will convey these sentiments there as well. If there is more I can do, I'm very willing to provide further input or assist in any way that could be beneficial -- just let me know how. Thank you once again for your dedication to our community's well being. I am confident that, with collaborative efforts, we can ensure that Piedmont not only grows but thrives, with recreational spaces that meet the needs of all residents, both present and future.
11/28/2023	Charles Alexander	Hi Kevin, Just learned about the Moraga Canyon plan and I cannot stress that the sewage infrastructure, wildfire threat, and landfill structure are not fit for group housing. Let alone increased traffic/parking for an already limited primary escape route. Be very careful with construction agencies making a buck vs. building a stronger existing infrastructure. Concerned Maxwellton Rd resident. Turning all of Moraga Canyon into a premier sports complex for Oakland and Piedmont makes sense. Forcing housing seems like an attempt at social/civil duty mixed with construction margin grift. Best, Charles Alexander (P.S.) Thank you. Full disclosure I am an Oakland resident fwiv. Just took a hard long look at the slides, I love the initiative, but I beg you guys to quadruple-check the implications of infrastructure. Especially in regard to fire hazards. One should expect if there was a fire event, it would be 2x 1991 given the velocity of winds from the past half-decade of wind storms. Also, is there any website with more information or an opportunity to join the planning/execution team? Thanks.
12/1/2023	Susan Garbarino	I'd like to make some additional comments now that I have attended the Nov 30th community meeting. I live in Upper Rockridge near the site and use Moraga Way frequently. I think it is imperative that Piedmont work with the City of Oakland regarding these plans as they will affect the surrounding neighborhoods. I didn't hear that this was happening at the meeting last night. My two main concerns are traffic and environmental safety. This is a very tight spot that already receives more traffic than it can bear. It is dark, curvy, prone to flooding, and surrounded by fuel for fires in the midst of a thickly settled area that has a history of wildfires. I was impressed by the presentation and plans last night. Most of my concerns are being considered. However, the proposed light at Red Rock (that "will be green most of the time" according to the presenter) didn't sound adequate. We need a light at the intersection of Harbord and Moraga. I realize that this is actually in Oakland, but it cuts between Piedmont and Oakland and must be considered. It is already a very dangerous intersection. I have witnessed more than one accident there. I will write to my City Councilperson to let her know this suggestion as well. Regarding which plan I would prefer and why: I strongly prefer Option three because it would change the current look and feel of the canyon the least. It provides some open space, allows for corporation yard access to Moraga, keeps Coaches field largely as it is while providing attractive housing set back from the road. It also looked like one of the least expensive options. I strongly dislike Option one as it would completely change the character of the canyon with 14 proposed 4 story buildings replacing Blair park. I think this would be unattractive, less safe and a shame to lose what little natural space Piedmont has. Thank you for reading this email and noting my concerns
12/1/2023	Adam Thacher	That was a great presentation last night. My clear favorite was I think Option 3 where the corporation yard moves across Moraga and there is no parking added under the soccer baseball field. This will make the home prices higher as the folks that will but these homes will be paying a lot and prices will be higher when they know they do not have to listen to the noise from the trucks going in and out, etc. I have a follow up question I wanted to ask the woman with dark hair who was the economics consultant who was doing the feasibility work/economic modeling etc. I did not get her card. Do you have an email for her? Thanks again for the work of you and your team. Cheers - Adam Thacher (P.S.) My question is as follows: Has she (Financing Consultant) met with or talked to experienced RE developers to see if what is being envisioned so far is economically viable from a developer's standpoint? If she has not I was going to suggest to her that there are at least 3-4 very experienced developers that live in town that she could meet with to get feedback throughout this process. I would guess that all of them care deeply about having a great end result and would be happy to meet with her informally simply as a public service. It seems like she has great experience to do the analysis but there is difference between being a consultant and having to invest in something as a business proposition as you are well aware. My wife, for one, said she would be happy to do so. And there are others who have similar experience. <a href="https://wilsonmeany.com/people/janice-thatcher/">https://wilsonmeany.com/people/janice-thatcher/</a> If the consultant wants to get her input and that of others I would suggest they would be more likely to help in informal meetings not in a public setting. I can provide an introduction if needed.
12/8/2023	Lauren Tompkins	I'm a Piedmont resident who is quite excited to see the development plans for Moraga Canyon! I would like to ask a question to see if I am interpreting the slides correctly and if so, have a followup. On slide 36: <a href="https://cdns5-hosted.civiclive.com/UserFiles/Servers/Server_13659739/File/Government/Projects/MCSP/2023-11-30-MCSP-Community-Workshop-Presentation.pdf">https://cdns5-hosted.civiclive.com/UserFiles/Servers/Server_13659739/File/Government/Projects/MCSP/2023-11-30-MCSP-Community-Workshop-Presentation.pdf</a> - Are the affordable and market rate units in separate buildings (e.g. 4 total buildings) or in the same buildings (2 total buildings)? I hope it is the later as we wouldn't want to isolate the lower income people in separate buildings. Also, is there justification somewhere of the inclusion of single family homes in the plan? Would townhomes not fit in the same space?

Attachment H

12/11/2023	Bruce Joffe	Dear Director Jackson, I attended the November 30 community workshop about the proposed Moraga Canyon housing project. You and I spoke about several issues, and you welcomed me to send you follow-up observations. I am concerned about the project's isolation, the low-income residents' separation, and the willingness of the project's managers to incorporate community feedback into the plans. The first part of the community meeting was a presentation by City staff and the project planning consultants to describe the project and its four options. Then, the assembled people were invited to speak one-on-one to various project team members at poster-board stations along the perimeter of the room. No opportunity was given for workshop attendees to question the project planners as a group. General questions about the overall nature of the project would not be answered by staff personnel who were designated to discuss specific options at individual poster-board stations. This gave me and several other people the feeling that the City isn't really interested in hearing and addressing our concerns. I am concerned about the isolation of the 132 new units planned for the Moraga area. There is no "urban fabric" connecting that location with the rest of Piedmont, except for the heavily-trafficked Moraga Ave. Walkers or bike riders would not see other Piedmont houses for over a quarter mile. Isolation may be a more severe problem for residents of the 60 subsidized units who may not have cars available for both going to work and for shopping or going to school. This problem could be mitigated if the City were to operate a shuttle bus, similar to the shuttles that Emeryville operates to and from the MacArthur BART station. A Piedmont shuttle could take residents down Moraga, along Piedmont Ave., across MacArthur to Grand Ave., up Grand to Oakland Ave., up Oakland to the City Center, and then along Highland back to Moraga. Connection to the BART station might even be included in the route. The City could operate the shuttle for the first five years, and then evaluate whether the amount of ridership justifies continuing, perhaps with support from passenger fees. This solution was mentioned when we spoke at the meeting, Mr. Jackson, so I am reminding you now and requesting that it be given serious consideration. A more serious problem is the planned separation of the below-market units from the market-rate units. This is a terrible idea that will have dangerous consequences. It would create a low-income "ghetto" in the midst of high-income housing. Low-income residents would be stigmatized whenever there was a problem like graffiti, or trash, or theft. The higher-income residents would instinctively blame any grime or crime on "those people" living in the separate, nearby buildings. Numerous studies have shown that when lower-income people are physically integrated into a higher-income housing project discrimination is minimized. Indeed, the lower-income residents become better integrated into the community, and their own economic circumstances improve faster than those living in separated housing. While you agreed that integration was a good idea, Mr. Jackson, you contended that separation was necessary because the subsidized housing had to be built as a separate project. This was not my experience when I developed housing for low and moderate income people, financed by both Federal and State programs, a few decades ago. Section 8's below-market rental housing units were part of a larger market-rate project financed through HUD (the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development). There was no physical difference between the rental units. A local non-profit corporation bought the project from a for-profit developer who gained the tax-shelter benefits from selling designated subsidized units at below-market rates. In Piedmont's project, some of the 132 units could be sold to individuals (72 at market rate, 60 at below-market rate), with unsold units being sold to a non-profit agency which would rent the market-rate units and the subsidized units together, with no physical distinction among the units. They would be seamlessly included within the 132-unit project. No ghetto. No separation. There are many different ways to finance such mixed-income projects - direct subsidies, tax credits, a combination of county, State and Federal funding, perhaps even some philanthropy. We discussed this possibility at the community meeting and you asserted that an integrated project was not feasible; there would have to be two separate projects. I implore you to go back and investigate State and Federal subsidy programs more thoroughly. Creating a new housing community that separates residents by their economic status creates a danger that will cost our City financially and socially in the decades to come. I hope you, the planning consultants, and the City Council act on these concerns productively, and demonstrate that you do respond to community residents' feedback.
12/15/2023	Vincent Fisher	Thanks so much for making time to meet with Liz and me. And I was great to bring the fire chief in as well. We really appreciate your view on this complicated process. Have a great weekend.
12/18/2023	John Cheney	Attachment - This is one more comment that is already on file with the City in 2017. I and others support "traffic calming alternatives". These are not fresh comments but rehashing comments made in 2017. We support "roundabouts" for calming traffic.
12/18/2023	John Cheney	DEIR Comments and attachments re educator housing: Attached are two separate comments on the Moraga Canyon EIR plan. I am open to meet anytime. Currently our groups have met with the PUSD to propose the general approach to the City.
12/23/2023	Roxanne Gault	Pala between Park and Moraga is basically wide enough for one car travel in one direction but is a 2 lane road. This road will see a huge increase in traffic for those going to a new 135 unit development. Waze already diverts traffic onto this road and cars in a rush travel very fast. The committee needs to think how the addition of these units will affect our quiet neighborhood
1/2/2024	Pam Hirtzer	Just letting you know that my neighbors a few doors down on Scenic Ave have just had their home owners insurance dropped due to severe wildfire hazard. Like myself they live above Moraga Canyon. I happen to have State Farm insuring my house, and I know that State Farm is no longer providing new policies to home owners in California deemed to be residing in high fire risk areas. Hopefully I will remain grandfathered in. This unwillingness to insure homes at risk of wildfire in California has been announced by many other insurance companies this past year. Please consider this information in the development of the Moraga Canyon Specific Plan.
1/3/2024	Marj Blackwell	Attached are copies of 2 traffic reports from past and proposed Moraga Ave. developments: 1. 1985 LSA report regarding development of Coaches Field; 2. 2010 Emmett Creason report regarding the proposed sports field in Blair Park. I would appreciate your assurance that both of these reports have been — or will be— provided to the consultants preparing the Moraga Ave. Specific Plan. As you can see, these reports — from 38 years and 13 years ago — both reference high volume traffic on Moraga Ave. and the danger to pedestrians trying to cross the road. Since then, Moraga Ave. traffic, if anything, has increased in volume and speed. In my and many others' opinions, this is a primary issue that must be addressed before any development can occur in Moraga Canyon. Thank you for your consideration, and I look forward to your response..
1/8/2024	Deborah Leland	In reviewing the proposed changes to the Transportation Element in advance of the Planning Commission Study Session this evening, I would like to call two items to your attention: 1. Figure 4.2 of the Transportation Element shows Maxwellton Road in orange, indicating a road width of 20' - 25'. However, I believe Maxwellton Road should be depicted in red, indicating a road width of less than 20', per the description of Maxwellton Rd as 12' - 16' wide in the sidebar entitled "Narrow Streets" on the page following Figure 4.2. 2. Figure 4.4 and Table 4.4 omit Spring Path (from Moraga Ave just above Red Rock Rd to Abbott Way) from the City's inventory of pedestrian paths. Thank you for your attention to these items, and I hope there is opportunity to make the necessary corrections before adopting the amended Transportation Element.
1/8/2024	Ralph Catalano	Verbal comments at Planning Commission meeting
1/8/2024	Pam Hirtzer	Verbal comments at Planning Commission meeting
1/8/2024	Marj Blackwell	Verbal comments at Planning Commission meeting
1/8/2024	Andy Madeira	Verbal comments at Planning Commission meeting

Attachment H

1/8/2024	Liz Lummis O'Neil	We live in the neighborhood above Coaches Field and are writing in response to the Moraga Canyon Specific Plan. It was a surprise to us that all four Moraga Canyon options presented at the November 30, 2023 meeting included two market value houses on Abbott Way and Maxwellton Road. We ask that you remove these from the Moraga Specific Plan. The two places are on extremely steep and difficult to get to locations. Accessing and building in these two locations would not be cost-effective. Surely there must be other options to consider. If these additional sites have been included as a way to provide additional income to the City of Piedmont, we are confident there must be multiple other more effective and less disruptive options for raising incremental funds. The financial assessment provided by the consulting firm at the November 30, 2023 meeting was overly simplistic, ignoring the real impact of their recommendations on current residents and placing too much emphasis on income from new, seemingly arbitrarily selected sites for market value housing. Not only was the selection of these sites arbitrary, it also subjects our neighborhood to a double burden. First, a disproportionate number of new housing units (132) have been reserved for the Moraga Canyon area. Second, the City is selecting the same area in which to locate market value units to raise funds. So, in effect, we are being asked to assume the burden of raising funds to pay for a plan that already disfavors us. This is egregiously unfair. It was a surprise to see fair market value housing even in the plans as this had never been raised in prior meetings and the rationale for adding it to the plan has not been disclosed to the community. It is a curveball at the final hour. Again, we ask that these sites be removed from the plan. A broader discussion about the role of market value housing in Piedmont should be a separate topic for the City Council. As one of the two neighborhoods most impacted by the housing element, it would be nice to know that you all were looking out for us and our property values, to assure fair treatment across all of Piedmont. Plans presented, environmental impact reports, zoning discussions and the like miss the reality that we are most impacted. We ask that in good faith you factor in a buffer zone in these plans when you consider locations for the fair market housing. We all moved to Piedmont for its sense of community. It now feels like our neighborhood is being treated differently. There were other neighborhoods that could afford lawyers and understood early how to navigate the system to ensure low income housing was removed from consideration in their areas. While it was uncomfortable to witness, for example, how quickly consideration of housing in the center or town was removed from the plan, it would be nice to know that you are looking out for us and assure fair treatment for all residents of Piedmont. Thanks for your time and attention. Sincerely, Liz Lummis O'Neil, Tom O'Neil, Vincent Fisher, Mehrak Kiankarimi, Arnie Levine, Mary Levine, Keith Dierkx and Laura Dierkx, Patty Siskind and Lawrence Siskind
1/8/2024	Liz Lummi O'Neil	Verbal comments at Planning Commission meeting
1/8/2024	Kirk Peterson	Verbal comments at Planning Commission meeting
1/8/2024	Julie Waters	Verbal comments at Planning Commission meeting
1/8/2024	Irene Cheng	Verbal comments at Planning Commission meeting
1/15/2024	Liz Lummis O'Neil	Following the meeting last Monday, January 8, we'd like to update our letter. We request that you do not add a nature trail entrance where the current fire road gate is. We request that the fire road remains gated. •Last-minute notice: This was an absolute and outrageous curveball at the final hour. The January 8 meeting was the first time any of us learned about the nature trail proposal. As it is not even part of the housing element, we'd like it removed immediately. •Fire Safety: Maxwellton has limited access for fire trucks. This can be a major hazard. For example, some youths brought tiki torches and smoking materials to the field, causing grave concern. Removing the gate and giving public access will surely exacerbate the issue. Adding parking for trailhead parking would block PFD fire truck access. •Traffic: It is not safe to factor into your plans ideas that necessitate increased traffic on Maxwellton. The proposed nature trail entrance on Maxwellton is not safe. Maxwellton is a narrow and winding road with blind curves. It is not wide enough for two cars driving in opposite directions, one car needs to pull over for oncoming traffic. •Parking: There is no space for trailhead parking. Street parking only adds to the issue of clear passage on the road. When we have visitors, they need to find parking at least a block away so we can maintain a clear passage. •Buffer zones: We request buffer zones be designed into plans for current residents. The drawing of the trail goes right past three bedroom windows and a garden gate at 190 Maxwellton Road. Further, it makes the houses at 180 Maxwellton Road, 190 Maxwellton Road and 198 Maxwellton. •Road exposed to would-be walkers, causing concern for our safety. •Trespassing concerns and home safety: This trail would give direct access to our homes on Maxwellton and Mountain View Cemetery property. The cemetery is clear that walkers on their property are only allowed access through its Piedmont Avenue entrance. •Personal Safety: On a number of occasions the Piedmont Police were called when our own efforts to subdue drunk and disorderly late-night trespassers failed. Beer cans and other remnants from partying have been left on homeowners' property. •Sound travels: We hear it when there is batting practice or trespassers on the cemetery property. We are already subject to the noise of 130+ units, plus automobiles, adding the noise of walkers and increased traffic and parking adds insult to injury. We would like to know the process in which the two single family dwellings were added to the four options and made public for community comment. There are no grade lines on any of the maps where the SFD on Maxwellton is located. This oversight therefore does not take into consideration the very steep grade. What other locations were considered? We reiterate our request that the two SFDs get removed from all four options without further discussion. As expressed in our previous email, we are currently bearing the brunt of the Housing Element plans. This is not a "blank slate:" this is a community with our homes that we have spent considerable time and resources to create and maintain. We look forward to hearing from you on the changes you will make to ensure our concerns are addressed. Sincerely, Liz Lummis O'Neil, Tom O'Neil, Arnie Levine, Mary Levine, Keith Dierkx, Laura Dierkx, Patty Siskind and Lawrence Siskind
1/16/2024	Jennifer M.	This is response to Moraga Canyon Park. If you put houses there, you are going to create such a traffic congestion that people will be fed up. The park has wildlife that you are disregarding. The people on Moraga are leaving because of this and more will leave. First of all, we do not have any open land for building, and you should fight this. We do not have ample land for parks in the city of Piedmont and you are supposed to have more parks by the law and that is not the case. You now want to take more and make a wrong situation worse? What on earth are you thinking. We do not want to be San Francisco if that is what you want then move there. The City of Piedmont used to be sweet and quiet and cozy a little slice of heaven you are now making a slice of hell. Who is this person in Piedmont that is doing this. They are just trying to make money. If you do this, you are bringing in more people, more crime and some very shady people. You are displacing wildlife and the beautiful park with more concrete. Think about this, more people more problems. More people more crime, which is what will happen we do not have a police department that is able to handle this. Complaints, loud cars, loud music, and all the other problems we already have, dogs attacking people and getting bit without reporting them because they threaten us. This is the time to stop, put the brakes on and really think low income will bring people sleeping in their cars and campers and also the homeless. Everyone knows that people know people and they will say we are living here in Piedmont so come stay if will be smelly, dirty and look like an ugly place. Every person will have to do what they can to protect themselves and their property as the City of Piedmont Council sends it all to hell. You will not be alive long enough to see how bad it will get but all the children will suffer and young parents, but you do not care. You are as bad as Trump, with lies telling people what they want to hear, not the truth. I wouldn't be surprised if you ended up having side shows, it will happen. People who have guns will be coming, you do not pay attention, it's all around, open your eyes. People say they want to move here, I tell them no, you do not want to, it is not at all what it used to be. So, let's think, I know people that have left because their kids were bullied in Piedmont Schools. I know some lawyers and former city council that say this is not legal, with the parks and this is very stupid idea and should get rid of the city council people. You are really going to slam that many more people into the schools that have already suffered and fell down in the standing. You already lied to people of the cost of the pool and then you raise our taxes. WE DO NOT WANT THE HOUSES, PAY THE FINE. We would agree to pay the fine, not like you do not get enough money from, us be real. Piedmont is supposed to be an upscale place, you are making us be like East Oakland. So again, if you like that then then move there and good luck surviving. It is coming our way especially with this wrong, wrong plan. Thank you.
1/18/2024	Chris Read	Option 1 is the the superior plan for Moraga Canyon: -The current Blair Park, south of Moraga Ave is underutilized; if you must build housing in the canyon, build it there! Despite being a park for a long time, almost nobody uses it! -The open space above the skate park and corporation yard would make a superior park, with hiking trails through grand oak trees yielding majestic Bay Area views. This area is already a wildlife sanctuary for deer, fox, coyote, turkey, owl, etc. In the 1800's this land north of Moraga Ave was part of the historic 75 acre amusement park developed by the founder of Piedmont, Walter Blair <a href="https://www.historyofpiedmont.com">https://www.historyofpiedmont.com</a> and <a href="https://localwiki.org">https://localwiki.org</a> > Blair's_Park . -Please do not locate housing North of Moraga Ave. The area was historically an amusement park and should be a recreation park area again for the people of Piedmont. Thanks for your efforts on this!



# Moraga Canyon Specific Plan Land Use Alternatives Survey

*Responses through close of survey January 16, 2024.*

## Contents

Summary .....	2
Outreach .....	3
Responses .....	4
Which of the following mobility improvements are most important to you? (Select your top three)....	4
Which of the following recreation/civic uses are most important to you? (Select your top three) .....	6
Some desired improvements may not be feasible within the initial development budget. Which of the following improvements, if any, would you support using public funds to implement? (Select your top three) .....	9
What features of Option 1 are important to you? .....	10
What features of Option 1 are NOT important to you? .....	25
Is there anything else you'd like to share about Option 1? .....	32
What features of Option 2 are important to you? .....	42
What features of Option 2 are NOT important to you? .....	53
Is there anything else you'd like to share about Option 2? .....	61
What features of Option 3 are important to you? .....	70
What features of Option 3 are NOT important to you? .....	81
Is there anything else you'd like to share about Option 3? .....	87
What features of Option 4 are important to you? .....	95
What features of Option 4 are NOT important to you? .....	107
Is there anything else you'd like to share about Option 4? .....	113
What else would you like the project team to consider as they refine land use alternatives? .....	123



# Summary

The City invited community members to share feedback on proposed land use alternatives via an online survey, which was open from January 5, 2024 through January 17, 2024. The survey received a total of 282 responses.


The survey was designed to mirror the experience and input opportunity of attending the November 30<sup>th</sup> community workshop as closely as possible. The presentation shared at the workshop was recorded, chaptered, and published on the City’s YouTube channel, on PiedmontIsHome.org. Key segments were provided for viewing within the survey platform itself.

Presentation slides, maps, and display boards were provided along with the survey questions soliciting feedback on each option.

**Your Priorities for Moraga Canyon**

First, we'd like you to consider the possible improvements that could be made in Moraga Canyon.

For background information, you can watch this video, which provides an overview of the type of site improvements that could be made in Moraga Canyon when the Specific Plan is implemented.



Which of the following mobility improvements are most important to you? (Select your top three.)


- A safe pedestrian crossing
- A pedestrian sidewalk on the north (Coaches Field) side of Moraga Canyon
- I'm not interested in mobility improvements in Moraga Canyon
- Other (please specify)
- An improved bike lane
- A pedestrian sidewalk on the south (Blair Park) side of Moraga Canyon

Which of the following recreation/civic uses are most important to you? (Select your top three.)

- An official U14 soccer field
- An improved baseball and softball field
- Scenic trails
- The Boy Scout Christmas Tree lot
- I'm not interested in recreation or civic uses in Moraga Canyon
- Other (please specify)
- A gated dog park
- Kennelly Skate Park
- Expanded parking for Coaches Field
- The Wildwood Dads Club Pumpkin Patch

**Land Use Alternatives: Option 1**


This option looks at placing the majority of the housing in the Blair Park open space site. There are two single family housing units at the top of the hill, accessed off of Maxwellton and Abbot.



This option generally leaves the Corporation Yard and Coaches Field intact, as well as the skate park.

All four options includes a hiking trail that winds up the hillside on the north (Coaches Field) side of the site.

[See detailed maps and renderings for Option 1 \(PDF\)](#)



What features of Option 1 are important to you?

What features of Option 1 are NOT important to you?



## Outreach

The survey was announced to local media and shared on PiedmontIsHome.org, on the homepage of the City's website, on the City's social media accounts, and promoted by email to subscribers of the following City e-newsletters:


- Moraga Canyon Specific Plan News (*557 subscribers*)
- Fair Housing/Housing Policy Updates (*565 subscribers*)
- Planning & Building News (*447 subscribers*)
- Piedmont Recreation Department eNews (*1,020 subscribers*)
- City of Piedmont eNews (*4,477 subscribers*)

Additionally, the survey was advertised through paid ad placements on the Meta Ad Network (Facebook, Instagram) to roughly 1,000 Piedmont residents.



# Responses

**Which of the following mobility improvements are most important to you?  
 (Select your top three)**



**“Other” responses:**

A roundabout road should be used in the area.
A strong pedestrian/bike connection to center of city (City Hall Schools etc.)
Apart from a bike lane, leave it as is.
Bad bad site because of loss of open green space and very high traffic location for housing
Better sight distances for pedestrians and motorists
Do not change transit in Moraga Canyon. Bicycle lanes would increase danger to bicyclists.
Either realign Moraga to make sight lines safe, or keep all housing on the cemetery side of Moraga.
Given the narrow corridor of Moraga Ave., any pedestrian sidewalk on the north and south sides, would be like walking next to a freeway. Conditions would be hazardous and unsafe, esp., because an unsafe driver on Moraga Ave., can injure or kill someone. If there is a safe pedestrian crossing with a signal light, the only location would be at Maxwellton Rd. There is no space to put two lanes for a left turn lane heading east on Moraga Ave. Currently, without a signal light, there is often a back up as cars wait to turn left because many cars on Moraga Ave. are driving west.
I care about all four mobility improvements listed. Is there any reason all four could not be implemented? It seems to me that there's plenty of space for sidewalks and bike lanes. Why are you restricting people to only three? If there's a specific reason for that, it should be explained so that people can actually understand the tradeoffs you're thinking about. Otherwise, you're artificially suppressing support for some of the options.
I'm very worried about worsening traffic congestion on Moraga Rd.






Improved traffic safety for the neighborhoods on either side of the canyon that includes both Piedmont and Oakland residents. Traffic safety includes the flow of vehicular traffic to and from piedmont at Moraga Av and Harbord Av. as well as safety for pedestrians and bicyclists on Moraga Avenue.
Improving the flow of traffic on Moraga while allowing the existing Oakland neighborhoods the ability to merge onto Moraga safely. Please bear in mind, that first and foremost Moraga is a vehicular transportation route that MUST be available for emergency exits when the next firestorm sweeps through!
Maintain a wildlife corridor
Please don't impact the current open spaces.
Reduedctrafficspeed
Slower speeds
There really is no room for improvents
This is a dangerous thoroughfare and building high density low income housing will require significant investment and ongoing financial support from the city to maintain.
Traffic calming for slower speeds
Traffic lights at Maxwelton and/or Harbord



**Which of the following recreation/civic uses are most important to you? (Select your top three)**



**“Other” responses:**

An area for the public to use for any recreation-frisbee, cartwheels, frolicking, in addition to organized sports
Blair Park is an open space that should be kept as such. There are Heritage Trees and should be designated and preserved as a significant Historic Area for Piedmont for generations. Every spring, former residents planted daffodils along the pathway and drivers are greeted with this welcome entry into Piedmont. Instead, the greeting to Piedmont will be a massive building of 132 housing units that do not reflect or represent what the City of Piedmont has prided itself as a beautiful area with unique houses.
Continued availability of recreation facilities comparable to what exists now.
convert the skate park into paddleball courts to move this activity out of the neighborhoods
I am most interested in creating attractive livable space for the residents in the four apt buildings and residents around Moraga Canyon. Overcrowding, poor traffic managment, no green space around the apartments is not considerate to the apt dwellers or a compliment to the City of Piedmont.
Keep playfields on the cemetery side of Moraga in order to avoid expensive to maintain artificial turf fields
Leave canyon as is.
Maintain the existing open spaces are they are.



Maintaining a wildlife corridor to maintain biodiversity.
Natural open space
open space and safe playground for kids/families
open space-undeveloped land is top priority
Pickleball Courts
Pickleball courts, tennis courts, soccer field
Playground
preservation of Blair Park, bad to set a precedent of destroying park/open space
Recalling the original BlairPark design/purpose
Retaining as much open space & wildlife habitat as much as possible.
Sand volleyball courts
scenic value of Blair Park that can be enjoyed while driving and walking through the canyon
The current ball field is sufficient. Unfortunately, there was no information in the slide presentations on the four site building options that addressed how much each option would cost to improve the ball field. Without the comparison, one can only say the current recreation uses should be kept as is.
The skatepark which is extremely underutilized should be eliminated and replaced with pickleball courts. This would relieve the need for courts in sensitive neighborhoods.
This is a very narrow canyon road...although I understand the desire to make it recreational...I strongly think that safety is the first requirement and that includes limiting, not expanding it's recreational use!
This is not the place to build housing of any kind. There is barely any room in the roadway as is to navigate safely. By adding new units of dense housing we're creating a multi-faceted problem. In addition, we're going to fall well short of the goal of providing housing to low income residents as there is no walkable friendly resources within this site. This is not a BART or downtown setting, readily accessible by public transportation which would be ideal for low income individuals. In addition, Piedmont is a community of higher net worth properties and high earners (considering the high real estate taxes levied by the city.) It is counter intuitive to




make Piedmont an entry market for first time home buyers with low income. The financial impact (property prices, investment costs to build infrastructure, maintenance costs to support new infrastructure, tax loss due to bulk of residents being low income and requiring reduced tax burden) to the existing community is not insignificant.

You are keeping things the same. What about the growth of pickleball? What about a basketball court? What about another rec building since there will be so many more families?



**Some desired improvements may not be feasible within the initial development budget. Which of the following improvements, if any, would you support using public funds to implement? (Select your top three)**



**“Other” responses:**

Again, we have no idea of the costs, so it's difficult to say whether a relatively inexpensive improvement for an evacuation route should be done. But I do not support adding public fund costs to expand or improve Coaches Field, etc. The tax and bond burden in Piedmont is already very high compared to other nearby cities of similar size and populations
Anti-racist planning: traffic should not effectively isolate denser housing
Anything that allows community members to gather together and connect.
Baseball and softball field. Keep it grass, use current best practices for drainage. No plastic.
Incorporating the affordable housing into the market-rate housing so there is no visual difference.
Minimizing the adverse environmental impact on Blair Park.
Safe pedestrian pathways along Moraga from Highland Ave to Harbord Ave to achieve walkability for this proposed development. This includes the path from Moraga at Red Rock Road up to Abbott Way.
See above
These proposed improvements sound good on paper in isolation but in the context of this poorly reasoned scheme they are boondoggles at best.
Traffic management like a traffic light.



**What features of Option 1 are important to you?**

<p>My least favorite option. Blair Park is dark, damp and cold. Mud slides and mold are frequent battles for those who live adjacent to the park. It seems mean and, frankly, punitive to future residents to put dense MF (presumably rental) housing at Blair Park. On the other hand, the view corridor, natural light and bay air on the Coaches field side of Moraga are currently wasted on the corp yard, ball fields and xmas tree/pumpkin lot activities.</p>
<p>This option removes the open space along Moraga...I find that an important and UNWANTED change. I much prefer the "quiet" of the park to the bulky housing that is being proposed. I do not like the idea of a large housing complex so exposed and overwhelming of the valley.</p>
<p>I like the housing south of Moraga in the unused area. Trails north of the recreation and the U14 soccer field would be nice!</p>
<p>this feels like the right place for the housing.</p>
<p>I am a fan of affordable housing in this area. And I love mixing 'market rate' and 'affordable' into a community.</p>
<p>None. This is a terrible option.</p>
<p>new public trail access</p>
<p>Keeping coaches field.</p>
<p>Looks lower cost/impact.</p>
<p>Leave Coaches Field intact</p>



Option 1 is the most feasible.

- Affordable housing developments, and all housing right now, are very expensive. Building on flatter raw land. A.k.a. Blair Park is feasible because it's less topography to deal with. Not to mention potentially contaminated soils and underground storage tanks at the corp yard would threaten any housing development's viability if located on that site.
- The northern parcel is not within what we call a Difficult to Develop Area (DDA), which provides additional funding for affordable housing and is often a requirement for feasibility for these types of developments.
- Building the affordable on Blair means that it can proceed on its own timeline without respect to any potential bond measures/construction for relocating the corp yard or soccer field.
- Keeping the existing uses in their existing locations, but modifying them, will be significantly less expensive than moving the pieces around.

Finally, unrelated to the different options but important for us to remember, is that the affordable and market can't be integrated within the same building because we will then lose all our affordable funding. I know there is a group of folks advocating for this, and while a wonderful concept it's not actionable because the way the funding works the units need to be in separate buildings/ owned by separate entities.

However, they could all co-locate on Blair (next door to one another) and have complementary design). I think it makes sense to at minimum do the affordable at Blair, possibly both if folks are ok going up 4-5 stories (with appropriate step backs to preserve a street frontage that's a little lower).

Keeps coaches field

I don't think units should be put in the Moraga Canyon area because of congestion and safety. The current open spaces should be preserved. However, if the Canyon area must be used for new units, option #1 is best because traffic can be better accommodated. It will be safer for all residents for emergency vehicle and personnel access and safer resident emergency evacuation.

Preserving open spaces and sports fields and Kennelly park for the children. Concern for increased traffic that will occur with the housing density so access for new units to Moraga is really important. (Will Moraga be widened to cope with more traffic?)  
Corporation Yard will remain obscured yet accessible.



<p>- Impact is less so sustainability score is lower due to less demolition &amp; b/c corp yard, rec field &amp; skate park remain where they are currently</p> <p>- Housing is closer to existing housing so may be easier to connect to utilities</p>
<p>Improvements to Moraga Ave, including signaled intersection for safety.</p> <p>Accessibility and safety for new housing -- because the units are on Moraga they are easily accessible by fire, medical, etc which is especially important in the canyon. There are many homes already in the canyon neighborhoods with limited entry and egress -- more homes with this challenge would put a strain on resources if we experience an emergency or disaster.</p> <p>Preserving the sports fields and Kennelly park and open spaces for all to enjoy -- new public trail access would also be a great addition to the area for everyone.</p> <p>Also appreciate the Corp Yard would remain tucked into the hillside and not visible from Moraga Ave like it would be if moved to Blair Park.</p>
<p>preserves coaches field and makes it U14, open space/trails, blair park seems to be a good site for the housing type.</p>
<p>- Having the low/mid-income housing built 100% on Blair park. This is the most convenient and least expensive option for a build and the one most likely to be executed successfully</p> <p>- Leaving the corporation yard untouched</p>
<p>Good idea to place the housing in the flat open space, not i the steep forested hills</p>
<p>1) most feasible option</p> <p>2) allows for improved fire safety (two ways to get out)</p>
<p>improvements of coaches playfield and public trail access addition. Option 1 is the best option of all.</p>
<p>Hiking trail</p>
<p>Everything is in Blair Park - this is excellent. It will the the most cost effective as you don't have to move the corporation yard. And it perseveres Coaches area. Please remove the two market rate Single Family homes - why are they on every single option?</p>
<p>Separation of Housing and Recreational activities.</p>
<p>Consolidated to one side of Moraga Canyon</p>
<p>Putting all the housing on Blair Park looks like a bad idea. There would be more open space around the housing on the Coaches Field side.</p>
<p>Integrating affordable and market-rate housing together in one building complex is a good feature.</p>
<p>leaving the recreation site intact</p>





The fact that the majority of housing is placed in the rarely used Blair Park area. Also keeps the openness of Moraga Canyon intact
The consultant speaking in accompanying video said the two market rate units at Maxwellton and Abbott would be easily rolled into the main development, so please eliminate these from all four plans. They are poorly conceived for numerous reasons and unnecessarily significantly impact existing resident on those streets.
U-14 Soccer Field
Improved Moraga Ave., new signalized intersection, housing, additional parking.
keeping coaches field/soccer field/skate park in current location. Optimal location for safety of children. maintains construction yard. minimizes increase in light and noise pollution. maximizes use of Blair park which is under utilized today
hate this, keep blair park as is
New signalized intersection, sporting field and new trail access.
The affordable housing can get done faster and independent of other improvements on the Corp yard site
It would be the least expensive alternative and require the least amount of change
It appears to have the least environmental impact and disruption
I'm not in favor of option 1; it is the least good.
Hiking trail Keeping coaches field and corp yard intact
Separates Recreation and the courtyard from housing units., thus reducing noise and traffic from the housing area.
None. I'm absolutely against this project in any form. We need to keep the last open space just that. Development should be built where people are close to services, not where a car is required. I repeat, Moraga has heavy traffic twice a day to the point where it's near impossible to turn on to the road. The light at Moraga & Highland backs up so severely that it takes several lights to move forward. The intersection of Moraga and Thornhill is a joke. You can't even get into the left lane to turn onto Thornhill as it's so backed up. We have the luxury of having cars but also elect not to go at out during rush hour due to the amount of traffic. We didn't spend human sweat equity to defeat the previous canyon development to have it developed.
None LEAVE IT ALONE
The expanded playing fields are nice.
Leaving the canyon intact
Placement of housing in this site will probably be most cost effective. The signaled intersection will allow residents to enter and exit this area safely. I prefer grouping the 70 DU market rate units adjacent to the 60 affordable units.
Public trail access



Blair park is too small of an area
Of key importance is that Coaches Field and the Corporation Yard are kept intact and do not have to be moved or altered. So no public funds should be needed, as the developer should be paying for the construction of the housing in Blair Park and its related infrastructure.
We would not want Blair Park to be developed. We very much appreciate the beauty and accessibility of Blair Park and would not like this option in Moraga Canyon.
This is the worst site for units due to impact on traffic and massive size of units concentrated in this spot ,ugly project that will detract from our cities appeal
None except the field, assuming it is 100-130 yards and a width of 50-100 yards. This is regulation for U14 and U17 which was a major need stated by the soccer clubs during the Blair Park discussion. I recall the clubs saying they needed 100 x 300 to host tournaments so perhaps limiting the size to below this criteria would be more practical.
new hiking trail, new signalized intersection, improved Moraga avenue bike & pedestrian access
I like the attempt to provide affordable housing to those in need.
Option 1 is unacceptable because it places housing on the south side where ped access is inherently dangerous.
I accept that public open space will be used for housing, I would like to know why Moraga Ave can't be re-aligned to run south bellow the new housing. That would link the new housing with the existing play fields and skate park.
I like the density of the housing
I like that it leaves coaches field and the surrounding area alone— I think it's a pretty space, and I personally go there regularly with my kids. I also think that the Blair open space contributes the least to local quality of life, so it seems like a natural fit to be improved. I imagine that placing housing there would mean upgrading walkability of that entire area, which would be great.
I like that the field and corporation yard are preserved.
Housing at the most reasonable location, including affordable. Not much expense related to corp yard and recreational facilities.
For all four options - the presentation at one point indicated a plan to segregate the market rate and affordable units. I strongly oppose any such segregation!
Also for all four options, high-quality pedestrian access to/from the rest of Piedmont is essential.
This is my favorite. It separates recreational activities for Piedmont youth from housing. It looks the most affordable since the current structure of Corporation Yard and rec facilities are maintained. This is beneficial most importantly for the residents who will not appreciate the noise and activity that comes from being near Corporate Yard and the rec areas.



New public trail access
While I would miss the open space at Blair Park, Option 1 is financially attractive because it takes advantage of an existing flat site to develop housing. This will make construction costs for the housing more reasonable than a hillside development. It also does not relocate sports facilities and the corporation yard, which already exist and function reasonably well.
Open space should not be sacrificed for housing.
Keeping coaches field and compost pick up.
Upgraded sports field and additional parking.
Keeping the baseball / softball and the skate park. Adding additional parking.
This plan is safety disaster. Prior EIR's establish that safe sightlines cannot be had for Blair Park. Blair Park, moreover, is a former un-engineered landfill.
Positive Features: 1) Corporation Yard left intact for minimal impact to their workflow. 2) Lowest Infrastructural Impact score of all options.
Negative: 1) Giving up all of Blair Park open space for housing.
I appreciate that the du's and associated parking are clustered in one area and that the option's environmental impact score (2.1) is relatively low. Minimizing environmental impacts is important to me.
I
None of them
Trail access and additional parking
A traffic signal at Coaches Field is essential. Increased parking at Coaches Field is necessary.
none
No additional street or pedestrian traffic going up Pala
Improved Moraga Ave with bike lanes and pedestrian crosswalks and lights U14 Soccer Field
Keeps residential area on one side of Moraga
60 DU affordable housing U14 soccer New signaled intersection
Housing location
Signal intersection Additional parking Affordable Housing
Improving the safety of exiting Maxwellton.



Seems least costly overall since so much stays in place. Concern about multiple entries/exits to Moraga Canyon. Should be one access road to serve all housing. Appreciate that the affordable housing could be built separately and/or combined with market rate housing depending on developer cost estimates.
Adding as much affordable housing as possible
Additional parking, skate park, affordable housing
Minimal disruption to current layout, so probably most affordable and expedient. Access to new housing seems most direct.
The fact that it minimizes the impact to coaches field and the skate park.
Preserve coaches, expand parking
This option seems easiest to implement.
Traffic control & safety
This is a TERRIBLE option. Please drop it.
Improved soccer field and expanded playfield parking.
this is the most obvious option... blair park open space is nice but not the most amazing open space in the world considering it is against the road and difficult to access. Blair park would best be utilized with the main housing element, which would feel similar to other housing along Moraga canyon already in place. This then keeps the congestion up the hill and away from the entrance to Coaches field where I can see major congestion problems.
affordable housing project
Preserves and improves Coaches Field and Corporation Yard. Put housing in a logical location.
Housing units below residential area is better than sports field. Improved sports field at Coaches. Maintain civic space for Christmas tree lot and pumpkin patch. Improvements to public works corp yard.
There is less overall impact to existing space which may be a cost savings. This option takes advantage of land that is not already used efficiently.
New signalized intersection but I think there needs to be more than one - at least 2, maybe 3 New public trail access Additional parking near Coaches field
Seems to have least impact on current structure but visible impact as you enter town seems significant. Also worry about pedestrian issues
Signal intersection Improve Moraga Ave Additional parking



I would prefer not to fill Blair Park with housing. I think housing placed there would be less valuable and less pleasant for occupants than housing as-placed in the other scenarios. And I think it would reduce the charm of Moraga Ave significantly.
Least impact to existing infrastructure/ additional parking and new signalized intersection.
Minimize housing profile Leave room to improve baseball field
Affordable housing is the most important. There are very few good options in Piedmont for a meaningful number of affordable housing units. This is by far the best location.
elimination of Blair park is less desirable
Improved soccer field. So many kids use this in this town. Adding parking for sports field Getting all 130 units in Signalized intersection
I know that many minds are on this, but having the housing on the Blair side seems like a traffic nightmare.
I like the idea of keeping coaches field where it is
I like how there is still space for the field, corp yard, etc.... plus the housing... it seems like the housing can be built on Blair Park
This seems the least expensive option.
You will need to allow for pedestrian safety, speed mitigation and bike safety
This looks like the most cost effective solution but the least esthetically pleasing It will look like you dumped multi- family housing on a narrow strip of land. This will necessitate the traffic signal intersection on one of the busiest thoroughfares in the city.
Lots of new housing units Improved sports field More parking Stoplight for safer intersection



<p>During 2023, the neighborhood around Moraga Ave, Maxwelton Rd, (Piedmont) and Harbord (Oakland), had five electrical outages. Most of the outages were due to fallen trees along Moraga Ave. The outages lasted an average of 3-4 days. The rest of Piedmont, not along the Moraga Ave. corridor have not experienced these outages. Every storm, small or large has resulted in electrical outages in this neighborhood. The Earthquake (1989) and Oakland Hills Fire (1991) affected this neighborhood more than the rest of the City. We were evacuated for days. Hundreds of homes in Oakland were lost in 1991. We live along the Earthquake Fault Line and we live in a wildfire zone. Therefore, the next emergency will occur sooner or later. Adding the density of 132 housing units in this area is unconscionable. Moraga Ave is a central corridor in and out of Piedmont. In case of the next disaster, the access out of this area would be impossible. Safety for lives should be the top priority when determining where to cluster so many housing units.</p>
Expanded soccer field, additional parking.
Leaves Coaches & City yard as they are
U14 sized soccer field with extra parking
Public trail access, improved moraga ave, signalized intersection
Skate park, expanding coaches field, parking, pedestrian additions
Sports field
Leaving or expanding the sports field. Kids in piedmont don't have enough playing fields
The full sized soccer field and other sports facilities.
Nice to have the soccer field and baseball field separate from the housing.
Playing fields stay where they are. Sidewalk along Blair Park land. New scenic trail. No fencing around new homes to allow for wildlife corridor. Substantial building setbacks from Moraga. Controlled intersection.
Least impact and cost to public areas.
the hiking trail
IMPROVE PEDESTRIAN AND BICYCLIST SAFETY AND ACCESS
none
Expand much needed field space
I prefer Option 3. Don't like having the housing on the south side of Moraga.
<p>It's hard to say what's important v. what I like. The new public trail access seems important here, but that's true across all options. All options also improve recreation. All options hit what's required.</p> <p>Generally, I really dislike this option. Putting housing in Blair Park feels unappealing to those who might live there -- just shunted off to the side with very little open, livable space. It would also be visually unappealing.</p>



<p>The current recreation footprints are not disturbed and all the new housing is away from our current uses. Placing housing in Blair Park keeps all the housing together and across the street and away. If the public recreation uses are moved Blair Park residents will have to traverse the road from one facility to another facility. Let us minimize having to cross the road. Making Blair Park all residential keeps all the recreation where it currently is and virtually undisturbed open space.</p>
<p>Adding 130 units of housing along Blair Park is absurd. There is not enough space to safely put that many housing units. The traffic along Moraga ALREADY is very unsafe, much less adding more people along that narrow stretch of road. There isn't enough usage of the other side of the canyon, where there is A LOT more space if housing in required. You're basically depositing these housing units along this strip without taking into account the tenants quality of living (busy streets, difficult access to city amenities) just to make the quota of units required by the state.</p>
<p>Leaves city needs met.</p>
<p>Generally like all the features here. Maintaining the existing sports and city facilities during construction and long term. This keeps the buildings somewhat consistent to adjacent buildings and makes good use of undeveloped land, although I worry about the interaction of cars coming in and out of the residences on the blind curve of Moraga.</p>
<p>Keeping coaches field . Need baseball field and can be used for all sport practice . Makes sense to place all housing on one side . Ease of building up . Just makes sense</p>
<p>This option will result in increased vehicle traffic entering Moraga which is already not capable of handling the existing traffic.</p>
<p>The many, many cars that will be entering Moraga at many points will result in a logjam and more traffic.</p>
<p>New public trail access</p>
<p>Provides good access to the general public day use area (trails and playing field).</p>
<p>That the current facilities stay as they are</p>
<p>Cost efficiency of new construction and not tearing down existing structures. Use of an underused space. Improved Moraga Avenue</p>
<p>I don't like that it would probably put dense vertical construction along Moraga.</p>
<p>It seems the easiest way to provide the needed housing and also will make that part of Moraga Avenue to be made safer for everyone - the new residents, drivers, bike riders and pedestrians. The latter is very important to me - I have walked, rode a bicycle, and driven on this road and it is not safe as it now exists - putting the housing on the Blair Park site will accomplish all of these goals.</p>
<p>Retains green space</p>
<p>Compressing new housing into the south side of the canyon would visually overwhelm the canyon as a whole. The corp yard takes up too much space, is an inefficient use of precious land.</p>



It does not require relocating and rebuilding existing facilities, which would be an absurd waste of money.
Walkability and alternatives to car travel are important for 130+ additional dwelling units. I don't see enough here.
I have major concerns for plumbing, sewage, and parking for the new housing projects. I suspect this is not being thought through vs. the pressure to build new housing.
Public trail. Signalized intersection. Keeping corporation yard where it is.
Blair Park is relatively open and unused land. Skate Park, Coach Field and Corp Yard can stay where they are and reduce impact.
I like that it keeps the Xmas tree lot, soccer field and skate park
Looks like a lower cost option.
I think it is a negative to destroy Blair Park
I don't like the loss of the Blair park open space
Having all housing located in Blair Park is a good use of underutilized land. Not relocating the recreation facilities, corporation facilities and parking should be cost effective. Option 1 allows NEW PUBLIC TRAIL ACCESS AREA(a replacement of Blair Park) for all Piedmont people to see spectacular panoramic bay views while walking among grand oak trees and wildlife. It preserves the existing and valuable wildlife corridor of deer, turkey, fox, coyote, owl, etc, for everyone to enjoy!
Soccer field and skate park maintained with teh public rail access, plus he housing looks better -- Option 1 is my favorite.
The housing on the Blair Park side is a great idea. But without an easy way for the residents to navigate to the rest of the city, I worry it'll be isolated. That's why the nearby facilities could be so nice.
This is the worst option in my opinion for 2 reasons: 1. it uses the most open space in Blair Park 2. it puts more people at risk of crossing an already dangerous street.
I would like Blair Park to remain untouched and be enhanced with more native plantings. This is important for biodiversity, carbon sequestration and to maintain the last open space in Piedmont.
none
the housing and fields





Simplicity of Opt 1 plan is the best choice. Integrating housing into the Coaches Field area (Opt 4) is complicated and likely more costly due to lifting field above parking. BP is an undeveloped and lightly used open space which can easily support housing projects. The Coaches Field area has several existing uses which can be enhanced but should be left in place.
Market rate and affordable housing are together.
Improve Moraga Road. It cannot be a congested road with housing more parking etc. it is a main thorough fair to the residence coming into Piedmont who live here.
leaves the Corporation Yard and Coaches Field intact, as well as the skate park.
Multi use sports field Moraga Ave and pedestrian improvements
Trails in the hills (I assume this connects up to Maxwellton?) Location of apartments on south side of Moraga seems pragmatic
Leaves the current field and skate park untouched
Location of housing. Lower cost
I think Option 1 is best. I'm very worried about cost over-runs for public projects (Witter Field, swimming pool) so I want to leave existing structures where they are--ball field and corp yard. This project is going to set a president for subsequent work for affordable housing, and I want us to be cost-smart. That way we can hope to get the majority of this stuff actually built.
Housing in Blair Park. Less relocations.
Keep U14 field
Safe crossing of busy Moraga Ave by children residing in the Canyon is the top priority. pedestrian safety
I prefer separation of traffic from housing and sports facilities for public safety (traffic etc), so like this option best. This option leads to development of a very developable site on Blair park and updates the existing sports fields to meet the city's current needs. Seems the simplest option from a cost point of view and lowest potential burden on taxpayers.
Location
the open space
U14 soccer Field w/ baseball & softball Kennelly Skate Park New Public Trail Access
This option looks good but most of the housing seems pretty segregated from the rest of the group
Housing is in a separate area from the sports field and makes good use of the open space
Multi family housing and Moraga Ave improvements for bike and ped



Coaches Field is very important - we need to preserve and improve recreational space for current and future residents.
New public trail access, improved Moraga Avenue
I like that the housing is all together and that there is a safe crossing
This is one of the lowest impact options. Added housing is the most important as well as improvements to pedestrian safety.
Signalized intersection for safety is a good idea; otherwise, neither traffic safety or fire safety are improved with this plan.
New public trail access
Improved sports facilities and new housing = win/win
Placing new housing on Blair park side seems to make the most sense
Open space. Keeping the site as natural as possible. Also access for fire trucks.
Separates housing from sports field; guessing that it is the lightest lift from a construction standpoint; guessing that it provides best likelihood of pedestrian access to sports field (less traffic?). Overall, it's the most straightforward option because it changes the least.
Access not on Moraga is nice. It's already too busy on Moraga with cars. Expanding coaches field is great.
The part I like that doesn't include completely replacing the existing facilities and structures. I like that it has public trail being included as well as improved crossing/signalized intersection.
All of them are important except the two market SFD houses.
Maximizing use of Blair Park to develop affordable housing.
I like the trails and maintaining the corp yard and a safer crossing. I don't like all the housing taking away the entire park.
I don't want to see Blair Park used for any of this .We need that open green space Development of Blair park will cause severe traffic disruption, there is not enough depth to develop this area
I don't want to see Blair Park used for any of this .We need that open green space Development of Blair park will cause severe traffic disruption, there is not enough depth to develop this area
Housing is further from recreational facilities, allowing for less noise/disruption for the residents during sporting events. Seems like it is going to be the cheapest to develop since the coaches field and corporation yard are left largely unchanged.
Maximize housing there
I think to keep our community strong, we need sports facilities for our kids. I also think keeping some parkland/green space is hugely important for our mental health, beauty, wildlife. We can't just be all concrete and have traffic issues in this teeny town.



<p>An actual use for Blair Park. Oakland made it clear that they do not want a playfield there. Housing is a good use.          Improved playfield to make usable for U14 soccer. Very needed.          Public trail access. Yes. Let us up the hill, with access to a street, would be wonderful. It's great wandering around Bushy Dell. A similar type path on the hill would be spectacular.          Improved pedestrian access.</p>
<p>The location of the high-density houses. I am happy with their location. The houses will have good access to Moraga Ave without a squeeze point (shared driveway). With that many new houses and their location, there must be a light or a traffic circle at Maxwellton.</p>
<p>It uses the Blair Park area for community wide benefits</p>
<p>Although specifics about cost were not included, this seems to be the less expensive option due to fewer structural changes and the houses not built into a hillside. Cost is very important to me.</p>
<p>Maintain field use as is. maintain parking. Signal to Cross Moraga.</p>
<p>Parking and pedestrian safety</p>
<p>-bringing the housing closer to the rest of the Piedmont residential area (i.e. less marginalized)           -new public trail access (it appears all 4 options provide this, which is great news)           -soccer field with softball overlay</p>
<p>Density</p>
<p>Public trails access and improved Moraga Ave.</p>
<p>The new houses are on the Blair park side, which is already flat and easier to build on. It seems cost efficient and safer than other options that require cutting the hillside of the Coaches Field area.          The new signalized intersection is a must as we expect the residents of the new housing units to cross Moraga Ave frequently.</p>
<p>improvements to sports field and extra parking</p>
<p>Baseball and softball field intact. Girls softball has been an afterthought in town.</p>
<p>Housing in Blair park.</p>
<p>None of these are important to me.</p>
<p>improved field space          hillside hiking trail          increased parking</p>
<p>scenic trails          housing project on current blair park land</p>



Preserving the playing fields
Preservation of open space



**What features of Option 1 are NOT important to you?**

Skate park. Doesn't seem inclusive but maybe that was just my family.
Housing in the Blair Park area will be a blight and cause traffic chaos.
skate park housing
Skate Park
N/A.
I think we can ditch the skate park
Mega houses are not important.
- Coaches Field & Kennelly Park remaining where they are currently; Kennelly Park is a very poor design for a skate park so it is rarely used
2 market rate houses on Abbott and Maxwellton.
I oppose the following: - Building of single family housing near Maxwellton and Abbott as they are not state requirements under the CA Housing Element and doubly impact our neighborhood congestion (the low income housing development and the addition of market value single family homes)
We do not need 2 market rate SFD houses in this neighborhood. This small area of Piedmont is already bearing the brunt of so many additional housing units.
Putting housing on Blair Park is a terrible idea.
This is a great option - it doesn't move the corp yard or the antenna or the skate park. You don't have to do any work to the Coaches side.
If cost to the City is an issue, the least important improvement is the U14 soccer field.
not sure I understand the value of two new SF homes
Signal
The proposed location of the housing.
SFD are not part of housing element requirements. New trail will increase illegal trespassing on nearby home owners and Mountain View cemetery and seriously impact ingress of Piedmont Fire department and emergency vehicles on Maxwellton and surrounding streets due to narrowness of streets/. Significant impact on Oakland home owners due to parking constraints.
New housing units, especially affordable housing units. I am concerned it will bring crime to Piedmont and congest Moraga Ave. It will totally change the vibe of what makes Piedmont so great.



I do not think it is necessary to do all of the market units on Blair Park- I could see doing 60+ affordable in apartment style and some market rate townhomes (maybe half of the 70) and using the hill for the other half. Keep them market and affordable independent, and use the hillside to increase market potential and fiscal contribution. I'd also be ok, with all of the market on the other side and one of the civic uses adjacent to the affordable on Blair
2 single family dwellings at top of hill Retaining existing skate park
On the other hand, I don't like putting housing in Blair Park at all. After going through the sports field project idea in the recent past, I don't know how issues of traffic, safety and pedestrian safety can be managed.
We do not need the soccer field. No more parking more cars for them to break into
I understand that Kennelly Skate Park is seldom used and I believe it is an example of poor Piedmont public land use. I strongly oppose the eradication of Blair Park as well as the sale of public land for SFD (?)market rate housing.
The two houses at the top are not necessary
Skate Park
The two single houses at the top of the hill are unimportant additions, unless they were specifically included in the plan that was submitted to the state (so we have to do them).
We don't want housing in Blair Park.
Leave Blair park alone
The skate park can be relocated. Moraga Ave pedestrian improvements on the Blair Park side not necessary.
putting housing in Blair Park. This will put dense housing in a high wildfire danger zone, which makes no sense. It also destroys the open space of Blair Park and it potentially will cause the most traffic impact in a narrow part of Moraga Canyon. The new signalized intersection does not appear to handle traffic from the new housing.
The market rate houses are of no import to me. If possible, they should be replaced with a much larger number of affordable units.
keeping the Corp yard where it is.
Don't care about leaving the fields and corporation yard as they are.
The existance of the skate park (it is always empty), the corp yard location
I do not like that public land (Blair park) is sacrificed for no apparent benefit to current residents.



<p>Remove/relocate market rate housing to minimize impact on long-term Piedmont residents. Additionally, these are on steep and hard to get to locations. There is no grade shown on SFD lot on Maxwelton; in fact this is a very steep grade. How about placement somewhere that is flatter and requires less engineering. These two houses seemingly just appeared at the final hour with no community input and little thought put into location as they are on all four proposals.</p>
<p>Remove public trail access on Maxwelton. There is no parking available on Maxwelton or nearby streets, both in Piedmont and Oakland. Maxwelton is not wide enough for two-way traffic; the road cannot handle increase usage. Furthermore, we are concerned about access for emergency service vehicles. In the past when the gate was not able to fully shut, neighbors here experienced many disruptions late at night. Trailhead will promote illegal trespassing on Mountain View Cemetery property. Trailhead has potential to be a public nuisance.</p>
<p>If by not important, you mean what I do not like about this option: I totally oppose putting housing in Blair Park. The park is shady much of the time, backed by a steep hillside, is dangerous for pedestrians to cross Moraga Ave. or for cars to enter/exit the park, and it is isolated from the rest of Piedmont. Putting housing in Blair Park will create a segregated neighborhood that will make Piedmont the poster-child of what affordable housing advocates oppose.</p>
<p>New signalized intersection</p>
<p>Adding any housing. Having a signal at the intersection.</p>
<p>Preserving Skate Park.</p>
<p>I question the importance of adding the two market rate homes off Abbott and Maxwelton. Their addition will have a disproportionate negative impact on existing residents of that hillside vs. the contribution of only two more homes to the City's housing requirements. Maxwelton is a very narrow and already overutilized road.</p>
<p>Housing and parking</p>
<p>Do not want signalized intersection as this will cause more smog build up and traffic backup              Soccer field not important</p>
<p>Soccer</p>
<p>I do NOT want the Public access trail on my neighborhood.. there is already too many problems with illegal access from Maxwelton where I live</p>
<p>It would be a shame to lose the open space at Blair Park.              Soccer is already too dominant in Piedmont. It appears that there would be a loss of baseball (not softball) in this option. Our family uses the baseball field and the batting cage at Coaches Field multiple times per week.</p>
<p>no housing should be on the Blair park side of Moraga</p>
<p>No housing on Blair Park</p>



2 Market rate SFD houses 70 DU market rate houses Public trail access
Skatepark
U14 Soccer Field Market Rate Housing
Regulation size recreational fields.
Maintaining the Skate Park. (Could move to Linda adjacent to bridge/grassy field.)
affordable housing
Housing
dog park
Market rate housing
the 2 market rate stand alone houses
Walkway up the hill for views totally unnecessary
Additional parking and preserving the corporation yard are not important to me. We should prioritize active transportation and transit options to minimize the amount of land we need to use for parking, especially surface parking.
All DU housing
None of it is important to me. This option makes no sense and should be dropped as quickly as possible.
Housing
market price housing
The skate park. How much use does it get? Could space be better used. I understand some skateboarding space in community is important.
Adding that many homes to a small area that only has one in/out.
Additional housing units
Skate park
Hiking trail
Do we need the market rate housing? Why not make it all affordable housing?
Skate park Trail access
I think the public trail is nice, but not necessary for me
Skate park
If there are no other options, Option 1 should be the least of the 4 options recommended.
The massive housing along Moraga
Skate park
Skate park, housing
Affordable Housing
Like the housing on Blair field and maintaining open space at coach's field





The trail and skate park.
Additional parking at the expense of open space.
Don't love all the housing on Moraga canyon. Feels most intrusive.
housing
preserving coaches field
the location
Don't like crammed apartments on Moraga Ave. Too congested and works against Piedmont beautification standards. Would like to see unused Blair park turned into field space.
As above - socially and visually unappealing
All the features of option one are an advantage over the other options if we must have this housing change of use. Blair Park should be converted to residential space leaving everywhere else in tack, and on the other side of the street.
Don't like the light.
Putting housing in this East of Eden area of Piedmont is deplorable. We are consenting to segregation. Do not waste our money on a project that will be litigated for decades.
None
Skate park Public trail
Housing
Preservation of so much open space above the existing play field.
If the skate park sees little use, then it should be removed in order to better use that space.
There should be premier sports facilities for families to use, as there is none in Piedmont.
Skate park. Does anyone even use it now? Sports field. That said, if there is to be one, the location should be on north side of Moraga.
There seems to be a lot of unused space
Heavy traffic area on the east bound area, and higher prone to accidents due to density of housing in the area.
The fact that the corporation yard is left where it is
Everything in Option 1 is important.
additional parking and new signal.
Where th housing is located
Skate park - is it actually used? You have not shared data on this adequately. What is the point of the SFH? Can they at least be duplexes or fourplexes or are you limiting it to SFH for some reason related to neighbor desires vs the market?



All
skate park
The details of a a renovated Corp Yard are not high on my list but undoubtedly important to Public Works. All other modifications seem worthwhile as long as they are not terribly expensive, i.e. Opt 4 lifting Coaches Field above parking.
NO skate park! Terrible use of space!
Not Expanding parking expanding the field we need to keep traffic at a minimum on Moraga Road as it is the main entrance into Piedmont for residence and exit in the event of disaster
The 2 single family homes at the top of the hill.
I want the affordable and market-rate to be mixed. I'm a psychologist and the the literature is clear that when a lesser-income group is isolated that causes social degradation internally and stigma/discrimination to the outside.
Should not loose the park
design
Retaining Kennally skate park in that location. It is inaccessible there and should be fixed once and for all with this project. Suggest expanding the corp further into the current skate park area and expanding parking and placing skate park nearer to the entrance by Red Rock road. If it can't be relocated, suggest removing the skate park in project.
coaches field
70 DU Houseing Project 60 DU Affordable Housing Project Signalized Intersection
I don't care about parking.
Single family homes, skate park and trails
Skate park is not important
I don't like the expanded field, because the amount of parking already is very insufficient and expanding the field will create a need for even more area to be used for parking.  I also think the skate spot is a huge waste of a large, scenic, flat site.
Cramming all the housing into the smallest available place is a traffic and safety challenge for Moraga Avenue.
Additional parking
Skate park
Placing two market rate units separate from all other housing doesn't seem to make sense.
Increased parking



The skate park has a poor design. It is too advanced and does not serve the average skater. Take it out.
None
Need for more parking. The structure underground would be nice here too
Two market rate houses. Is the revenue from sale of these designed to attract the contractor for the low income housing?
Leaving corporation yard intact
I don't see the need for the new soccer field.
I think all of the development should be put on coaches Field
I think all of the development should be put on coaches Field
I don't like the idea of adding so many units into a small area. I drive there every day, traffic will be horrible! Wildlife won't survive. We already barely have green space.
The location of the two market-rate houses.
The hiking trail
Keeping the skate park where it is currently is not important. I don't feel it gets used as much as it could and potentially a new location could increase usage.
Impact to houses above Blair park will be negatively impacted by option 1.
I do NOT support.
Corp yard in current location. Maintain skate park.
Leaving current recreational facilities untouched.
-preserving current soccer field (I would prefer to move/improve/expand it) and leaving things intact
-leaving Corp Yard intact (I would prefer to modernize this - or make more compact)
The single family homes
Improved sports facility. SFD
Corp field. That could be moved elsewhere outside Piedmont or reduced in size.
Additional parking when parking is not that major of an issue right now-we should be encouraging people to walk and exercise more not take more land to support pollution and laziness. The city is 1.7 square miles—at least half the houses are within walking distance.



## Is there anything else you'd like to share about Option 1?

The proposed density and concentration of housing on Moraga Av. in Blair Park are of concern for traffic reasons.
This is my least favorite by far.
Please eliminate it.
Do not want housing on the south side of Moraga.
there are no improvements to the dangerous intersection at Maxwellton Road, despite the added traffic
Looks easy. Some concerns for neighbors around noise and traffic on Moraga.
Please see above.
Having the housing density right on Moraga is less ideal
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- What is the impact on traffic of the signalized intersection? I heard some homeowners in the area who spoke at the last Planning Commission meeting claim that it would back up traffic onto Highway 13. Is this true?</li> <li>- IMHO this option does not capitalize on the beautiful views referred to in the videos. For this reason I think it may be best for the housing to be on the opposite side on the skate park &amp; corp yard sites</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- In my book, very high priority to maintain existing green space in Blair Park — the beautiful open space is central to what I love about living in the canyon</li> <li>- Seems less integrated</li> <li>- Seems less safe for occupants</li> <li>- I imagine option 1 would be less desirable to prospective occupants for other reasons as well (e.g. crammed up against Moraga, no hillside view)</li> </ul>
Adding this many units of low/mid-income housing to this area, regardless of the option, will negatively impact traffic, noise levels and property values for the Piedmont residents in this neighborhood. As previously pointed out by many residents of Moraga Canyon, this plan forces the majority of units on a single community, no matter how high the barriers for development. We were shocked at how quickly any proposals for build in the center of town were dismissed, despite having many merits. This reinforces the belief that residents with greater influence and financial clout are directing the build away from their homes.
Segregating low income housing to Blair Park should not be an option. No housing there is appropriate. It's not safe, there's not enough green space, no potential views, those houses are practically on the street. Blair Park should be preserved as a green space.
Please remove the two market rate SFD - this part of Piedmont is taking more than their fair share of new housing. We don't need those two homes there. Plus why sell off two parts? Keep the whole thing open as it is. There are already trails that go from Abbott way and a city gate.



<p>The housing in Blair Park is going to incur significant retaining wall construction. This was identified in 2011 when a soccer field was proposed for that property in 2011. The proposal was ultimately withdrawn partially because the proposal would have put the City in the position of being legally responsible for damage to any of the residences above from any earth movement, slippage, etc. which might result from that excavation and wall construction - in perpetuity. Having very clear fiscal responsibilities of all parties is crucial on that site - including very thorough investigation of the soil bearing capacity - given that it is rumored to be just uncompacted fill and debris and that our proximity to the Hayward Fault could require extraordinary foundations for even 5 story buildings.</p>
<p>This also happens to be the cheapest alternative and the most likely one to be economically feasible.</p>
<p>These projects put a significant, unfair burden on the residents near the proposed development - Piedmont should be fair and come up with a plan that reduces the impact on these residents and shares more equitably with the rest of Piedmont.</p>
<p>Not a very good option.</p>
<p>I do not think there should be any building in Blair Park...both an eyesore and a loss of a lovely park for all to use.</p>
<p>Best option.</p>
<p>This is the most economically feasible, least disruptive, and fastest route to actually getting affordable housing built.</p>
<p>This option is too disruptive to the neighborhood, safety and traffic flow and would take away the open space that so many use on a daily basis. Would also disrupt the wildlife (there is alot) and create more noise for the surrounding neighbors as it would echo throughout the canyon. <b>STRONGLY OPPOSE THIS OPTION!</b></p>
<p>an eyesore of congestion right along the road!! Blair Park obliterated.</p>
<p>I don't support housing in Moraga Canyon from the get-go. The main reasons are that it is isolated, does not provide public transportation, and it is separated from the rest of the city, thus creating a housing ghetto.                  Equally important, Moraga Canyon sits next to the Hayward, fault line, and is a wildfire hazard area. The problems of traffic on Moraga Avenue and the need to provide safe pedestrian crossings don't seem to have realistic answers. These thoughts hold for all of the four options, so please apply them to my overall review.</p>
<p>All the ideas are bad sucks</p>
<p>It appears that the so-called 'Public Trail Access' cannot be accessed conveniently by the vast majority of Piedmont residents via pedestrian routes. I'm wondering what slivers of the "public" are envisioned to access this trail-- where does the trail go? This component of the plan is not well articulated.</p>
<p>Why build two houses at the top of the canyon?</p>
<p>I do not think that the 132 units should go into Blair Park. I do not like this option.</p>



<p>All the options include adding too much housing density to this small area. Housing should be spread out throughout Piedmont and not concentrated in this one corner of the city. This will affect the quality of life of the current neighborhood, will cause traffic jams, sound and light pollution, make the neighborhood less safe during fires and negatively affect the beauty of the canyon.</p>
<p>Leave Blair alone</p>
<p>This design is too bulky for the canyon and Blair Park in particular. It shows no design sensitivity for preserving any open space in Blair Park and preserves inefficient use of the corporation yard for public use. And this diagram does not provide a realistic rendering of how parkign ia adequate for the 130 units. The corporation yard is much better aesthetically for such dense housing and the light and views are much better than Blair Park. The two SFD off Abbott seem out of place - I know that area and it is very steep-sloped and vegetated. Housing would mar this area. Better to subdivide lots elsewhere in town to achieve 2 units.</p>
<p>There is no information on what is defined as affordable housing. It should be the first item clearly defined in the site documentation and easily accessible. I attempted to find this information and could not find it. I know we would all like to see hundreds of affordable housing units built in the community, but the reality is that Piedmont is not an affordable community... it is an affluent community. To create housing for affluent people in the community makes sense because those are the people who can afford to live here after probably having bought their starter house in a lower priced housing area. It is illogical to put "affordable housing" in this neighborhood/community. The financial impacts are significant and multi-dimensional.</p>
<p>I would like to see the housing pushed farther back off the road. It looks like they will tower over Moraga, creating a canyon effect. If the structures could be dug into the hillside, they will fit into the space better.</p>
<p>A non-starter</p>
<p>The "hill" next to the existing coaches' field parking lot can be removed. Can the footprint of the Corp yard be shrunk or better yet moved?</p>
<p>I like it the best of all the options presented.</p>
<p>This seems by far the best housing option. I'm concerned about traffic safety for all modes.</p>
<p>I've said it all above. Blair Park is a terrible place to build any kind of housing. Furthermore, it will destroy a designated city park and will become the one and only city in California to take a park for housing. It is especially bad for Piedmont, which is already below State guidelines for recreational and park open space.</p>
<p>Of the four options, this one seems the most economically feasible.</p>
<p>It's stupid but politically expedient.</p>
<p>I do not support this option due to the loss of Blair Park's open green space.</p>



<p>Regardless of the site plan, 132 additional units in narrow Moraga Canyon will have a deleterious impact on the safety of existing homes and lives in the area. Moraga Ave is a major transportation route for the Hwy 24/13 area (including Montclair and Upper Rockridge whose residents should have been notified of this endeavor). This plan puts thousands of people in this area at risk in the event of a major fire. The arterial already is at or near capacity during commute hours. In light of the fact that insurance companies are cancelling home insurance policies in CA, the additional risk created by this proposed development could very well result in the same outcome for this area.</p>
<p>Would like Blair park to remain natural</p>
<p>I defer to the comment that this is segregation.. the housing units required should be spread THROUGHOUT piedmont and not just in one neighborhood</p>
<p>What is the impact on the *baseball* field at Coaches? Is it being eliminated in favor of softball? There aren't enough baseball fields in Piedmont.                  The Coaches Field baseball diamond has poor drainage and the field is unusable for many days of the year. When it rains, there are gulleys and areas of the red dirt field that are dangerous and we have to wait for the City to repair them.                  Open Space is important for Piedmont. What large open spaces would remain if Option 1 is enacted?</p>
<p>What is the arrow going up Pala?</p>
<p>How is the increased traffic going to impact access to Maxwellton road. It's already a difficult blind left turn to exit the neighborhood and head eastbound.</p>
<p>Not clear if Corporation Yard needs renovations. If not, this seems cost effective but otherwise seems like a waste of valuable hill space, which could enhance value of market rate housing and get it off a main road.</p>
<p>Option 1 sucks</p>
<p>We were told initially that we just had to find a place for additional housing, and nothing more. Seems like now it's morphed into actual plans to build housing.</p>
<p>so important to have affordable housing</p>
<p>I don't like the fact that the recreational fields and housing are on opposite sides of the street. The project site would be safer and more vibrant if both were on the same side, with either the corporation yard or open space on the other side, as in Options 3 and 4.</p>
<p>I HATE it. Please KILL it immediately.</p>
<p>Housing so pressed against Moraga doesn't seem particularly desirable.</p>
<p>this is a cumbersome format / layout to do on a phone</p>
<p>This has a low infrastructure impact, and likely a lower overall cost. The housing construction can be separated from Coaches field improvements if needed.                  Can there be trails or dog walk behind housing at Blair park site; up the slope toward existing residential?</p>
<p>I would like to see the project incorporate more improvements to existing spaces, suc as coaches Field and the Corp yard.</p>



<p>There is no discussion about additional traffic signals outside the City of Piedmont and how this would impact traffic flows onto highway 13 when trying to enter and exit off of highway 13. These lanes (on Moraga and on the freeway) are already backed up without the additional building structures. What additional road ramps, traffic signals and barriers will be used by the City of Oakland and/or State of California to aid in this project?</p> <p>Also, when the sun is setting, driving down Moraga is difficult. Isn't there anything that could be built over Moraga Ave?</p>
<p>Too many homes in a small area.</p>
<p>This is my least favorite option of the four</p>
<p>Blair Park isn't really used for all the things that parks are usually used for. Few people picnic there, or go for walks. It's difficult to access on foot and has no views. I only see dogs run around there, and there are other dog parks in Piedmont where they can go. It seems like the best solution to locate the dwelling units there.</p>
<p>Housing architecture should meld into the canyon. It should appear as an organic part of the woodland space.</p>
<p>I'd like to see the open space on the west side of Moraga preserved as it is now. There's value in seeing that green, open space as we pass through Moraga Canyon-- one of the reasons I'm glad the suggested sports field didn't go in there several years ago.</p>
<p>Could you accommodate more than 60 units of affordable housing? We should try to make a substantial development, not a piecemeal step.</p>
<p>I honestly want whatever option has the most likelihood of being built.</p>
<p>Nature trails lead to private property of Mt View Cemetery. They will object to use of their property for nature trails.</p>
<p>What has been done to allow for noise and light mitigation?</p>
<p>Why are 2 houses in this area at market value being added in all options without discussion. Can't the City pick some spot in the rest of the city to put new housing?</p>
<p>The proposal for possible one single family housing on Abbott and one on Maxwellton is not realistic. The specific lots would be on narrow streets and steep hillsides. A recent new construction on Maxwellton took more years than projected and has created road damage from heavy construction trucks on Maxwellton Rd. Traffic up and down Maxwellton has increased in recent years and often two cars can not pass each other going opposite directions. Please re-consider and remove this proposal.</p>
<p>Having housing in the Blair Park area seems a little exposed, not as private as on the hill.</p>
<p>I think the other options that move or sharing corporate yard are preferable— corpyard takes up too much space currently</p>





Affordable Housing will de-value the City of Piedmont property values, create over population and crime.
Why not build even more housing? There seems to be more room in this version.
Putting all the housing on a narrow strip of land on Moraga Ave seems problematic in terms of getting in and out of the houses on to a busy road and still having safe routes for pedestrians and cyclists even with a new signal which seems far from the project
For this hillside location, two level parking should be considered to retain some open space for picnic tables, a tot lot etc. I.e. Things that build community. Why is there no convenience store or Amazon Depot? Why is there no mention of the existing trail from the parking lot to the street above? A traffic circle would be more effective given the drunks and stolen vehicles that regularly get smashed up further down Moraga. They would blow through traffic signals that probably stay green at night. A traffic circle would also make a nice entry into Piedmont and be a good place for event and fire safety signage. No gated community please.
losing this wild space seems like a bad step
Bad lighting for anything that is built there and will be harder to get a good price for market rate units.
I think important to all options is pedestrian safety across Moraga. I think the only safe option for pedestrians is a bridge. That is a dangerous road. There will be mistakes with people not stopping for a sign or light in time. It's dark in the canyon. I think a pedestrian bridge is a requirement. It could also be simple but visually beautiful.
If we must choose an option, Option 1 makes the most sense to me. Cost effective, puts housing away from all current uses and it would be all on its own side of the street, current recreation land uses do not need to be altered, all recreation uses remain on the same side of the street and citizens would not have to deal with crossing street traffic. Reinforce the Blair Park Hillside with a retaining wall and place all the new construction there out of the way of our existing public space and use. The houses above Blair Park will be able to look over the tops of the new residential buildings retaining their views still enjoying the naked green hillside views.
Terrible option.
All options are so despicable.
Are none of you thinking how those children stuffed off in a corner of piedmont will be perceived by their fellow classmates????
I think the is the best of the 4 options. Most of the construction expense remains on the housing which can be recouped.
Just makes sense . Cost .
This is obviously a bad idea.
The traffic would be a nightmare if we add homes here. How are you planning for that?



<p>Creates somewhat of a wall canyon housing effect on the upper portion of Moraga. Better to push the middle two units back further toward the hill and screen them with landscaping.</p>
<p>Generally, nothing about this Option (or, I expect, any of the others) is important or not important to me. Perhaps you should have asked what I find attractive or like (or do not).</p>
<p>The higher density housing does not seem well worked into the larger urban structure.</p> <p>It's good to have a traffic light for access to the field et .... But of that many people are going to live in these new housing structures shouldn't there'd be a traffic light in front of those structures too?</p>
<p>The corp yard should be reconfigured for maximum efficiency on the south side. The current space occupied by the corp yard is wasteful. For decades, it has been a special retreat for staff, so their reluctance is understandable. However, their customs should not be the driver of land use for the entire region.</p>
<p>5-story podium buildings are absolutely the wrong choice for this site. Tall, blocky, overbearing, formulaic boxy architecture. This site should NOT look like Broadway in Oakland or downtown Berkeley. The far better choice — and the only option that stands any chance of “pencil” in the immediately foreseeable future — is the lowest-density alternative. Two- and three story buildings with some tuck-under parking and some on-grade surface parking (no structural concrete \$\$\$). There is no reason not to use substantially all of the land area of the site for buildings and parking. Modest amounts of well-designed landscaping will make for an attractive project.</p> <p>A well-designed project of this scale would be infinitely more attractive than the proposed podium structures, which could not possibly look more grotesque in this location. Fire the consultant!</p>
<p>Walkability and alternatives to car travel are important. I don't see enough here.</p>
<p>leaving the corp yard untouched is not the answer</p>
<p>Do not approve such a large percentage of low cost house. Too concentrated.</p>
<p>The additional housing is not being thought through at a civic level. Just 1.5 cars per unit, would be 195 new parking spaces. With Moraga Canyon already a tight space, this will lead to on-street parking that will be hazardous due to the windy nature of the area.</p>
<p>Better than options 2&amp;3.</p>



<p>If there's an efficient way to manage east bound traffic this might be a very viable option. I believe a roundabout road would be better safer than a new signalized intersection.</p> <p>The concern is traffic flow on east bound side, if it's possible to isolate vehicles when entering roads.</p> <p>Would be great to have a dog park area incorporated (not a high priority).</p>
<p>placing all the new housing in Blair Park destroys all the open space that exists there now</p>
<p>I don't think the aesthetics of four large multi unit buildings along Moraga fit the look and feel of Piedmont especially on a street that acts as a gate to one entry point to the city, I feel like tucking it away is a much better option</p>
<p>Not my favorite</p>
<p>it is a wste of resurces</p>
<p>Developers undoubtedly will prefer Opt. 1 as it is simpler and less dependent on other improvements in Moraga Canyon. The one infrastructure improvement identified of moving the existing wastewater pipe in Blair Park seems to be something that should be done.</p>
<p>I do not care for Option 1.</p>
<p>This is a very small road that does not need more housing or construction or parking as mentioned it is a main entrance and exit for the people who live in Piedmont. It needs to remain safe for Travel.</p>
<p>I believe this option should not be approved. Blair Park should continue to be vital open space and one of the few opportunities for dog owners in the City.</p>
<p>Location of DUs is terrible along Moraga. Especially market rate, won't be as valuable close to the road with no open space, traffic noise and no views.                  Zone additional SFUs north of proposed to create more value for developer</p>
<p>The Blair Park area with the housing gets no sun in the winter, and little in the summer. Not really desirable places to live.</p>
<p>Blair Park is wonderful as an open space and woodland habitat for creatures. It is not, however, welcoming as a living space for homes as it is dark and dank and is adjacent to a noisy, busy, dangerous thoroughfare. It could be suitable as office, storage and parking space for the Corporation Yard which would not include children who would be tempted to cross Moraga Ave.</p>
<p>irradical design</p>
<p>I think housing on this side would be more peaceful</p>
<p>I strongly dislike this option as it will basically build all of the housing right along the road. I think this will be unattractive and unsafe as this road already carries a ton of traffic going very fast.</p>



Piedmont is lacking recreation fields for its kids. They are asked to drive out of the area to practice.
In general I think traffic calming measures would be needed for the area since there is a lot of traffic.
I like option one the best.
Limited access to the 130 DU from Moraga Ave, there may be big traffic implications. Also evacuation during a wildfire would be difficult.
If the field remains where it is, and especially if it is expanded, I think it is really important to create an easier pedestrian link on the downhill side of the field so that more people could walk from other areas in Piedmont to the field. It's not that far but it seems far because you have to come all the way up the hill past the field to access it, rather than from the downhill side
This shows the least imagination of any options, just jamming housing on the remaining open space south of Moraga and leaving most of the rest of what is north of Moraga essentially the same (while jamming two houses at the dead ends of the roads abutting the corporation yard that will only be expensive builds)
We need public transit to support people who don't own cars and make the housing accessible
Best captures value of existing infrastructure rather than relocating sport field and corp yard.
Wildlife corridor connecting open space.
Market rate and affordable housing should be mixed. Equality should be our value. There should be no stigma attached to the affordable units. Do not physically separate them.
No.
Unclear where parking and access to Blair Park housing units will be located. How will potential congestion on Moraga from new housing units be addressed?
This piece of property should be left alone, there is not enough depth to properly develop the housing unit and parking in this area
This piece of property should be left alone, there is not enough depth to properly develop the housing unit and parking in this area
I like this option the best. How come only two market rate homes on Maxwellton? Could you instead make a new cul-de-sac road at the top of that ridge and build several market rate homes along the road?
I don't like this option as it destroys Blair Park and creates congestion along Moraga Road.



<p>It's a good idea to separate the corporation yard from the housing. It already coexists with the playfield, but adding more people all the time might create issues. Figuring out a spot for a dog park might be helpful to Maxwellton and new residents. This option 1 seems to have the least impact overall, as not much is moving, just being added.</p>
<p>I'm concerned about the traffic management.</p>
<p>While those market rate lots are a great location for homes, it does add more houses in a problematic area for wildfire evacuation.</p>
<p>We don't seem to be optimizing open space with this option, but just spreading everything out a bit more</p>
<p>Housing location will not be as desirable in this location for the residences because they will be disconnected from the field, more cramped, closer to the street traffic and kids will need to cross Moraga twice when walking the center of town unless a sidewalk is created on that side of Moraga. As an observer, housing in this location will feel cramped and be an eye sore.</p>
<p>Option 1 is very problematic given the inherent roadway sightlines of arterial Moraga Avenue. You simply will not be able to have pedestrians safely cross Moraga. Additionally placing a stoplight will create severe traffic issues on arterial Moraga Avenue and likely lead to litigation with Plaintiff Oakland as was threatened in 2012 concerning converting Blair Park to a soccer complex.</p>
<p>I dislike the idea of losing Blair Park.</p>
<p>-seems like if we are building new housing, why not take advantage of the views: so I would prefer to build the housing on the hillside and not on the Blair Park footprint</p>
<p>Not enough density</p>
<p>Don't like the idea of separating the housing from fields</p>
<p>existing skate park is not in a good spot for skaters and seems a waste of some of the very best views</p>
<p>If I was living in these apartments, this option would be the least attractive. It places my residence directly on Moraga Ave with virtually no buffer to traffic and noise. There is no green space buffer or privacy. Parking will be very limited, and I have no idea where visitors will park. Importantly, my kids would have to cross Moraga Ave to get to school, which will be dangerous and entirely unnecessary given the other options. And when I pull out in my car, I am exiting directly into traffic on Moraga. I wouldn't want to live here.</p>



## What features of Option 2 are important to you?

While the location of playing fields at Blair Park seems low impact, anyone who has walked or cycled on Moraga Av. knows how scary it can be. I cannot imagine having children getting out of cars and other ball field activities on such a busy street.
I like having the housing around the here, it will be much more pleasant on this side of Moraga. It also takes advantage of the wonderful views of the bay.
I don't think this would work out well and require way more construction. There is not enough room for a soccer field south of Moraga, not to mention the recreation area already exists at coaches field. The grassy area south of Moraga is practically unused, and a great location for new housing.
Signal for crossing is great.
Keeping the recreation space on the Blair Park site, even if it is active.
partial preservation of Blair Park new public trail access
It seems more disruptive and expensive overall without much advantage.
None
Please see comments on Option 1. I don't believe any of the other scenarios are realistic/financially feasible.
- The housing takes advantage of the views & open space & it is more protected from Moraga Ave so safer from cars. - I like that all the rec facilities are grouped together: field, skate & dog parks - It looks like it would allow some of "Blair Park" to remain as open space
Moving coaches field to a more easily accessible area and keeping the area somewhat open without construction.
Improvements to Moraga Ave, including signaled intersection for safety.
New public trail access.
gets official u14 field
Keeping the Corporation Yard intact
None... a bad plan for safety as well as expense
1) development of hiking trails
Housing on the north site is much more appropriate.
Why would you move the soccer field and skate park when you already have them in place? Keeping the corporation yard intact is wise.
None - this is a terrible idea - one that appears that it would burden the City with extraordinary costs and liabilities. Overly developer friendly and City unfriendly.
Separating the market rate housing from the affordable housing is a BAD idea. Don't do it! Building housing next the the Corp yard is a terrible idea.



new public trail access
The consultant speaking in accompanying video said the two market rate units at Maxwellton and Abbott would be easily rolled into the main development, so please eliminate these from all four plans. They are poorly conceived for numerous reasons and unnecessarily significantly impact existing resident on those streets.
Public Trail Access
New housing. The location of the housing is separated from the sports facilities activities. Creates a much nicer housing environment for the housing. Improved Moraga Ave., new signalized intersection, new public trail access, additional parking, new sports facilities.
Massive and unnecessary costs - relocating soccer/ball park/skate park
would like to tuck housing into hill side or be partially hidden
Dog park, improved Moraga Ave, new intersection sound good.
I like the value contribution of the market rate on this side of the Canyon
putting the soccer field in Blair park would create a problem for the immediate and surrounding neighbors with additional traffic, safety and noise.
slightly better
Expansion of Coaches Field to include regulation size soccer field
Safety features - pedestrian and emergency
I don't like option two at all. We've already evaluated Blair Park for a sports field and it is a terrible site. I equally dislike separating the market-rate housing to the hillside, giving those units, better reviews and more distance from traffic. Ugh
None. I'm absolutely against this project in any form. We need to keep the last open space just that. Development should be built where people are close to services, not where a car is required. I repeat, Moraga has heavy traffic twice a day to the point where it's near impossible to turn on to the road. The light at Moraga & Highland backs up so severely that it takes several lights to move forward. The intersection of Moraga and Thornhill is a joke. You can't even get into the left lane to turn onto Thornhill as it's so backed up. We have the luxury of having cars but also elect not to go at out during rush hour due to the amount of traffic. We didn't spend human sweat equity to defeat the previous canyon development to have it developed.
We need the open space
I like the field space. I also like the housing units placed closer to Highland Ave and adjacent to an existing sidewalk for pedestrian routes to schools.
None
The addition of the dog park in this plan is nice. Additional parking for field use is important.
Housing unit on the north (coaches field side of moraga canyon)



I do not like at all that the soccer field and skate park would have to be moved likely using public funds. And again, we all need to know how much all these four options would cost us, both in moving recreation facilities and the overall option costs to our taxpayers.
The soccer field in Blair Park reduces the use of the park and open space for hiking, picnics and dog walking. We don't like the use of Blair Park for the soccer and baseball fields. We are also very worried about Moraga Road being clogged with traffic before, during and after games.
Lower impact on Blair
Location of all the housing on the Coaches side of Moraga Avenue.
This preserves the open space/recreational use of Blair Park. It provides traffic control for all the new housing through the new signalized intersection, thus limiting the traffic impact on Moraga. It provides public transit access to the new dense housing and bike and pedestrian improvements. Housing is separate from the recreational facilities to reduce noise and possible lights, yet the recreation facilities are nearby. I also like the new hiking trail.
New public trail access should be the only thing going on in this canyon.
Loss of large baseball/softball field is an undesirable feature of this design.
Another nonstarter. No recreational uses should go on the south side.
There is still a problem with a busy road cutting through a new residential area and public spaces. Moving the road to the south would eliminate this and make it safer for pedestrians. Currently most youth and adults who use the field come by car. The traffic problems are not trivial. There is a wooden deck walkway linking to the rest of town but it gets light use. This would make that problem worse.
I like having a new expanded field and putting the housing off from the road
Keeping a local soccer field. The housing looks decently tucked away, which is sort of nice. The new public trail access (i meant to mention that in option 1 as well)
Still having a soccer field.
Housing including affordable, but this seems like it would be considerably more costly to construct than option 1, unless the higher value of the market rate housing would assist I. Underwriting the affordable.
at least Coach's field is relocated, however, this looks expensive. Haven't we been through this when Blair Park was previously considered for a soccer field?
A sports field in Blair Park was proposed and ultimately rejected by the City Council 11 years ago as being too expensive to build and a totally inadequate site. There is no room for sidelines for a U14 soccer field. The proposed field would have required excavating into the hillside, endangering houses above on Scenic Ave, and required a retaining wall along Moraga Ave. NOTHING in Blair Park has changed since the sports field was rejected a decade ago. It's a ridiculous plan.
I like that open space is maintained on the current site of Blair park.





Loss of open space
More parking for coaches field
Additional parking.
Keeping the baseball / softball field.
The field week have to be artificial turf because there's not enough sunlight for natural turf. This is a very expensive option.
Positive Features: 1) Corporation Yard left intact for minimal impact to their workflow.
Negative: 1) Giving up all of Blair Park open space for housing. 2) Soccer field noise for residents living above on Scenic. 3) Highest Infrastructural Impact score of all options.
I appreciate that all du are clustered in one area, in this scenario on the north side of Moraga. I also appreciate the recreational uses being clustered on the south side of Moraga. However, I do not like this option's overall higher environmental impact score of 2.8. Minimizing environmental impacts is important to me.
Dog park, public trail
trail is nice feature
Trail access
None. While having a traffic light at Coaches Field would be nice, we wouldn't use it if the baseball field is gone.
I like 100% of housing on Coaches field
No additional street or pedestrian traffic going up Pala
Improved Moraga Ave, bike lanes, pedestrian crosswalk, signal lights Enclosed Dog Park that's flat! Housing that is not in Blair Park. Housing in Blair park would create a corridor effect and really change the feeling of Moraga Canyon Maintaining Corporation Yard
DU affordable housing. New signaled intersection. Dog park.
New skatepark location
Improved Moraga Rd
Signaled Intersection and crosswalk Affordable Housing Additional Parking
Minimizing the reflected sound off the retaining wall that supports the soccer field. Traffic noises will be amplified at all hours of the day.



I like that the housing comes off the main road. Gives market rate housing fantastic views. Sets precedent that additional housing could be built on hill. Keeps primary residential pedestrian traffic with a continuous pedestrian walkway into Piedmont Center. Like that it provides an opportunity to redesign skate park.
Loss of open space is sad to see. Also I fear this option would lead to more traffic and congestion on Moraga.
as much affordable housing as possible
Grouping together affordable & market rate housing, new signal intersection
keeping corp yard
Option two would be more expensive than option one.
None.
none - awful
I like the idea of the soccer field having its own space since the kids don't have enough soccer fields here. The dog park and skate park are easily accessible in this plan. There is parking now on this side of the street. The new housing can take advantage of views on this plan.
Keeping the new housing out of Blair Park.
Improved soccer fields and expanded parking
horrible.. moving a field across the road because it is easier to build housing on existing flat space doesn't make any sense. Then you are building twice for one thing.
Location of housing is desirable
affordable housing
This option seems to cannibalize the entire area and includes the loss of Coaches field. This is a lose/lose option which includes increased traffic which seems inevitable. None of the options addresses this concern in any meaningful way. None of the options address the lack of grocery and other services within walking distance for low income residents.
New housing. Improved sports facility. Maintain civic uses. Improve Public works facilities.
I think separating the housing and the field might be appealing to the new homeowners/renters. The north side of Moraga has better views.
I do NOT support housing views at the expense of recreational views. All sorts of people come to watch the games at the fields. The beauty of Piedmont should be showcased to all - residents and visitors alike.
Concern about pedestrian (particularly young people) crossing Moraga.
that there are no homes on the now open area side.



Signal Improve parking Dog park
This is probably my favorite option. It preserves Blair Park as open space, adds much-needed parking for the playing field, and avoids the significant expense of creating an underground parking garage beneath the playing field. It also places the new housing units where I think they will be most pleasant for new occupants and most valuable to the city.
The new signalized intersection and additional parking.
Keep housing appearance and footprint consistent with canyon space.
I like that the housing is on the east/north side of Moraga Canyon and therefore less visible/more tucked away. And I like that the sports field will on the west side will retain some of the green, open space effect we have now.
Interesting alternative. Does it really work? It would seem to make more sense to give the housing the best access to the street.
I like that Blair park is still maintained as relatively open space I like that the housing units have space around them I like the new public trail access
Good playing field with adequate parking. So many kids in this town use this. Building up the slope, utilizing land otherwise not used.
This is my least favorite option. I don't like the idea of moving the field to Blair Park. It looks like it will limit the scope of what can be used on the field (i.e., no baseball?)
I like how there is still a sports field and I like the addition of an actual dog park
This plan is the most expensive. It builds all new recreational and city buildings plus adds all the low income housing for the City in one location. You have created a low income ghetto . The neighbors of this area are paying for 1) increased noise 2) light pollution 3) new City facilities and all of the low income housing in their neighborhood. Plus they are now adding 2 market rate lots in their neighborhood on very narrow streets.
This is less invasive to the environment but will destroy Coaches Field and require building a new facility. Looks expensive.
Lots of housing units Improved sports field with more parking Safer intersection
There was a proposal to build a Soccer Field on Coaches Field, which PRFO , opposed in 2012. Please refer to the history of this proposal, the lawsuits and ultimate City Council decision to rescind the proposal. Not
Expanded soccer field, skate park, taking advantage of views for housing.
The housing is off the street and all together
Soccer field



Trail access, intersection, improved moraga ave.
Tucking the units on coaches field, new facilities on Blair park site, more pedestrian and parking, shared common
Sports Field
I don't think the cost of moving the field is a good use of funds
Sports fields and parking.
Nice idea to put all the housing on one side of the road and the field on the other side. Signal on Moraga ave seems sensible for safety.
Good views and a nice trail will help to incentivize developers.
Like the soccer field and the housing is more tucked away.
the hiking trail
dog park is a nice addition
Moving sports field.
Don't like moving the field to the south side of Moraga. I prefer Option 3
I appreciate that all housing is in the better location, better visually and better for the community living there. More \$ for at market housing too. I appreciate that there is still a dog park area. I appreciate the recreation upgrade.
None. No features of option 2 are important to me. Not a good option improvement over option 1. The most important thing is to keep all the public recreation use attractions on one side of the street avoiding citizens having to cross the road to get to multiple facilities.
This option also does not utilize the space that Piedmont currently has in the best manner... shoving a skate park, dog park, AND a huge soccer/softball field in that narrow space does not make sense given the traffic and safety of the area... There is space on the other side of the canyon to RETHINK the need/desire/location for a park and field.
Safe pedestrian traffic.
Sports field. Adequate space for city corporation yard.
Nothing
This reduces the number of points where traffic will be entering Moraga so is slightly better than option 1. Now you've replaced the entry points with people crossing a very busy and dangerous road at peak traffic times.
Also it still has far more cars on Moraga which already cannot handle it. Where are the at least 100 more cars going to go? There is no public transport and AC Transit already underserves. How do you expect 110 people to get here without additional cars?
Dog park
Maintains trail behind units. Sets the units back from the road better and provides views from the units.
It raises the visibility of the play field. The housing forms a "community".



I like Option 1 - this one is too complicated and involves too many unnecessary changes.
The new housing seems much better integrated— visually, spatially, ... and so I likely also socially which is of utmost importance. This plan makes an effort to arrange that like existing residents of Piedmont, residents of the new dense housing structures will feel they live in a green area, with organic access to community spaces.
The cost of relocating the existing sports field and unused skate park is unnecessary. The corp yard in the middle of housing also does not make sense. It would never happen if the corp yard weren't there already, because of the jarring disconnect between the two disparate uses in such close proximity.
Need to address transportation and congestion. I don't see features to make the housing and recreation facilities accessible by foot or bicycle. Please address public transit options for new development.
Do not approve of so many low rent housing units in one area. Reduces the attractiveness of added housing. Becomes the ghetto of Piedmont
Again in Option 2, you have no parking for any of the housing. Thats 200-300 cars not being accounted for. This is beginning to smell worse and worse.
Sports field in Blair Park is poor choice. Keeping corp yard where currently located is good. Impact is worst with this option. Poor option.
Potential cost to city for moving playing field. Prior traffic and environmental impact did not support development of this area for soccer field.
This plan makes the most sense to me. It provides housing as needed without burdening residents with an active play field and the parking issues that will bring. It contains the field to its own area.
Traffic flow looks better, the new road connection that heads west bound. The only concern would be illegal east bound (left) turns.
placing the soccer field in Blair Park is again a negative and severely impacts existing residents
I don't like the loss of the open space and moving the soccer field
None
not a fan of option 2
The housing in one spot is nice, as is the integration with the open space.
This is the second worst option in my opinion. It significantly decreases the open space in Blair Park and it creates additional safety issues for people needing to cross Moraga to get to the sports facilities.
none
I like interspersing market rate and affordable housing together, field and dog park



The sequence of development is key. The ability to develop housing projects will be tied to the relocation of Coaches Field. There does not seem to be any compelling need to relocate Coaches Field so this is an unneeded and potentially burdensome plan.
I like the idea of moving the field and improving it.
None of them, but if I had to pick, I'd say market rate houses, but no one in there right mind would want to pay big dollars and live by section 8 people
Keeping affordable housing mixed with market rate housing (not isolating affordable housing).
Multi use sports field Moraga Ave improvements Pedestrian access to/from town
Public trails are nice
The plan is better for real and desireable housing.
Keeping the u14 field. Keeping the dog park as part of Blair park.
Again, this option, while better than Option 1, would locate children on Blair Park which inherently includes the dangers of crossing this busy roadway. Children will be tempted to cross at any point on the roadway and may not heed warnings to cross only at proscribed crossings.
safty.....cars & humans
Again, like that housing and recreation are separated from a traffic safety perspective.
the housing is better placed; not right on the road
Soccer field / Skate spot
This option seems much better as the housing is set on a larger lot and does not seem to be squished in to a single area.
None. I don't like option 2 because it seems silly to move the field when that is unnecessary.
Multi family homes
I like that the housing is all together and think the views could be amazing. Can we fit a U14 field in Blair Park? If so, I think that could be a great place for recreational activities, as long as there is parking and pedestrian access.
Keeping some open space in the existing Blair Park. Having the 130 DU spread out and not all directly along Moraga Ave.
The housing is situated nicely along the hillside
This one seems like a great option in terms of the placement of the housing units. Also, the recreation is on the side of Moraga that has the larger Piedmont population,
Signalized intersection, more space for the housing north of Moraga so that location seems better (and at least some folks would have view from there)
Public trail access
Sports fields with sufficient parking on south side of Moraga. New Housing appears to blend in well to hillside. This version appears to have it all. Well done!



Separation of housing and sports facilities is good.
Maintaining open space. Like the location of the housing.
Separation between sports field and housing; probably creates higher value housing than option #1.
As with before improved intersection & public trail are great. I like the rec facilities having been moved to Blair park - as long as there's good sidewalks added, it's great to have them on the side of Moraga where most kids live (to make walking to / back safer). I like the utilization of views.
All of them except the two market rate houses.
Access and parking to new affordable housing with minimal congestion. Productive use of Blair Park space for recreation.
Safe crossing. Like the housing being more hidden.
slightly more desirable since it impacts Blair Park to a lesser degree
slightly more desirable since it impacts Blair Park to a lesser degree
Sports fields, dog park, skate park, green space, trail access
Public trail access. Improved Moraga Ave/Signal. Skate park improved access.
The location of the high-density houses. I think that mashing them all together with their only street access near a blind curve on a high-speed road isn't ideal unless a light is installed at the entrance to the development.
The 2010 vision of soccer fields at Blair Park would be realized for the children of the generation that the fields were first proposed and the community gets new housing.
I like that the skate park will be redesigned and hopefully more appealing and an updated dog park. It would be visually appealing to have all recreation activity on one side of the road and houses on the other.
I don't like it at all
It seems a better use of the existing land and improves upon current Blair Park site.
-new public trail
-improved Moraga Ave with signalized intersection
-soccer field with softball overlay
-housing on the hillside to provide nice views
Clustering if housing
All housing on North side of Moraga Ave is a better option. Public trail access.
n/a
None
This is a disaster. The idea of a dog park maybe but that's it.



improved fields new and improved skate spot maximizing views hillside trails
public access trail
More privacy; potentially better traffic management and my kids can access the sidewalk on the north side to walk to school. It might actually be pretty.
Housing is off the main road
Like that it still includes a skate park





## What features of Option 2 are NOT important to you?

Although I have been opposed to having the soccer field at Blair Park, I prefer that than having housing there. In case of an earth quake with land slides, it is better to have a field affected than housing.
Skate park
None. Its a good option.
Do not want a U-14 soccer field on South side of Moraga.
new skate spot
Trails.
All
N/A
- The field
Dog Park.
2 market rate houses on Abbott and Maxwellton.
I oppose the following: - Building of single family housing near Maxwellton and Abbott as they are not state requirements under the CA Housing Element and doubly impact our neighborhood congestion (the low income housing development and the addition of market value single family homes) - Expansion or any modification to Coaches Field, as this is a separate issue not related to the Housing Element and inclusion of it in the specific plans is confounding the issues
1) likely more expensive and less feasible then option one 2) moves the soccer field to a less ideal location 3) does not include safe egress path 4) effects views
The soccer field should remain on the north side. Blair should be preserved as is.
Don't move the soccer field to Blair Park. Put the houses there. it's the most logical and least expensive (likely) alternative.
N/A
Too dangerous for those needing to cross Moraga
not sure why you would move the soccer field
Signalized
Dog park



<p>SFD are not part of housing element requirements. New trail will increase illegal trespassing on nearby home owners and Mountain View cemetery and seriously impact ingress of Piedmont Fire department and emergency vehicles on Maxwellton and surrounding streets due to narrowness of streets/. Significant impact on Oakland home owners due to parking constraints.</p>
<p>Concerned about adding so many multitenant buildings, and affordable housing, and the crime it could bring and the congestion.</p>
<p>It is not important to me to expand the soccer field nor put it on Blair park. I think that will increase and disrupt traffic flow significantly. Think about driving up Linda past beach school any time the soccer field is being used there....very concerning traffic congestion and that is a less traveled street. Tucked in a neighborhood like Hampton field, seems much less disruptive?</p>
<p>Retention of skate park                  Separation of 2 dwelling units from rest of development</p>
<p>See above.</p>
<p>We do not need all this housing also NO SIGNAL</p>
<p>I do not think that Piedmont needs to provide a skate spot. It is very cement-dominant which is very environmentally damaging. There are other skating opportunities in neighboring communities.</p>
<p>Disruption to both spaces, the canyon and Blair Park</p>
<p>Skate Park</p>
<p>Keeping corporation yard intact                  Soccer and softball field in Blair Park</p>
<p>If the ball field and skate park could be relocated without the use of any public funds/bonds/taxes, and the public cost to build this entire option is the same for all Piedmont taxpayers, then it doesn't matter.</p>
<p>The dog park, new public trails, new skate spot, pedestrian improvements on the Blair Park side of Moraga Avenue.</p>
<p>The dog park is not needed - Piedmont has enough dog parks and there will still be open space in Blair Park.</p>
<p>Don't need a new dog park.                  Don't need to create more traffic congestion on Moraga Ave by adding "New Signalized intersection".                  Don't need to destroy Blair park (one of the few remaining open spaces in Piedmont available for resident to walk to) with ill fitting and ill thought out new construction schemes.</p>



<p>Keeping the corp yard as-is                  for most of us the Yard is a black box. We do not know how heavily it is used and whether it needs to be the size that it is, etc. Please talk more about the Corp yard and the needs of the city. Obviously, it needs to be within City limits but what about location and size?</p>
<p>Not important to have the lower income housing closer to Moraga</p>
<p>Skate park</p>
<p>I do not like sacrificing city property for a housing project that does not benefit the current residents of the city. The only apparent benefits are to those who obtain the housing and the developer and contractors who profit from the project.</p>
<p>Remove/relocate market rate housing to minimize impact on long-term Piedmont residents. Additionally, these are on steep and hard to get to locations. There is no grade shown on SFD lot on Maxwelton; in fact this is a very steep grade. How about placement somewhere that is flatter and requires less engineering. These two houses seemingly just appeared at the final hour with no community input and little thought put into location as they are on all four proposals.</p>
<p>Remove public trail access on Maxwelton. There is no parking available on Maxwelton or nearby streets, both in Piedmont and Oakland. Maxwelton is not wide enough for two-way traffic; the road cannot handle increase usage. Furthermore, we are concerned about access for emergency service vehicles. In the past when the gate was not able to fully shut, neighbors here experienced many disruptions late at night. Trailhead will promote illegal trespassing on Mountain View Cemetery property. Trailhead has potential to be a public nuisance.</p>
<p>There is nothing "NOT important" about my opposition to this plan, as explained above.</p>
<p>Time without fields when work is being done and fields moved</p>
<p>Don't like the sports fields on the other side of Moraga Ave.</p>
<p>Adding any housing. U14 soccer field in the new location. Having a signal at the intersection.</p>
<p>Retaining the Skate Park.</p>
<p>The two additional du off Maxwelton and Abbott are unimportant and possibly deleterious to me given I live off Maxwelton. It is extremely narrow and often unpassable by two cars at the same time. Parking is also extremely limited. I do not drive it in the dark to avoid head-on collisions, and often take Harbord as an alternative route, thereby placing negative externalities on the adjacent Oakland neighborhood. Harbord already receives a lot of commute traffic to circumvent the already very busy Moraga commute shed. This Upper Rockridge neighborhood should have been included in the project notifications and mailings.</p>
<p>Skate park</p>



<p>Dog Park is not important          Soccer field is not important          Skate park not important          Do not want signalized intersection this will cause smog to build up and traffic back up.</p>
<p>Everything else</p>
<p>Where did this public access trail come from?? it simply will create more problems than we have in the space behind it</p>
<p>Adding another soccer field to Piedmont is not really necessary. And sacrificing the open space at Blair Park for a soccer field is a poor choice for the City.</p>
<p>I dont like putting the play fields on the South side of the road. It is too dangerous</p>
<p>U14 soccer field location          70 Market rate housing          2 Market rate</p>
<p>Market rate housing</p>
<p>Housing location</p>
<p>Soccer Field          Dog Park</p>
<p>Soccer field and softball field</p>
<p>dog park</p>
<p>dog park</p>
<p>seems WAY too expensive, since moving almost everything.          soccer field seems too exposed to traffic          keeping and moving the skate park.          the 2 stand alone houses</p>
<p>This option makes the least sense to me - it requires disrupting use of the field, just to still end up with the field and the housing on opposite sides of the road.</p> <p>The additional parking on the Blair Park side is wasteful and a horrible reason to destroy existing green space. Instead, we should try to consolidate parking as much as possible on a brownfield portion of the site, such as the existing corp yard. Create one consolidated parking structure and let people walk to their final destination, rather than creating a surface parking lot for every single destination. This relatively small site really does not need multiple surface parking lots that create impermeable surface, increase heat, and destroy open space.</p>
<p>All of the housing. This is a disaster and perhaps an intentionally bad option to make the others look good.</p>
<p>The soccer field. Please drop this idea.</p>
<p>Dog run space</p>



Corp Yard next to new housing doesn't feel right. Who wants to live next to a parking lot of municipal work vehicles?
skate park market rate housing
Moving sports field. Providing views for the new housing.
Keeping the Corp yard intact. I think it needs some improvements.
I don't think keeping the Corporation Yard at its current location is important
All features that increase congestion on moraga Ave are not important to me
Skate park
Skate park — move it.
I have to say this is odd/difficult wording for these choices. What's not important to me about this??? I can more easily say what I like and what I don't like.
Do we need a new skate spot?
Corporate yard untouched.
Not sure who is going to pay for the infrastructure upgrades. Hard to see how this pencils for a developer.
Skate park
Dog park
Skate park, dog park.
Skate park, housing
I like all the features
Any type of housing
Don't like moving the soccer field across moraga
Trail access.
Nobody uses the existing skate park. If push comes to shove, that space is better off as a tot lot or a splash park. A U14 field in Blair Park would likely create a need for additional tall fencing up against Moraga and eliminate flexibility for an effective wildlife corridor. Moving the field will incur additional expense.
again, the loss of blair park seems like a bad step
I would prefer housing off of Moraga and not a field there, parking would be trickier
none
I worry about parking being split and people crossing the street without a pedestrian bridge.
I do not find it important to place the residential development where they have views or to have the residential integrated with recreational facilities.
Skate park.
Skate park , why why
Housing



It is possible that the new rec site in what is now Blair park will offer slightly less than coaches field, but I'm ok with that because Piedmonters will still definitely go there and use it. That's why I think putting the rec site in that awkward Blair parks space, rather than the housing, has a better chance of maintaining (or at least not actively undermining) community cohesion.
Relocating the sports facilities.
Again in Option 2, you have no parking for any of the housing. Thats 200-300 cars not being accounted for. This is beginning to smell worse and worse.
corporation yard being left where it is.
Why is the skate park so important to keep? If you are moving the soccer field, perhaps its worth considering what the overall community needs are since you're adding so many more people and shifting the center of gravity for the city?
all
See above. I don't see any value in relocating Coaches Field to Blair Park.
NO skate park! Terrible use of space!
All of it
require grading work and additional parking. The skate spot would be on this side as well.
Establishing soccer field and skate park in Blair Park. This should remain open space and available for dog walkers. Query--does anyone currently use the skate park?
Leaving PW as-is. The city facilities are old and inefficient. Should be improved as part of development requirements
The corporation yard remaining untouched
coaches field, recreation, xmas tree, pumpkins, open space
I don't think this is a serious option per last effort to put a field on Blair. Putting a big field on Blair was deemed technically risky and very challenging from a construction point of view due to slope in the last effort, so I question the viability of a u14 field there. Have all those involved done their homework on this? I think it should be quickly evaluated and validated technically before spending more community time on this due to the prior issues.
the dog park , I think this would be ugly
new housing new signal
I don't care that the field would be separated that much from the rest of the housing.
I don't like option 2
Skate park, trails
I'm worried that an expanded playfield and ball field won't fit well and will require too much grading and parking area



Soccer field/skate park south of Moraga; those are fine, just not critical to meeting the Housing Element goals. And does this mean getting rid of a baseball field used by many? Looks like it, but that is not important to me.
Parking, dog park
New skate spot
Soccer fields
Curious whether sports field location creates more traffic since it is (maybe?) less accessible to pedestrians.
Open space should be used for more field space for kids
I don't love that market units and affordable units are in separate buildings. I hope as the development progresses, we can mix them so we don't create further class differentiation in and around Piedmont.
Two market rate SFD houses. What does SFD mean?
Maintaining corporation yard.
Don't need another dog park here. Seems like a more expensive option.
I prefer option three
I prefer option three
Again, squeezing housing units into a cramped space, taking away green space, killing wildlife, losing the visual of trees and plants, losing sports fields for our kids.
The location of the market rate houses.
Separating the housing units by a road seems unnecessary use of space. Maybe a more expensive option to create a new sports field instead of work with the one we have. I don't like that some of the parking for the sports field would require crossing Moraga, being potentially more dangerous and creating more traffic.
Skate park. Corp yard
Soccer field.
-concern that separating all the housing and rec would lead to little integration of new residents
-keeping corp yard intact
Soccer field
SFD.
Soccer field. It's a baseball field that soccer destroys each winter.
Corp yard is not important to have so large.



Moving the fields: currently they're tucked away. Now you'll bring it to a more dangerous area.

A signal will cause ridiculous traffic and, again, more traffic means more pollution. Traffic will lead to angry parents being late and I would anticipate more accidents and injuries to come on Moraga Ave.

dog park





**Is there anything else you'd like to share about Option 2?**

<p>The idea of having hiking trails so convenient to the housing is attractive. This gives homeowners a place to walk without crossing Moraga Ave to go to the current open space.                  This is probably my third preference choice.</p>
<p>If it needs to stay, could Skate Park also include a basketball court? Also, Pickleball is wildly popular and a way to keep citizens healthy if it can overcome the NIMBY protest to noise and people.</p>
<p>It's a good proposal that allows the functions the city needs to stay while expanding and improving public space.</p>
<p>there are no improvements to the dangerous intersection at Maxwellton Road, despite the added traffic, maybe worse with parking lot right across the street</p>
<p>Having a soccer next to a major, busy street where speeding is common is unsafe for kids.                   Also cars entering and exiting the new park will be at risk of car accidents because of speeding cars coming from a curve. Speed limit is 25 mph but average speed is closer to 40 mph.</p>
<p>Seems less optimal.</p>
<p>Please do not move the soccer field to Blair Park, next to the busy street, which would be very dangerous for kids. Besides, it would be too costly to move the soccer field. Its current spot on Coaches Field, which is nicely tucked in, makes a lot more sense for the safety of the field users.</p>
<p>N/A</p>
<p>I worry that the new Coaches Field would be a disruptive place to have it re traffic and the surrounding housing.</p>
<p>- This is my favorite option b/c the different elements seem to be where they fit best e.g. housing w/views &amp; space, more safety from cars,</p>
<p>I think this is the most aesthetically appealing option.</p>
<p>doesnt seem to make a ton of sense to move something that already exists.</p>
<p>- In my book, very high priority to maintain existing green space in Blair Park — the beautiful open space is central to what I love about living in the canyon                  - Worried about light pollution</p>



<p>Not supportive of this option.          Adding this many units of low/mid-income housing to this area, regardless of the option, will negatively impact traffic, noise levels and property values for the Piedmont residents in this neighborhood. As previously pointed out by many residents of Moraga Canyon, this plan forces the majority of units on a single community, no matter how high the barriers for development. We were shocked at how quickly any proposals for build in the center of town were dismissed, despite having many merits. This reinforces the belief that residents with greater influence and financial clout are directing the build away from their homes.</p>
<p>too many housing units in a small area. Not a desirable option.</p>
<p>Please remove the two market rate SFD - this part of Piedmont is taking more than their fair share of new housing. We don't need those two homes there. Plus why sell off two parts? Keep the whole thing open as it is. There are already trails that go from Abbott way and a city gate.</p>
<p>See my comments on Option 1 comments. Thanks.</p>
<p>I do not like this option. The development of the steep terrain in Moraga canyon appears daunting and costly.</p>
<p>These projects put a significant, unfair burden on the residents near the proposed development - Piedmont should be fair and come up with a plan that reduces the impact on these residents and shares more equitably with the rest of Piedmont.</p>
<p>Best option of the three. Sports facilities wear out fast so its best to have new ones. The housing should have the best environment. Maybe the corporate yard could be relocated elsewhere?</p>
<p>Crazy to have a playing field and no parking right there.</p>
<p>I don't dislike it, I just think the cost and time to develop the affordable makes it infeasible.</p>
<p>NOT A GOOD OPTION! Very disruptive to the neighbors due to increased noise, traffic and to the wildlife.</p>
<p>See comments for Option 1</p>
<p>Stop screwing up our town no signal you suck</p>
<p>The "Public Trail Access" is a confusing element.</p>
<p>Not a good solution</p>
<p>I worry about building on the hillside in these locations. (Based on the recurring land slides at the base of Maxwellton Road).          I think this area is less accessible than the south side.</p>
<p>I am concerned that developing both sides of Moraga Canyon (coaches field and blair park) will increase traffic on Moraga Ave. The new developments should be consolidated to the northern side of the canyon allowing blair park to remain as much needed, large open space.</p>



<p>All the options include adding too much housing density to this small area. Housing should be spread out throughout Piedmont and not concentrated in this one corner of the city. This will affect the quality of life of the current neighborhood, will cause traffic jams, sound and light pollution, make the neighborhood less safe during fires and negatively affect the beauty of the canyon.</p>
<p>I favor Plan 4</p>
<p>A public trail up the forest path to Abbot Way would be much better. Not sure the city owns this land.</p>
<p>There is no information on what is defined as affordable housing. It should be the first item clearly defined in the site documentation and easily accessible. I attempted to find this information and could not find it. I know we would all like to see hundreds of affordable housing units built in the community, but the reality is that Piedmont is not an affordable community... it is an affluent community. To create housing for affluent people in the community makes sense because those are the people who can afford to live here after probably having bought their starter house in a lower priced housing area. It is illogical to put "affordable housing" in this neighborhood. The financial impacts are significant and multi-dimensional.</p>
<p>I like the preservation of open space on South side.</p>
<p>The skate park needs to be moved to the center of town. Cramming the park up in a distant corner of this canyon that is not easily reachable by young people is embarrassing. Kids who skate should have a facility that is within walking distance (skating distance) of most homes. For example adjacent to the pool or at one of the central parks. Crocker Park seems particularly underutilized.</p>
<p>I think its a decent option</p>
<p>In regards to the new signalized intersection have heard from long-time residents that a proposal for a traffic light on Moraga did not get approved due to the curve.</p>
<p>Blair Park cannot accommodate a sports field. It should be left as natural open space.</p>
<p>Does it really make sense to relocate a soccer field that already exists? Hillside housing will be more expensive to build than housing on a flat site.</p>
<p>Why do this? It satisfies no interests.</p>
<p>I do not support this option due to the loss of Blair Park's open green space and noise/stadium lighting issues for residents living above the new field.</p>
<p>Regardless of the site plan, 132 additional units in narrow Moraga Canyon will have a deleterious impact on the safety of existing homes and lives in the area. Moraga Ave is a major transportation route for the Hwy 24/13 area (including Montclair and Upper Rockridge whose residents should have been notified of this endeavor). This plan puts thousands of people in the area at risk in the event of a major fire. The arterial already is at or near capacity during commute hours. Moraga is only one of two (the other being Park) connectors for the whole city of Piedmont to Montclair Village, Highway 13, and Hwy 24.</p>



<p>I don't want to spend tax payer funds on any of this. This space, particularly on the south side of the road, opposite the coaches field, is a wonderful wildlife habitat area. Wildlife will be sadly affected. The beautiful daffodils that bloom in the spring, along the side of the road will likely be gone forever.</p>
<p>Do not want signalized intersection this will cause smog to build up and traffic back up.</p>
<p>Cannibalizing the current baseball field at Coaches Field is unconscionable. There aren't enough baseball fields for the City. Where would older kids play baseball now? Hampton and Linda Beach are too small and overused.</p>
<p>Sitelines are terrible along Moraga Avenue and you should keep people off of the South side for that reason. Too dangerous!</p>
<p>I don't think the location of the soccer field is good for the existing houses on the southside.</p>
<p>I think putting all the new housing (intermixed) where Coaches field and the skate park are now makes a lot of sense... easier to put in signaled intersection and it gives the new housing more privacy and is set further back from Moraga Ave...more neighborhood like. The options don't seem to account for enough parking, which has always been an issue at Coaches Field</p>
<p>Improving safety of entering and exiting Maxwellton.</p>
<p>Concern about kids walking to sports field/skate park having to zig zag across Moraga to stay on sidewalk. Seems to make continuous uphill bike lane more challenging than other options.</p>
<p>Option 2 sucks</p>
<p>I don't like the fact that the recreational fields and housing are on opposite sides of the street. The project site would be safer and more vibrant if both were on the same side, with either the corporation yard or open space on the other side, as in Options 3 and 4.</p>
<p>I have this option - awful. This is a disaster and perhaps an intentionally bad option to make the others look good.</p>
<p>Please keep any new housing out of Blair Park. It is bad for the environment, and I am dismayed that the city would even consider taking such an irresponsible step.</p>
<p>I think neighbors above Blair Park would rather have have houses instead of sports field below. Likely higher overall costs.</p>
<p>It looks like there would be a dedicated dog park, which, hopefully would be fenced - especially if there is a soccer field in the vicinity. I really like the idea of a fenced dog park, as we currently don't have one in town. This would be a nice benefit for the new residents.</p>



<p>There is no discussion about additional traffic signals outside the City of Piedmont and how this would impact traffic flows onto highway 13 when trying to enter and exit off of highway 13. These lanes (on Moraga and on the freeway) are already backed up without the additional building structures. What additional road ramps, traffic signals and barriers will be used by the City of Oakland and/or State of California to aid in this project?</p> <p>Also, when the sun is setting, driving down Moraga is difficult. Isn't there anything that could be built over Moraga Ave?</p>
<p>still an issue with traffic and loss of open space.</p>
<p>Picking up and dropping off kids for sports practice at coaches field is a nightmare after school hours.</p>
<p>Factoring in construction costs this is my favorite option. The city has undertaken several expensive projects recently (major high school expansion, new pool, Hampton Field re-do, etc) and I'd prefer not to see a ton of money go to underground parking if it can be avoided.</p> <p>That said I think this scenario puts the affordable housing in the least desirable location for the new occupants. That side of the current field will be a bit dark. The cost of putting the housing in the best place for new residents while not putting the Corp Yard in Blair Park where it will look awful comes in the form of the underground parking garage.</p>
<p>It seems expensive and pointless to relocate the soccer field to Blair Park instead of just building the new dwelling units there.</p>
<p>Again, I like that the housing is tucked above the road.</p>
<p>Prefer not to relocate sports field away from current spot. Creates more noise due to canyon effect.</p>
<p>I think having the housing way down that hill be hard to build, more expensive to build and probably won't get built</p>
<p>Have you allowed for NOISE and LIGHT pollution to the neighbors in any of these options?</p>
<p>Not an option!</p>
<p>I do not like this option</p>
<p>I like how accessible and visible the rec area is in the Blair park area.</p>
<p>I like how it creates a community not right on the busy street and with access to some outdoor space for the new DU's. However, I'm not in love with the soccer field being right on bust Moraga without some protection (like the trees and distance and fence which are present at Coaches currently). It does seem like ther might be more room for small bleachers for the field which is nice.</p>
<p>This seems really good</p>
<p>Don't like the fact that kids would be playing soccer near a very busy Moraga street.</p>



There seems room for more units in this model as well.
I'm concerned that the fields are too exposed in this day and age when people use vehicles as weapons. The current location forces some amount of deceleration and I think the field is actually above the grade of the street.
Any new housing should be privately funded. If any city or public items are being relocated, the new Moraga Canyon developments (not city wide) should cover the cost.
There is no reality where coaches field goes away given the shortage of field space for baseball and soccer. Blair park is not a realistic substitute even if there is technically room to cram a soccer only field there. From a pure safety perspective, you can't have hundreds of children and families trying to enter and exit that location for practices and games.
I think I perhaps don't like this as well as #3 and #4 (as I remember them) b/c you'll miss some open space along the canyon when the rec area is replaced with housing.  I wonder if all housing on this side would lead to better evacuation routes (across the cemetery) in case of emergency? I know most ppl might jump into their cars.... I don't know how likely emergency scenarios might play out.
Scratch option 2 and keep the housing across the street in Blair Park and away from current recreational land uses. This will avoid city wide citizens having to cross the street to access other public facilities.
Have to rethink utilizing the larger space on the other side of the canyon for housing plus the recreational amenities together.
This option 2 maintains a nice appearance to the gateway to the city, but loses the softball field(important) and possibly temporary loss of the use of the field unless the work is staged appropriately. Problems are: errant balls can reach the roadway much easier unless an unsightly high fence is added. Kids have to cross the road to access the existing sidewalk connecting to town. Some residences have to look at the city corporation yard- not the most pretty view. Extra non recoverable cost by moving the sports field.
Having so many people crossing Moraga at peak traffic times is obviously a bad idea.
Traffic would be a nightmare
Creates more of an access problem between the units and playing field for people trying to cross Moraga that live in the units.
Don't understand why you would remove the existing structures to build housing.
I generally like this option.
This Option feels pretty good to me, largely because the market-rate units get to take some advantage of the view from the hillside.
Need to address transportation and congestion. I don't see features to make the housing and recreation facilities accessible by foot or bicycle. Please address public transit options for new development.



Again in Option 2, you have no parking for any of the housing. That's 200-300 cars not being accounted for. This is beginning to smell worse and worse.
Worst of the four. Sports field should not be in Blair Park.
If there's an efficient way to manage east bound traffic this might be a very viable option. I believe a roundabout road would be better safer than a new signalized intersection.
The concern is traffic flow during peak events at the soccer field/softball.
I would not support this option
Option 2 has a ball field in Blair Park which was already rejected years ago. Put the housing in Blair Park. A partial loss of the existing wildlife corridor for housing would be a travesty. All of the area above the corporation yard should be a replacement for Blair Park.
The field is not in a good place
it is a waste of resources
See above. This is a problematic and complicated plan.
I do not like the division of Affordable housing on the bottom of the hill vs Market rate housing at the top end of the hill.
I do not believe this option should be approved. There is little open space in this area of the City and nowhere to walk dogs.
Will look ugly with 40-50ft bldgs right on Moraga Zone additional SFUs north of proposed to create more value for developer
Move the corporation yard to the Blair Park open space
Don't like it.
no
It seems that rather than have a dog park, it would be better to leave the canyon as is. It is already open space that people can use with their dogs.
You should keep it how it is and then build another soccer field like in this option. Have all the new housing on the hill and in the storage yard and where the dog park is located in option 2
Option 2 seems like a much better way to create a community than option one
I don't like option 2
I think people drive to the dog park so I would switch the dog park with the skate spot, and move the field downhill if possible, so that the recreational uses are more easily accessible by foot from the rest of Piedmont and the parking area is by the dog park. I'm also worried that this plan may make the Maxwellton/Moraga intersection harder to navigate than it already is



Moving the rec/sports activities to the south side of Moraga without creating pedestrian better pedestrian access seems short sighted. Looks like most folks would have to park at what is now the Coaches field side of Moraga and then keep pressing button at the intersection, making it a bottleneck for traffic. Am I missing improvements on the south side other than a path leading from the intersection site?
We need public transport options too
There are better dog parks and trails elsewhere in Piedmont so this version wisely puts spaces to better use.
Kinda like how housing units make their way up the hill on Coaches field side, could make for more interesting variety of units.
I thought Oakland didn't like the soccer field idea. Wasn't there concern with the last soccer field proposal for Moraga canyon that fire trucks couldn't get access?
This design is not acceptable. The affordable and market rate housing should be integrated. This very very important!
Seems to better address potential congestion issues from affordable housing development than option 1
Not a fan. Seems wasteful to relocate the sporting facilities, and annoying that some of their parking is a crosswalk away from them.
I don;t like this option because a soccer field would destroy Blair Park.
Oakland has indicated they do not want a playfield at Blair Park. Mixing corporation yard and housing might creat a conflict.
Could be problematic having the Corp yard being so close to such intense housing. Corp yard is an early in the day, if not 24 hr, operation.
I am concerned about the field being in this location because of the sound and light impact on the houses up the hillside on Scenic. Also, this location creates a lot of pedestrian crossing on Scenic which is dangerous and will slow traffic flow.
Really Bad that little kids will have to cross Moraga to get to parents cars for pick up. So dangerous!
This does not seem realistic given traffic issues
seems like limited parking for rec space - parking across Moraga seems challenging (would a pedestrian bridge be possible/financially feasible?)
Good density
Isn't it expensive to move the Coaches field to the Blair park side? We looked at the baseball facility plan in the past and I thought that we found the width of the Blair Park was limiting to accommodate a regulation size baseball field and related facilities. Is this plan really feasible? What's the point of moving the sports facility to the Blair park side and build new houses on the north side of Moraga Ave? It will be more expensive than Option 1 for sure, but I don't see any benefit.
loss of baseball field is a problem
Housing seems better integrated with houses on Moraga ave





seems unnecessarily expensive to move the fields

It's fine that the soccer field moves to Blair Park. It will need to be level, which given the drop down through the canyon, will mean a large berm similar to a freeway onramp will need to be built along Moraga Ave. Therefore I would move the soccer field to the flattest portion of Blair Park. It is not necessary that it be a full U14 field.



### What features of Option 3 are important to you?

I think the concentration of housing near the fields is a good idea.
Having the corp. yard on this side would be better than a soccer field...the field would need to be raised so that it was level creating a blocky looking structure at the street. The corp. yard and buildings could be strategically placed using the grade as an advantage.
The area of the DU Market rate and affordable housing is in an area that should be treated as an animal preserve because it extends and already large area of the cemetery. Putting the housing here would create a disturbance to the natural wildlife in the area.
Mix of affordable and market rate homes.
What is important is to keep the Corp Yard out of Blair Park.
I like the arrangement of buildings and open space. The access in and out of the development - for both the residential area and the new corporation yard - seems logical and safe.
new public trail access
This seems smart because we can retain the sports facilities and keep housing/traffic off Moraga yet give up only some of Blair Park with a new Corp. Yard with easy road access.
Soccer field remains in place
Please see comments on Option 1. I don't believe any of the other scenarios are realistic/financially feasible.
This seems like the best option for housing as well as the place for Corporation yard. Nice views for the new housing will make it more attractive, thus additive to Piedmont real estate values.
Corporation Yard would be visible from Moraga - unsightly
- Housing on the north side of the site - The Corp yard in Blair Park makes sense since it doesn't need to be on the north side of the site which is more desirable for residences
Improvements to Moraga Ave, including signaled intersection for safety.
New public trail access.
preserves coaches field, units have more location appeal
A very bad idea for safety, congestion, and expense
Hiking trails
Housing on north side.
Moving the corporation yard is going to be very expensive. This needs to be costed out. Putting all the houses on Coaches side does not make sense. Please put the homes on Blair Park it is logical and most likely the most feasible and cost effective.



<p>None. Another terrible idea. Planning to have market rate housing staring down on a ball field? Assuming there might be some elderly folks living there ( like me ) whose wife takes a nap every afternoon ( like my wife ) - are you kidding? And then when do we find out about the lights on the field. I realize you have to explore options but I'm not sure you have to present them all to us.</p>
<p>This is the best option PROVIDED that the affordable units are seamlessly integrated into all the buildings. Best for open space around the housing. It will need some kind of bridge to people can cross Moraga Ave. safely. Glad a dog park is included !</p>
<p>corp yard is not a nice thing to see when driving into piedmont. Seems like a great developer opportunity but not as nice for the community</p>
<p>The consultant speaking in accompanying video said the two market rate units at Maxwellton and Abbott would be easily rolled into the main development, so please eliminate these from all four plans. They are poorly conceived for numerous reasons and unnecessarily significantly impact existing resident on those streets.</p>
<p>Soccer Field</p>
<p>Improved Moraga Ave. safety. New signalized intersection. New housing. New sports facility.</p>
<p>No leave Blair park as is</p>
<p>This is my least favorite version.</p>
<p>I could better emergency response and better corporation yard on that side of Canyon (more accessible) but also not as attractive as residential.</p>
<p>like the housing on the Coaches field area - better for noise and less restricted space. Better for the neighbors, however, do not like the corp yard relocated to Blair Park.</p>
<p>better</p>
<p>New signalized intersection                  New public trail</p>
<p>Although I understand the Corp-yard needs improvements, I don't know whether it makes sense to move and rebuild the entire area to Blair Park.                  At least an option three, the housing is not separated by Hillside view, however, each unit would be either market rate or low income, and the units themselves would not be integrated. I've heard from the project designers that it is very hard to get market rate housing and low income housing built in the same unit, however, I have also read comments by architects and builders saying that this can and has been done.</p>



<p>None. I'm absolutely against this project in any form. We need to keep the last open space just that. Development should be built where people are close to services, not where a car is required. I repeat, Moraga has heavy traffic twice a day to the point where it's near impossible to turn on to the road. The light at Moraga &amp; Highland backs up so severely that it takes several lights to move forward. The intersection of Moraga and Thornhill is a joke. You can't even get into the left lane to turn onto Thornhill as it's so backed up. We have the luxury of having cars but also elect not to go at out during rush hour due to the amount of traffic. We didn't spend human sweat equity to defeat the previous canyon development to have it developed.</p>
<p>Do not move the yard it is perfect</p>
<p>Inclusion of the enlarged playing field and as well as the housing units in a more compact footprint. It doesn't make sense to separate the dog park from the rest of the recreational facilities, IMO.</p>
<p>None</p>
<p>The expanded soccer field. Public trail access</p>
<p>All housing units on north side of the site</p>
<p>My comments are the same as before - we have no business using the housing project as an opportunity to expand recreation fields/facilities. The current ball fields are fine. Folks, we just can't afford to keep piling on unnecessary expenses to our taxpayers.</p>
<p>We would like Blair Park to be left as is -- open space for the city and neighborhood to use as well as a beautiful gateway to the city.</p>
<p>Less impact on Blair</p>
<p>All the new housing on the Coaches side of Moraga Avenue. Relocation of the Corporation Yard to Blair Park.</p>
<p>This option provides traffic control for all the new housing through the new signalized intersection, thus limiting the traffic impact on Moraga. It provides public transit access to the new dense housing and bike and pedestrian improvements. I also like the new hiking trail and the improvements to the soccer field to include softball.</p>
<p>Affordable housing is a great idea and I support it for locations close to public transport. Unfortunately Moraga Canyon is not a good spot for any large scale public works schemes.</p>
<p>The only viable option. Move the corp yard to the south side. Housing and recreation on the north.</p>
<p>This is the oddest of the three. Who wants to live behind a sports field? Talk about feeling like second class! That is a steep hillside. This is shoe-horning the development at the expense of building good residents. Meanwhile, city trucks get great access and flat ground! Again, can the Yard be shrunk? That would allow a field next to the Yard.</p>
<p>I'm glad the soccer field would still exist.</p>



See comments for Option 2.
why put residents so close to a loud soccer field? Will there be lights on at night? This lay out does not seem welcoming or respectful.
This is the least objectionable of the first 3 plans -- IF the Corporation Yard is reduced in size and does not occupy more than 1/4 of Blair Park and preserves most of the open space as it is.
This option is awful! Locating the corporation yard on Moraga would be an eyesore.
Some preservation of open space
Expanding the field
Improved sports field and additional parking on existing side of Moraga Ave.
Additional parking
It's clearly the best choice. It's the safest. It avoids segregation. It keeps playfields on the sunny side of Moraga so the cost of plastic turf can be avoided. It optimizes return on the market rate units because they can be sold as "view" housing. The corp yard will have to be rebuilt anyway so might as well move it to the location where it makes the most sense as a land use.
Positive Features: 1) Soccer field remains in place. 2) Some of Blair Park open space is retained with new dog park.
Negative: 1) Moving Corp Yard and interrupting work flow. 2) Major roadwork impact.
I appreciate the housing being clustered in one area.
I do not appreciate this scenario's relatively high environmental impact score of 2.3. Minimizing environmental impacts is important to me.
Dog park, housing not in Blair park
Nice to have the housing hidden more in landscape
Dog park
Probably none. The fenced dog park is probably too small and would become overcrowded with aggressive interactions of dogs in a confined space. There are too few off-leash dog areas in Piedmont.
this is the best option and the safest involved
No additional street or pedestrian traffic going up Pala
Moraga Ave improvements, lights, pedestrian, bike lanes Enclosed dog park No housing in Blair Park Maintaining the corporation yard in general. As long as not eliminated I like the how the housing is clustered together backed up into the hill



Relocated corp yard and dog park location. Location of soccer field. New signalized intersection.
Relocate corp yard
Playing fields
Affordable Housing Signal Intersection No children need to cross Moraga Ave for fields or activities Parking, parking, parking!!!
Making the corporate yard visually attractive
This is my favorite option if it's financially feasible. Having housing off the main road seems ideal. Having housing and recreation facilities adjacent to each other and connected by pedestrian sidewalk into downtown Piedmont is good. Seems to put a low traffic volume activity on one side of Moraga instead of distributing it on both sides.
If the Corp. Yard doesn't involve a lot of traffic onto and off of Moraga, AND this placement would be "scenic" from Moraga (not just a parking lot for equipment), this one is one of the better options.
as much affordable housing as possible
New signal intersection, affordable housing, improved Moraga Ave
nice space for corp yard good spot for formal dog park
Option three is more expensive than option one.
The fact that the housing and the field are on the same side of the street.
None - is coaches field gone? That would be a disaster.
I don't really like this plan that much.
This option is not horrible, and I generally support putting all of the housing on the north side of the site.
Improved soccer field and expanded parking
moving the corporation yard would be a good use of blair park, but the problem with housing above coaches field is the large amount of congestion at that intersection....
Housing looks like it's in a good spot. Keeping the sports field and skate park next to the new housing seems like a good fit - could be a great way to build community.
New housing. Improved sports facilities. Maintain civic spaces. Improved public work's facilities.
I like having the housing on the north side. I like the idea of improvements to the Corp yard.



Maintaining the recreation field at its current location is important to me. Moving the Corporation Yard and developing Blair Park open space makes sense.
Is it desirable to have residences so close to a playing field? Noisy? Otherwise seems better for living spaces.
allows for SOME open space.
The main thing I don't like about this scenario is the use of Blair Park for the Corp Yard. I would like to keep Blair Park feeling somewhat open and natural - I think it's a long-term asset to Piedmont to keep it that way and using it for a playfield keeps that open quality. The Corp Yard will no doubt be an eyesore in that location.
I do think this scenario places the new housing in the appropriate locations.
New signalized intersection and improved Moraga Ave.
Tucking it away is a good idea.
It's nice that the field doesn't have to be moved and I like that the housing is above the road. Moving the corporation yard to this new location seems like a good solution. It could preserve some sense of open space.
It looks like there is room for housing on both sides of Moraga. If so, we should consider expanding the affordable housing.
I don't like the idea of moving the corp yard to Blair Park because it seems to be a waste of space there. It's nice to have the soccer field near the housing units up above New Traffic signal seems necessary to ensure safety New public trail access is good.
Great use of the slope for the housing. This is really excellent. Improved playing field for U14. So many kids use this in this town. Relocation of Corporate Yard to its own space away from playing field seems to make tremendous sense.
This is my favorite option - keeping the field as is, and moving the corporate yard to Blair Park
Will it hard to build the housing there?
The skate park is the least used facility in the city. Why are you moving it to a more visible area?  Nature trail goes to private Mt. View Cemetery property. They will object  2 market rate lots carved out in the same area as ALL the low income housing. Come on. Can't the city at least put two lots elsewhere in the City?
This looks more attractive and a better option for the people who live above Blair Park.
Keeping recreation area where it is.



Expanded soccer field, views from housing, I like how the two types of housing are together. The hiking trail.
We still gave a corporation yardage but in a dangerous location
Sports Field
Expanding the soccer field
I like the access the housing will have to the soccer field and trails. I also like the corp yard being moved across moraga
Sports fields.
Makes sense to place the corp yard on Blair park and away from the housing and rec fields and retain some space for a dog park.
I think that the new location of the corporation yard and a wild life corridor can coexist. The fields are closer to the new homes. I like that the market homes are not literally looming over the below market homes.
public trail access
keeps sports field in place
Improved field space is much needed
Keeping the location of the field. Putting the housing near the field. Moving the corporation yard to the south side of Moraga seems the least disruptive use of that space
I think the housing location with its open space due to the rec field and hills is great here. It seems like it might be more utility to have the corp yard in this spot? I'm unsure.
Improved corp yard—preserving open space along Moraga Ave—Keeping soccer/baseball field/skate park in tact as is—Tucking housing next to hillside away from view
No features of option 3 are important to me. There is no need to keep Blair Park unaltered. There is no need to move the corporation yard to Blair Park. Place all the new housing in Blair Park. Keep recreation and city land uses where they are currently and leave them undisturbed. Place a retaining wall to hold back the Blair Park hillside and place all the new housing away from the city's recreation facilities. This would also keep all the recreation action on the same side of the street. If the new residential is placed in Blair Park, it would allow the homes on the Blair Park bluff to look over the housing below and maintain their green space outlook views as they are today.
MUCH better utilization of the larger space; revamping the field and adding scenic trails along that side. BUT Blair park shouldn't be the site for the corporation yard... we have to beautify the entrance to Piedmont, and adding trucks/buildings will not allow for this.
Sports field. Appearance of entrance to the city.
Dog park , keeping some sort of field , houses will be hidden more so . Parking under units add parking
So now an open space becomes an unattractive garage? This reduces the traffic entry point problem with just 1 place where far too many cars will be causing a logjam.





Dog park
Does a good job of setting units away from the busy street. Provides good access for the playing field.
The new Corporate Yard would have to look nice. An example if a bad look is the Oakland yard on Shepherds Canyon.
Same as Option 2.
Plantings along Moraga Ave hide some of the corp yard
The location of new housing up and away from the existing field and the road is ideal both for the occupants and for the public's view along the canyon. The relocation and redesign of the corp yard facilities is sorely needed and the site on the south side is ideal: flat, easy in and out access....
Walkability.
open space partially preserved in Blair Park
housing and sports on the accessible side of Moraga
You are putting all these buildings on a dump. And building a garage with a playing field on top . Where is the earthquake analysis?
AGAIN - No parking is being listed for the housing units. This screams of developers prioritizing work over functionality vs. state subsidies for making housing.
LET ALONE - the sewage and plumbing is almost half a century old.
Moving Corp yard o Blair park is a terrible idea. Loss of Blair Park is very bad. It is not just for play but for walking.
Having walked and seen this site, construction of four units, parking lot and drive way would require extensive earthworks and retaining walls to be done.
This is my least favorite plan as it seems to provide less housing
Corporate yard looks well placed.
Destroying the open space of Blair Park is a negative
I don't like the corporation yard in the open space
None
none
This feels great - community gathering place to go with the new housing. Perhaps they'll find the noise to be too much, though?
I prefer having the housing and sports facilities on the same side of Moraga as they have access to pedestrian walkways and don't require crossing Moraga.
Although I would prefer keeping Blair Park untouched, moving the Corporation Yard there would be a less intrusive option than housing or sports facilities.
This is my second favorite option.



none
I like having all housing together on one side and improved field
Similar to Opt 2 this is a complicated and unnecessary development sequence. The new developments in Moraga Canyon are housing projects which can be located in Blair Park. Relocating the Corp Yard or Coaches Field is warranted only if the current location somehow is problematic.
I like the combination of Affordable and Market rate housing into one overall community with shared access to the field.
I like the relocation of the corporate yard.
I like the public trail access.
All the housing is tucked up against the hillside.
Housing integrated together. Corp yard moved.
Moraga Ave and pedestrian improvements to town Housing moved off the street Multi use sports field Public works moved and redeveloped for highest and best use of space SFUs critical to getting it to pencil for developer
Housing and current use are in best places.
Making corp yard a modern, esthetically pleasing building. Avoiding traffic jams on Moraga Ave
It is very important that all of the housing is on the north side of the site which is the only safe side for children and therefore, ultimately, for vehicles on Moraga Ave.
north side housing
Keeping and upgrading the field in its current location seems efficient.
the housing is in a good location, less visible from the road. This is also more desirable for the residents. Leaving a good portion of open space.
So far this is the best option as it has housing and recreation in the same area.
None, I don't like option 3
I like that the housing is all together and the views would be amazing. Not sure if the residents would like living right next to a recreational field? Might be noisy and create parking/traffic congestion.
Keeping open space in the existing Blair Park. Letting the Corp Yard have it's own space, as opposed to Option 4.
The corp yard and dog park seem to work well on the south side of Moraga
The housing and recreation are closer together. Placement of housing, recreation and corp yard.
Signalized intersection; space for the housing.
Public trail access, more housing



The sports field and housing north of Moraga appear to go well today. Perhaps it is most optimal to move the corporate yard.
Could be nice to have sports field co located with housing. Visual of having corp yard right on Moraga could be less than desirable.
Open space preserving biodiversity.
Sticking the field and housing on top of each other seems like a disaster from a noise and traffic standpoint. Really skeptical of this idea...
I like having housing up high on a hill blending in and access from other streets and not Highland.
This and @ 4 are my favorite. Taking advantage of views, keeping the recreation close to the housing units and moving corporation yard.
This is all ok again with the exception of the two market rate rate houses.
Seems to offer best integrated community for new housing units. Appears to manage potential congestion issues from new development.
Separation of public and non- public uses.
This is my preferred option the housing units are not sitting right on the road, Moraga Road is not being encroached on
This is my preferred option the housing units are not sitting right on the road, Moraga Road is not being encroached on
Preserving as much of Blair Park as possible.
Same answers as #2. I want to keep as much greenery, sports fields, open space, play space, mental health space vs. concrete and buildings and traffic. Traffic will be terrible!!!
New public trail access. Improved Moraga Ave/Signal Upgraded playfield for U14 soccer.
The location of the public works. I think this is by far the worst plan. The ugly public works buildings are in the most visible spot.
Consolidates housing and recreation areas together. Give Corp yard chance to get facilities to reflect 2030 rather than 1950. Isolates Corp yard from the high density housing and rec areas.
I like that the housing units are all together vs. separated in option #2. I like a new skate park that is more accessible, as well as preserving a dog park. Views from some units may increase value, but didn't seem like this would greatly increase revenue for the City.
Least impactful to houses above Blair park.
U14 field. Good location for housing. New skate feature seems cool. Good location of Corp yard- out of the way
This is the most realistic option given the inherent sightline roadway issues.
Preservation and improvement of Blair Park.



-expanded soccer field
-I like that the housing is on the hillside AND overlooks the rec space
-keeping the expanded parking close to the rec space (when hauling gear)
Relocation of yard too costly and long
All housing on North side of Moraga Ave is a better option. Public trail access.
extra parking and keeping baseball field
None
Separating corp yard from housing and integrating the fields with housing
A public trail is a nice idea.
improved field space maximizing views new and improved Corp Yard! hillside trail
public access trail
All housing together so lower income not segregated



### What features of Option 3 are NOT important to you?

We are not dog-owners so a DOG PARK, per-say is not important.
It's not important to move the corp yard into such a visible space and destroy open space.
Improving the soccer field. I would prefer to maintain the current configuration and natural turf so there would be less impact on riparian area below. Does the new housing above depend on the field expansion?
relocated corp yard
Trail access and skate spot.
Move Corporate Yard to Blair Park
N/A
Option #3 -- housing tucked against the hill. Earthquake danger. Emergency vehicles can't access and residents will not be able to escape.
How safe is it to have high density housing tucked against the hillside?
- Having the field on the north side of the site; parking and sharing the space between residents and rec users may be challenging - Field
Dog Park.
2 market rate houses on Abbott and Maxwellton.
dog park doesnt serve a significant portion of the community. I'd like to see it changed to a park/dog park. something that is also designed for use by people without dogs
I oppose the following: - Building of single family housing near Maxwellton and Abbott as they are not state requirements under the CA Housing Element and doubly impact our neighborhood congestion (the low income housing development and the addition of market value single family homes) - Expansion or any modification to Coaches Field, as this is a separate issue not related to the Housing Element and inclusion of it in the specific plans is confounding the issues
Similar problems to option 2 Moving corp yard will be very expensive and it will be visible from moraga which is not a great first impression for the city Playing field is crowded
Corp yard should remain on north side.
Expanding the field is not necessary. You are trying to do too much at one time. Focus on the job at hand.
The housing - just kidding.
Signal



New corporate yard.
SFD are not part of housing element requirements. New trail will increase illegal trespassing on nearby home owners and Mountain View cemetery and seriously impact ingress of Piedmont Fire department and emergency vehicles on Maxwellton and surrounding streets due to narrowness of streets/. Significant impact on Oakland home owners due to parking constraints.
The affordable housing.
As in option 2, more costly and more disruptive. Less aesthetically appealing along Moraga.
New skate park 2 market rate du separated
Moving the Corp yard. This way, Blair Park becomes the center of noisy trucks, and that will negatively affect houses nearby, and the peace of dog walkers in the now-smaller dog walk area.
The soccer field
Replacing one of Piedmont's only natural parks with the concrete Corp Yard is a very unattractive option.
Disruption to both spaces, the canyon and Blair Park
Corporation yard to blair park
New skate spot, new public access trails, pedestrian improvements on the Blair Park side of Moraga Avenue, 2 SFD.
Putting the Corporation Yard in Blair Park destroys much of the park's open space. The dog park is not needed - Piedmont has enough dog parks and there will still be open space in Blair Park.
Destroying Blair Park is a terrible idea. Demolition of the relatively recently built City Corp Yard units to move them to a pristine Blair Park location which would destroy the flora and fauna of the only open space in the area is thoughtless at best.
the sports field is important as there are not enough soccer fields in the region as it is. But why not move it to another location? Such as the underutilized Crocker Park. Parking could be located under the field.
I think it is odd to have the corporation yard right on Moraga and worry that it would be a eyesore
The corporation yard does not seem like a very attractive feature to have along Moraga, unless it is somehow hidden by foliage or walls. I do not like sacrificing city property for a housing project that does not benefit the current residents of the city. The only apparent benefits are to those who obtain the housing and the developer and contractors who profit from the project.



<p>Remove/relocate market rate housing to minimize impact on long-term Piedmont residents. Additionally, these are on steep and hard to get to locations. There is no grade shown on SFD lot on Maxwellton; in fact this is a very steep grade. How about placement somewhere that is flatter and requires less engineering. These two houses seemingly just appeared at the final hour with no community input and little thought put into location as they are on all four proposals.</p>
<p>Remove public trail access on Maxwellton. There is no parking available on Maxwellton or nearby streets, both in Piedmont and Oakland. Maxwellton is not wide enough for two-way traffic; the road cannot handle increase usage. Furthermore, we are concerned about access for emergency service vehicles. In the past when the gate was not able to fully shut, neighbors here experienced many disruptions late at night. Trailhead will promote illegal trespassing on Mountain View Cemetery property. Trailhead has potential to be a public nuisance.</p>
<p>If by Not Important, you mean what I do not like about this option: It will be difficult for city vehicles to enter and exit Blair Park without a turning lane on Moraga Ave., and WHERE would that go??</p>
<p>Where the corporation yard is located</p>
<p>New signalized intersection</p>
<p>Added housing, signal at the intersection.</p>
<p>Expanding soccer field to U-14.</p>
<p>I do not like the corp yard being relocated to open space, and in particular next to a dog park. Corp yards and dog parks are incompatible adjacent uses.</p>
<p>As with the other scenarios, I think the two dus off Maxwellton and Abbott are unimportant and should be eliminated entirely due to safety concerns along extremely narrow and overutilized Maxwellton. Check out the condition of paving on Maxwellton, and I am referring to the Piedmont segment. It is in significant disrepair.</p>
<p>Skate park</p>
<p>Dog Park Soccer Field</p>
<p>Too much emphasis on soccer in Piedmont. Corporation yard. Can we downsize the corporation yard?</p>
<p>Market rate houses at the top of the hill</p>
<p>2 Market rate housing 70 market value housing.</p>
<p>New signal</p>
<p>Skatepark location</p>



expanded soccer field dog park
I would consider moving skate park to Linda adjacent to bridge/grassy field to open up more space here for development.
Affordable housing
dog park
2 market rate houses
with housing near the soccer field, traffic in and out of parking will be too heavy where will parking be for housing? do not need a skate park
All housing.
It seems silly to move the Corporation Yard to the south. I would drop this part of the plan.
Dog run space
Dog park. Views for new housing.
Skate park
Expanding the soccer field.
You would put the corporate yard in public view on Moraga? I don't understand the logic of that.
Dog park Skate park
I like that the corp yard is farther from housing and rec, but I don't like how it will be visible driving on Moraga.
Dog park
All housing
Public trails
The skate park is currently underutilized. I think the surface parking should be multi level to allow for more open space uses.
Don't like the visible corporate yard. That's an eye sore
Moving the corporation yard to Moraga seems like a worse choice than moving recreation there
Unsure it's very nice to see the corp yard as one drives into town, but that's not the most important thing.
Need to tear down current corp yard and move it...that's fine with me!





<p>It is NOT important to me to try to provide view property to these new housing units!!! They do not need to be up on the hillside on our public view real estate. We never placed homes there before and it is nice open space as it is now and it must remain so. I see no need to provide views for the new residential construction. Leave those views open to the public as they are today. Maybe improve the trails to make the views more accessible to all citizens.</p>
Housing
Corporation yard takes up prime open space.
Skate park, dog park.
AGAIN - No parking is being listed for the housing units. This screams of developers prioritizing work over functionality vs. state subsidies for making housing.
the views afforded to the new housing.
moving the corp yard
Why dog park?
all
Moving the Corp Yard to Blair Park seems to be unnecessary and forces too much development into the Coaches Field area.
NO skate park! Terrible use of space!
Expanded soccer field.
separating the market and low housing
Don't like it.
soccer field
Combining housing and recreation in the same area is objectionable as I have mentioned due to traffic safety and congestion. I think there should be multiple egress points for the many units of house that are separate from the recreation access points for public safety. The density of this solution will create unnecessary noise and traffic disruption in a very concentrated area that I think will create a lower quality of life in the development, which is ironic given the desire to be harmonious with all the open space.
the dog park
I'm not sure much of the space needs to be devoted to a storage area.
I don't like option 3
The expanded field seems really jammed in, and the housing seems uncomfortably and unnaturally close to the playfield.
Corp yard relocation is not critical to meeting housing element goals, but is not terrible.
Corp yard, parking, dog park
There are better dog parks and trails elsewhere in Piedmont.
Having two separate units of housing up the hill.
Corp yard
I think there still could be field space and corp yard in Moraga canyon.



See above
Corporation Yard location in Blair Park seems to create eyesore for community.
Seems like all parking needs pushed together and seems like there is not enough parking.
Dog Park
Squeezing in the cramped buildings.
The location of the two market-rate houses.
Might be too much traffic if both housing and sports fields are in the same location? This could cause excessive congestion on Moraga
Keeping a dog park
Soccer field
-seems like they are only 70 units with this plan, where's the other 60 like in the other options?
-not too important to me to leave half of Blair Park as open space
Soccer field
SFD.
Soccer. I know the cult is strong, but keep the baseball and softball field intact. There are many places to play soccer, but few places for baseball and softball.
Corp yard
Moving the skate park—it's too advanced for kids to even use it so if you need something to go there, just get rid of it don't pay to relocate it.
Again additional parking is unnecessary and quite frankly there shouldn't be affordable housing in this city.
dog park



### Is there anything else you'd like to share about Option 3?

The two SF dwelling units could be made affordable by increasing the number of units on the site. True in a scenarios.
This would be my second choice
Allow the dog park to integrate other people-uses to broaden use.
This is a non starter!
I like it. Needs a dog park. The corporation yard would have better access.
High wild fire risk. During the summer time, vegetation there are extremely dry. Even with fire in one unit can easily spread to the entire maxwelton hill.
Currently with the already high risk for wild fire, insurance companies already dropping policies in this area. With the added fire risk, insurance companies might not even want to cover this area.
Putting Corporation Yard on formerly open space is a terrible idea.
Instantly create fire hazard when adding 100+ units on a dry vegetation area. Even higher risk for wildfires. A very unsafe choice.
N/A
I prefer Blair Park to remain as an open/green area that is accessible to the new residents and existing community. I am not a big fan of the idea of building there especially a corporation yard.
Would prefer that the Corp Yard is not moved to Blair Park -- it would be visible since it is right on the roadside (Moraga Ave).
- In my book, very high priority to maintain existing green space in Blair Park — the beautiful open space is central to what I love about living in the canyon
Not supportive of this option
Adding this many units of low/mid-income housing to this area, regardless of the option, will negatively impact traffic, noise levels and property values for the Piedmont residents in this neighborhood. As previously pointed out by many residents of Moraga Canyon, this plan forces the majority of units on a single community, no matter how high the barriers for development. We were shocked at how quickly any proposals for build in the center of town were dismissed, despite having many merits. This reinforces the belief that residents with greater influence and financial clout are directing the build away from their homes.
Please remove the two market rate SFD - this part of Piedmont is taking more than their fair share of new housing. We don't need those two homes there. Plus why sell off two parts? Keep the whole thing open as it is. There are already trails that go from Abbott way and a city gate.
No comment. Option 1 by far the best alternative.



<p>These projects put a significant, unfair burden on the residents near the proposed development - Piedmont should be fair and come up with a plan that reduces the impact on these residents and shares more equitably with the rest of Piedmont.</p>
<p>If you are going to relocate the corporate yard, relocate it somewhere else, less expensive real estate.</p>
<p>Corp yard is not nice to look at and would now be front and center!!</p>
<p>Not the best option as it is disruptive to Blair Park, neighbors, sound, wildlife, traffic/safety.</p>
<p>See comments following option one.</p>
<p>Bad plan not needed</p>
<p>Separating the dog park and giving away public land to build additional single-family housing units, seems really contrary to the purpose of this effort which is to use land *more* efficiently and build denser housing. I strongly oppose using any public land for SFDs.</p>
<p>Not a good solution</p>
<p>Same concerns about landslides and building costs on the north side of Moraga.</p>
<p>Again, I feel that we should consolidate development of the canyon to one side (northern). If we do not have to, I don't think we should develop what could remain open space (blair park)</p>
<p>All the options include adding too much housing density to this small area. Housing should be spread out throughout Piedmont and not concentrated in this one corner of the city. This will affect the quality of life of the current neighborhood, will cause traffic jams, sound and light pollution, make the neighborhood less safe during fires and negatively affect the beauty of the canyon.</p>
<p>I favor option4</p>
<p>The corporation yard should be moved as far as feasible to the eastern end of Blair Park. The western end of the park has better utility for open space and a better natural aesthetic with the oak tree grove on the slope. Relocation of the three structures to the eastern end of the park would create more parking at the western end of the park which could be used as over-flow parking in game days.</p> <p>Vehicles entering Moraga Avenue from the Coaches side seem to integrate more seamlessly with the prevailing traffic flow of Moraga Avenue - predominantly right-hand turns into western traffic on Moraga Avenue in the mornings and cross-traffic turns from a protected turning lane in the afternoons.</p>



<p>There is no information on what is defined as affordable housing. It should be the first item clearly defined in the site documentation and easily accessible. I attempted to find this information and could not find it. I know we would all like to see hundreds of affordable housing units built in the community, but the reality is that Piedmont is not an affordable community... it is an affluent community. To create housing for affluent people in the community makes sense because those are the people who can afford to live here after probably having bought their starter house in a lower priced housing area. It is illogical to put "affordable housing" in this neighborhood. The financial impacts are significant and multi-dimensional.</p>
<p>I dont like the corp yard moving to blair— its sort of ugly and is currently tucked away. I think that land could be put to better use.</p>
<p>Why is there all the concern about skate park location. We hear it is very underutilized. Could instead be a great spot for revenue generating housing - lower cost to build and more bang for the buck for Piedmont.</p>
<p>I totally oppose the entire concept of building housing in Moraga Canyon on either side of Moraga Ave. I have expressed my opposition numerous times, made comments and raised questions about how it would be done. My comments and questions have NEVER been answered. So what good does it do to express my opinion? This whole process is a game of frustration and a losing proposition for Moraga Canyon neighbors.</p>
<p>No, no, no! Do NOT put the corporation yard directly on Moraga. Yuck.</p>
<p>It's the solution that minimizes public discontent. This is important given that the community will be voting on a tax override ballot issue that requires 2/3 approval.</p>
<p>I do not support this option due to relocation of Corp Yard and impact to roadwork.</p>
<p>Regardless of the site plan, 132 additional units in narrow Moraga Canyon will have a deleterious impact on the safety of existing homes and lives in the area. Moraga Ave is a major transportation route for the Hwy 24/13 area (including Montclair and Upper Rockridge whose residents should have been notified of this endeavor). This plan puts thousands of people in this area at risk in the event of a major fire. The arterial already is at or near capacity during commute hours. In light of the fact that insurance companies are cancelling home insurance policies in CA, the additional risk created by this proposed development could very well result in the same outcome for this area.</p>
<p>Do not want signalized intersection this will cause smog to build up and traffic back up.</p>



<p>It's wrong to sacrifice the baseball field and turn it into a soccer/softball field. There is already too much competition among baseball, softball, soccer, and football practice at Coaches Field.</p> <p>Even if you allow baseball to continue at Coaches along with the other sports, there is too much conflict in scheduling and the field is unplayable because of rain and soggy field conditions (poor drainage and poor maintenance in the infield and grassy areas). The additional wear on the field by increased activity would be difficult to maintain grass. We already have astroturf on all of Beach and much of Hampton. We need a natural turf baseball field in Piedmont and the only one is at the High School field which locks out the public.</p>
<p>Personally I think this one makes the most sense.</p>
<p>Relocation some housing close to corp yard to improve open space with view and larger space</p>
<p>It makes sense to create mixed housing on the current Coaches field area...creates more of a neighborhood. By keeping the field space there, no children need to cross Moraga for activities or field space.</p> <p>Noise complaints and parking problems for the residents near the field will be a constant battle.</p>
<p>Hopefully this is beneficial to Corp Yard in getting upgraded facilities.</p>
<p>option 3 sucks</p>
<p>As I've mentioned in every option, consider ways to make the parking less wasteful.</p>
<p>This is as bad as option 2.</p>
<p>This option is palatable but is still vastly inferior to Option 4.</p>
<p>Option 3 looks to make unnecessary alterations to the area, moving the corporation yard unnecessarily and placing housing adjacent to play fields which can be noisy early and late in the day. Vehicular access to housing could decrease pedestrian safety.</p>
<p>Most infrastructure impact.                  Likely higher cost.                  Would have to first spend money to move Corp yard to accomplish the new housing.</p>
<p>There is no discussion about additional traffic signals outside the City of Piedmont and how this would impact traffic flows onto highway 13 when trying to enter and exit off of highway 13. These lanes (on Moraga and on the freeway) are already backed up without the additional building structures. What additional road ramps, traffic signals and barriers will be used by the City of Oakland and/or State of California to aid in this project?</p> <p>Also, when the sun is setting, driving down Moraga is difficult. Isn't there anything that could be built over Moraga Ave?</p>



<p>It looks like this scenario avoids (?) underground parking beneath the field, so that's a plus from a cost perspective. And the housing is where it should be. Otherwise I don't like this plan much. Along with the scenario with the housing in Blair Park, I am strongly against this one.</p>
<p>I rather like the idea of moving Corporation Yard to Blair Park.</p>
<p>This might be my favorite.</p>
<p>I like this</p>
<p>Not enough housing units. If we are going to do this project we should maximize housing!</p>
<p>I don't know why the corporation yard needs to be given such a prominent spot.</p>
<p>The other two options are much better.</p>
<p>Please refer to comments made under Option 1. Essentially, clustering of 132 units anywhere along Moraga Ave. invites serious Safety issues for its residents and dramatically increase traffic along Moraga Ave. It only takes one big Wildfire in this area to burn anything in its path.</p>
<p>This is the best option</p>
<p>The City should purchase some land from the Cemetary or the City of Oakland to better plan the housing.</p>
<p>I like that the corp yard is separated from the field me housing, but I'm just Not sure this makes best use of the Blair Park space</p>
<p>Feels crowded by coaches field</p>
<p>There is more room for housing here as well? We need more housing.</p>
<p>I like this plan best because housing is tucked away from the busy road and separate from the corp yard but I wonder whether dense housing and activity on the fields are compatible</p>
<p>This community will need a tot lot. The corporation yard can use the surrounding land as demonstration hillsides perhaps.</p>
<p>Any new housing should be privately funded. If any city or public items are being relocated, the new Moraga Canyon developments (not city wide) should cover the cost.</p>
<p>seems the corporate yard would be much more visible (ugly)              having the soccer field directly next to the housing seems like a terrible idea</p>
<p>I don't like this option</p>
<p>This is the best option</p>
<p>Parking is needed for fields.</p>
<p>No one wants corporation yard to be the entrance to Piedmont. Can't corporation yard be tucked in unused space farther behind its current location?</p>
<p>My first choice</p>



I think I most like keeping open space on the blair park side, either as is or for recreation. So I guess I'm not a huge fan of this, but it's better than #1.
I don't like the other options. Putting the field on top of the underground parking sounds like asking for trouble.
The city should consider the simplest development and not disturb the uses we have today. Leave the recreation where it is on one side of the street and place all the new housing in Blair Park away from current recreational uses. Never split recreation across the street from one another causing all citizens to cross the road to get to additional/other recreational facilities.
Positive is Aesthetics for the housing and sports are maintained. But at the cost of rebuilding the city yard. Some of that cost is recoverable in that the city yard will eventually need maintenance and upgrading. But the big downside is the effect on appearance of the entrance of the city. Nobody seems to recognize that corporation yards are inherently messy and have big trucks. Do we want to see that as first thing entering the city? Screening will only cover so much- you still have to have a big driveway and gate.
It's a shame to get rid of coaches , can it be made to combo type field . 3 is not a bad option
The first thing that people will see of Piedmont is an industrial area with a traffic jam?
The traffic!!!
This option allows for a bike path along the south side of Moraga away from the busy street.
Again, why remove existing structures. Doesn't seem cost efficient.
I like this option with an attractive corporate yard.
Not too exciting.
I like that the new housing is in green space ... but I'm a little worried about whether, with its own access road and being entirely behind coaches filed, it might seem hidden from the rest of Piedmont. I really think it's important not to isolate the newly dense housing.
This is the best option by far, for the reasons mentioned in the top box.
It is important that the new development has safe walking access to Highland Ave and the public transit line 33, also to schools and a commercial district. The City should commit to reducing the need for car-only access to these housing and rec developments.
Yet a different version with the same mistake. You are putting housing, almost 50% which is low cost requiring government payments and social services next to "regular" housing. Who would want to live in such a ghetto? Maybe 10% low income max .
AGAIN - No parking is being listed for the housing units. This screams of developers prioritizing work over functionality vs. state subsidies for making housing.





Along with #2, a very poor idea. It is best to crowd the developed parts and leave open space in Blair Park, including a good pathway set back from Moraga but to allow walking (and biking) along Moraga.
Too much congestion in one area, this would be a terrible setup / issue.
I would oppose this option
Building on a hillside is expensive, all of the new housing should be in Blair Park. The entire area above the existing corporation yard should be the NEW PUBLIC TRAIL ACCESS AREA and wildlife protection area. This superior park location can be a replacement for Blair Park.
don't like losing the skate park and trail -- option 1 is the best...
it is a waste of resurces
This is the worst of the four in my opinion.
I love this option of the ones suggested.
I'm not sure whether 'podium style' means more of a condo type setup or if these will still feel like single family homes. It would be nice to preserve the feel of a single family home.
Moving the Corp Yard might work, but only if it doesn't eliminate the dog park.
Should move skate park next to dog park. Residents will hate a skate park at their front door. Add overflow parking near public works. Zone additional SFUs north of proposed to create more value for developer.
I think putting housing in the outfield of a baseball field is a questionable idea; feels like there would be many broken windows... Would there be a large fence in the outfield? This would be an eyesore.
the separation between low and market rate housing is questionable.
no scoccer field
give up that land
I don't like option 3
Could the housing be more stories high, and some of the parking for the playfield be across the street, so it wouldn't feel so jammed in?
Not clear if, in this option or the others, there will be fencing or other barriers protecting the propeties on Scenic Avenue (there are none currently, but no one really uses the sout side of the Canyon except for an occasion dog walker or bird watcher.
We need public transport
This option could feel like too much infrastructure on north side....generate too much traffic etc.
Can the new corp yard facilities be built in such a way to be as green as possible prserving the look and feel of a park?



<p>The affordable and market rate house needs to be integrated. Do not separate them. This should be the value of our city.</p>
<p>Location of affordable housing and sports complex in one location on coaches' field site seems to offer most community friendly approach. Could this be done while relocating corporation yard somewhere else (less visible) in community</p>
<p>My second favorite. Not sure how residents will like living on top of a skate park and sports field.</p>
<p>Corporation Yard relocated in Blair Park should be reduced in size and hidden with landscaping to preserve the natural beauty of the park.</p>
<p>Corporation yard separated from houses makes sense. But should the corporation yard be the first thing you see when entering Piedmont? Mixed feelings.</p>
<p>I think this plan is horrible on all levels. Aesthetically and practically.</p>
<p>Best option of the group</p>
<p>This option and the last option are very attractive to me. Keeping the field in this location and building the houses behind it and up the hillside with some views is a very functional design and minimizes the pedestrian crossings. Whether the corp yard is under the field or across the street needs more information. It can be nice to have city employees around keeping an eye on the field and parking, but it could also be good to keep it separated across the street.</p>
<p>It's my second choice after option 1</p>
<p>Not sure I like the move of the Corporate Yard across the street. The Corporate Yard would seem to be less aesthetically pleasing than apartments tucked up against the hillside. But perhaps it could be designed to hide, for instance, outside storage.</p>
<p>I'm opposed to this plan mainly for two reasons. Building the new housing units right next to the soccer/baseball field is a bad idea. The residents of the new housing units would have to deal with noise from baseball/soccer games constantly and that could be a source of disputes and troubles in the future (they might argue for rules for when the field could be used, etc.) Second, I prefer the corporation yard to be hidden because it is a bit of an eyesore and not consistent with beautification of Piedmont. I don't want to see trucks and construction equipments as I drive on Moraga Ave.</p>
<p>skate spot so close to housing might be noisy</p>
<p>It's not clear to me that four apartment buildings would actually fit in a line behind the soccer field. If they do, then this is the option that I would find most attractive if I was renting or buying in Moraga Canyon. Privacy, safety, attractive. I'm not sure how the soccer field activity and living activities will merger together. It would be important to me to make the Corp Yard low impact to the Blair Park space, and well landscaped.</p>



## What features of Option 4 are important to you?

Blair Park remains a dog park and Moraga Ave is improved (presumably with a lane for cyclists and a trail or sidewalk for pedestrians).
Option 4 leaves Blair Park as passive recreation. I vote for option 4.
I very much like the consolidation of this plan.
Keeping Blair Park open is wonderful. I would suggest having some additional parking available and also an elevated walkway to allow access to the park from the north side of Moraga. Elevators and ramps would be good so that disabled as well as bicycles could safely cross. It would be possible to use this space for the annual pumpkin and Christmas tree sales.
This seems even worse than option 3, the dog park is so seldom utilized.
Signal, mixed affordable/market-rate homes
Keeping Blair Park space intact.
I like its problem solving prowess. Leaves open space. Gives upgraded corporation yard. Recreation facilities. Improves circulation. Housing. Safety. Trails.
new public trail access stacking of sports field and parking/offices
Give the dog owners somewhere else to go off leash besides Piedmont Park! Keeps sorts investments intact.
Keeping open space in Blair Park
Keep Coaches Field intact
Please see comments on Option 1. I don't believe any of the other scenarios are realistic/financially feasible.
This is a very clever use of the space under Coaches
- The housing on the North side of Moraga
Availability of parking and keeping Blair Park as an open space for new residents and existing community.
Improvements to Moraga Ave, including signaled intersection for safety.
New public trail access.
preserves coaches field and gets it to u14
None
A ver bad plan, for safety, congestion, and expense
Parking structure Hiking trails
Preserving Blair park Hiking trails Housing in more open green space and closer to facilities and not on top of the street.



<p>This might work, but it could be very expensive to put a field on top of the parking. Why not use Blair Park - it's open and empty and only used by dog walkers.</p>
<p>None.                  Again, let's take a site and just jam everything together in one area and see how that turns out. Not very well. Obviously the most complex of all options to develop, fund and construct. And who is on the hook for a big portion of this ( the ball field, some parking, the corporation yard and of course the skate spot )? - let me guess - the reliable old Piedmont taxpayer?                  Hey, but we get a dog park!</p>
<p>I like this option. It seems to be the best use of the land with the least impact overall.</p>
<p>Same comment about housing integration as previous options. This would be the most expensive; probably also the space under the structure would not adequately accommodate the Corp Yard needs.</p>
<p>The consultant speaking in accompanying video said the two market rate units at Maxwellton and Abbott would be easily rolled into the main development, so please eliminate these from all four plans. They are poorly conceived for numerous reasons and unnecessarily significantly impact existing resident on those streets.</p>
<p>Soccer Field</p>
<p>Housing. Siting of all the other activities. Too concentrated. The fact that Blair Park becomes a dog Park leaves it the eyesore it presently is. The parking is not provided for dog park and all parking is concentrated in a large parking garage. An anomaly in Piedmont</p>
<p>I think this is the best plan</p>
<p>this is least effective use of Blair park. 30 years of anecdotal evidence suggests minimal use of Blair Park as a dog park. impacts quality of housing unit residents due to noise and light pollution</p>
<p>this is the best option, allows for building tucked, blair park open, probably least expensive</p>
<p>None</p>
<p>Good use of space to keep the housing on the Coaches field side and combining underground parking with soccer field on top.</p>
<p>BEST- THE SOLE OPTION I AM IN FAVOR OF.</p>
<p>BLAIR PARK MUST REMAIN OPEN SPACE</p>
<p>u14 soccer field and other sports field improvements                  Retention of open space on Blair Park                  Public trail                  Signalized intersection</p>
<p>Leaving Blair Park as a quiet area for hikers or dog walkers.</p>



<p>None. I'm absolutely against this project in any form. We need to keep the last open space just that. Development should be built where people are close to services, not where a car is required. I repeat, Moraga has heavy traffic twice a day to the point where it's near impossible to turn on to the road. The light at Moraga &amp; Highland backs up so severely that it takes several lights to move forward. The intersection of Moraga and Thornhill is a joke. You can't even get into the left lane to turn onto Thornhill as it's so backed up. We have the luxury of having cars but also elect not to go at out during rush hour due to the amount of traffic. We didn't spend human sweat equity to defeat the previous canyon development to have it developed.</p>
<p>None if would look junky</p>
<p>Preservation of Blair Park as a natural space is nice.</p>
<p>Blair Park would remain intact</p>
<p>I love the idea of lots of concealed parking, but think the cost to do this will be prohibitive.</p>
<p><b>BLAIR PARK REMAINING INTACT</b>                  All housing on the north side of Moraga Avenue                  Efficient use of space with the sports field on top of the parking structure with half serving as parking and other half public works</p>
<p>Keeps Blair park open and non congested. Would not affect traffic patterns as much.</p>
<p>This is the worst option. The parking structure, new field and new parking for the City's vehicles would be pretty expensive (per the speaker showing the option slides). These structures and costs are not necessary and very undesirable.</p>
<p>This is probably the best option with the development behind Coaches field and with leaving Blair Park as beautiful open space.</p>
<p>This is the best since traffic will be dealt with more safely no need for crossing Morago to use recreation                  Room for units and would not have the Massive density of units on Blair</p>
<p>All housing on the Coaches side of Moraga Avenue.</p>
<p>This option is the best as it has the most positives (except possibly the cost). It completely preserves Blair Park. It provides traffic control for all the new housing through the new signalized intersection, thus limiting the traffic impact on Moraga. It provides public transit access to the new dense housing and bike and pedestrian improvements. It Improves the soccer field, including softball support. It adds the new hiking trail.</p>
<p>Keep Blair Park untouched and available for the community to visit a a natural open space in the canyon.</p>
<p>Another nonstarter</p>



<p>Keeping the canyon "park" is not warranted if we want this housing. It gets minimal use currently and there has been little interest in improving it. A ball field proposal 15 years ago raised all manner of opposition.</p>
<p>At least put the skate park there and get a decent crosswalk.</p>
<p>I like keeping the park as open space (though this is not my priority)</p>
<p>This might be the best option if it preserves or expands the soccer field, maintains space for the corporation yard, as well as preserves Blair Park.</p>
<p>Housing including affordable. Seems like construction cost of structure parking would be prohibitive.</p>
<p>Soccer field on top of Corporate Yard? Sounds expensive. We are not getting the benefit of additional space by utilizing Blair Park for key needs in the community.</p>
<p>Wow, retaining Blair Park open space! What a great idea! But I don't kid myself that this would ever happen, as it is the most costly option and therefore the least likely to be considered.</p>
<p>While this option maintains Blair Park, the trade off appears to be a structured parking garage with a playing field on top. There is a note indicating the location of the corporation yard, but it doesn't seem to be shown on the plan other than below grade. In a basement? What would the floor-to-floor height be in order to accommodate heavy equipment? And the space lost to the vehicular circulation below grade?</p>
<p>If done well, could be a great use of space</p>
<p>Improved sports field</p>
<p>Added parking, maintaining baseball field and skate park.</p>
<p>It keeps housing where it belongs for safety, marketing, and integration purposes. It's second best after option 3. It would be best if the parking structure could be reasonably financed.</p>
<p>Positive Features:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Blair Park remains in place with new dog park.</li> <li>2) Housing placement feels more private for future residents.</li> <li>3) Innovative design of soccer field on top of parking structure. Underground parking reduces footprint and is a good use of space.</li> <li>4) Corp Yard/Public Works gets new admin space.</li> </ol> <p>Negative:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Highest structural complexity which could mean more money needed and time to complete.</li> </ol>
<p>Blair Park remaining entirely undeveloped is important to me.</p>
<p>This option's relatively low environmental impact score of 2.0 is important to me.</p>



Dog park, trails, housing not in Blair park, Blair park open space preserved
Like keeping Blair park intact and open
Larger dog park
Preserving the open space of Blair Park. Adding a fenced dog park would be great, but it needs to be very large for off-leash use.
this option is also a good one.   I would choose 3 or 4, whichever is the least expensive for the city
No additional street or pedestrian traffic going up Pala
Upgrades and improvement to Moraga ave, pedestrian and signal lights Enclosed Dog Park Like how housing is clustered together and against the hill. Public access hiking trails
Dog park location. Affordable housing. Location of everything.
Sports field in sunny location
Dog park butsize could be reduced
Signaled intersection Affordable housing Parking
Seems extraordinarily expensive.
Dog park
If a raised field above the CY is realistically feasible and within the right price range this option seems good. I'm not familiar with raised soccer/sports fields so I don't know what sort of problems it might bring but I'd guess there are some.
as much affordable housing as possible
New signal, affordable housing, improved Moraga Ave, Corp yard on the structure
probably reasonably lower-cost
Find the sky plan, I can see the cost being overrun!
Preserving Blair Park, minimizing impermeable surface, field and housing on same side of road. This is the only option that attempts to consolidate and minimize the impacts of parking.
None
I don't really like this plan.
Keeping Blair Park open space intact. This is important for maintaining the environmental integrity of Blair Park. Every other option requires the city to take a huge leap backward with respect to the environment and sustainability.
Improved soccer field and expanded parking



too expensive.... building a structure to have a field on top is not worth the saving of blair park
Housing is in an excellent spot. Sports field and skate park proximity to new housing could serve as a wonderful community hub. I like how much of the parking is tucked out of sight.
New housing. Improved sports facilities Maintain civic uses. Improve the public work's facilities.
I like the added parking.
This option seems the most costly but allows for the most open space which is important to me.
Hard to believe this isn't much more expensive project.
Keeps open space
Housing is well located to be pleasant for occupants (ie off Moraga rather than right on it)  Blair Park is underutilized in this scenario in my opinion (but I do prefer that it remain open). Per comments on other scenarios, I prefer putting the playing field in Blair Park.  Corp Yard is in a place that is not super unsightly (ie not in Blair Park)
Additional parking, new signalized intersection and improved Moraga Ave.
Keep Blair Park open space.
I like that the open space is still there on the west side of Moraga.
Putting the ball field on top of parking is an interesting idea.
This seems to be the best option to most efficiently use the space. If it is not significantly more expensive than the other options, I would vote for this one. This way, you keep Blair Park utilized recreationally New traffic signal seems needed for safety.
Using slope for housing, agree with this. Improved playing field for U14.
This is my second favorite - although the corporate yard under the field seems odd, especially since Blair Park is not well used as it is





<p>This also seems like a more expensive option. It is a VERY congested plan on a VERY busy street. My car was totaled on Moraga Avenue at Maxwellton because of site lines and fast, crowded traffic. They shouldn't even think about adding 2 new houses and 132 low income on this side.</p>
<p>I haven't seen anything proposed about managing noise and light pollution.</p>
<p>The Nature trail goes to Mt. View Cemetery property. They will object.</p>
<p>Having the housing on the north side of Moraga and tucked away from view as much as possible.</p>
<p>Good amount of housing, much more parking, improved sports field, safer intersection.</p>
<p>Expanded soccer, tucked away covered corp yard, housing types all together, views, expanded parking for Rec area, Blair park stays open.</p>
<p>None</p>
<p>See comment below</p>
<p>Not moving infrastructure</p>
<p>Sports field</p>
<p>I like this option the best but I would also vote for Blair Park to be turned into a sports field because our kids need additional field space.</p>
<p>Sports fields and housing.</p>
<p>Retain open space of Blair Park. The pandemic demonstrated how vital these resources are and our needs will grow with our population.</p>
<p>Efficiency, maintaining open space and improving it with dog park</p>
<p>leaving blair park intact</p>
<p>dog park</p>
<p>none</p>
<p>Like the field improvement and expansion. Parking is essential, underground makes sense from land use perspective.</p>
<p>I don't think keeping the entire dog walk area is a priority for the community at large, or worth the expense of this option</p>
<p>visual focus on open space, good placement of houses for community and \$\$ (views). This is my favorite one. I appreciate the protection of some open space with Blair Park, although I understand this might not be possible. But I also think this open space, either as a park or just fields, is probably also important as a fire break.</p>
<p>None. Just place the new residential units in Blair Park away form all present recreational uses.</p>
<p>This is the best option for using the space in a cohesive manner.</p>
<p>I like this the least of the 4 options.</p>
<p>Don't like at all</p>



<p>Again reducing the entry points is good. But everyone who lives past this point in Piedmont needs to add 10 minutes during most of the day to get to the center of town and schools. Tell me again why all the housing ended up here and none in the middle of town where there is transit?</p>
<p>Preserving the open space on Blair and the underground parking</p>
<p>Maintains the open space and minimizes overall impact on the site</p>
<p>Same as Option 2</p>
<p>Hillside housing development is very desirable, since it is away from the road. Visually for those driving through and also quieter for residents.</p> <p>The extremely high cost of underground facilities is important, too, and probably renders this option useless for continued discussion. We should focus on what is reasonably possible financially.</p>
<p>Walkability! The "new public access trail" is important to me only if it provides access to Oakland via Abbott Way to Maxwellton.</p>
<p>best option, preserves all open space</p>
<p>See above</p>
<p>AGAIN - No parking is being listed for the housing units. This screams of developers prioritizing work over functionality vs. state subsidies for making housing.</p> <p>What happens on the day of a big soccer tournament and the housing parking lot at full?</p> <p>This screams of developers making money and no real thought being done.</p>
<p>Combining parking structure with the recreation field is an outstanding choice of land use.</p> <p>Keeping Blair Park as open space is great.</p> <p>Keeping corp. yard on both side of Moraga is important.</p>
<p>It would be nice to keep the open space in Blair Park.</p>
<p>Do we really want a soccer field on top of a parking garage??</p>
<p>This is the only option that makes sense</p>
<p>This seems like the best option, then housing isn't front and center on Moraga, it retains the open space, tucks the corporation yard away from view, and creates more parking. I am sure this is the most involved from an engineering perspective but seems like the best option. I like that Blair park can be made into a better dog park then it currently is, perhaps nearly as large but fenced in to some extent.</p>
<p>None</p>
<p>Option 4 seems like second best option.</p>
<p>The hosing above the field</p>



Like Option 3, great to have the fields near the housing to help residents be a part of Piedmont.
<p>This is my favorite option as it allows Blair Park to remain an open space. Piedmont has shown its commitment to protecting the environment by building an all electric pool complex. We should not negate the environmental impact of this by cutting down trees, and ruining our last open space. This space should be enhanced, not diminished.</p> <p>The other factor that is important to me is keeping pedestrian traffic on the Coaches Field side of Blair for safety reasons.</p>
none
I like the additional parking
Option 4 leaves Blair Park along which while desirable to adjacent neighbors would be a poor use of an undeveloped and lightly used open space. Blair Park should be developed. It's potential for additional open space use is very limited for many reasons.
I do not like the idea of putting the field on top of the parking lot. That seems like a terrible idea and will look and feel too industrial.
AMAZING soccer field! We need more sports fields in piedmont!!
All the housing is tucked up against the hillside on the north (Coaches Field) side of Moraga Avenue.
Preservation of Blair Park as open space and a dog park. Integration of housing (not isolating affordable housing).
open space is nice!!
Moraga Ave and pedestrian improvements to town Housing off street
I think the parking structure with field on top is a nice approach, albeit costly.
Increased parking with structure & field space on top. Housing in Moraga canyon. Minimal impact rating.
I love that Blair park is intact in this option. Large dog park.
This is by far the best of the options presented because it vastly increases the safety of both future residents and drivers on Moraga Ave by eliminating additional pedestrian and vehicular crossings of the very busy Moraga Ave. In addition, leaving Blair Park as open space is a great benefit to the environment and would not compromise the safety of the Blair Park hillside and the homes built atop on Scenic Ave by cutting into the hillside and the utilities of the homes. The utilization of space with the parking structure and soccer field placements is a boon.
use/ get rid of coaches field & soccer field
get rid of soccer fields, use for parking, sidewalk & safety



The parking garage addresses some of the parking congestion concerns of the prior design. The elevated field / garage will have greater curb appeal than the prior very dense looking design.
lots of open space
This option of putting the sportsfield on top of a parking structure seems like the best use of space out of all of the options presented.
This option is off the table. To cram everything into one space, and leave the open area as a dog park is not what most community members had in mind with this project.
IF we could afford it, I really like the recreational field on top of parking - seems like an efficient use of space.
Keeping Blair Park as open space. Having the 130 DU not all along Moraga Ave
I like the efficiency of putting parking under the field (especially if the field is going to be expanded), so long as it doesn't raise the field up too high creating an awkward wall
Interesting approach to stacking recreation, corp yard and parking and keeping Blair park untouched. This is also the other low impact option. There could potentially be more housing added to Blair park eventually, maybe less units than Option 1.
Signalized intersection; vertical integration of the Corp Yard and rec uses to maximize use of available space.
Trail access, more housing
Least favorite option overall, too much infrastructure in the canyon.
This is my favorite. Dog park and preserving open space.
Again, seems like a really bad idea to put the sports field and housing in the same vicinity (noise/traffic), and crazier still to add the corporations yard. Mega density for what? Just to keep Blair open space? Nah, if we are going dense, let's build there too.
Highly complex, presumably costly. This seems wishful.
I love this idea of parking structure under the field and housing tucked high in the hillside with access from other streets and not highland.
I suspect this one may be the one that will get the most support for the "don't destroy Blair park" crowd (who probably never once has visited Blair park). I am a fan of using small footprint for multiple purposes so I love the elevated sports field with parking and corporation under it.
Corporation yard not labeled. Assume grey area. This is the least attractive of the four options.
Seems like best compromise option to create viable community with new housing units and sports complex, while minimizing congestion and unsightliness of visible corporation yard in central location.
Seems like the best for the public uses and keeping blair park.



I think keeping the housing units more removed from the actual road is definitely an improvement, option one is the absolute worst in terms of the density and massing it creates.
I don't think option for it was presented at the last meeting
I think keeping the housing units more removed from the actual road is definitely an improvement, option one is the absolute worst in terms of the density and massing it creates.
I don't think option for it was presented at the last meeting
Preserving Blair Park
Public trail access. Improved Playfield to U14 Soccer. Improved Moraga Ave/Signal.
The location of the high-density houses. I just like in option two, I'm worried about the traffic implications of locating the houses where they are.
This seems to be the best use of space, would allow for a new field to be created (current one has drainage issues), allow for units with views, be the most visually appealing as there would be more open space on the south side of Moraga.
This is the best option. Satisfies the housing need without impacting current residents.
Field size. Got plenty of housing in.
The parking structure would be unattractive though if Option 3 is not possible then this is the next best solution
Maintaining the open space in Blair Park would be nice.
Great efficiency of land use and improvement of Blair Park.
-I really like the idea of the parking structure below the sports field (like Underhill Parking in Berkeley) - it seems very efficient
-keeping Blair open could be good for future possibilities (in case more housing is needed down the line)
-this seems like the best option in terms of parking, preserving some open space (for folks that are prioritizing that), and expanding the soccer/softball field
Housing
All housing on North side of Moraga Ave is a better option. Public trail access.
None
Like the efficiency but concerned about the fiscal and storm water etc impact
This is my favorite of all because it keeps the space open and green and welcoming. There is no need to destroy one of the few pieces of land left in the city.



field space...can soccer and baseball/softball really fit on top of parking?

corp yard space... will this function well for DPW?

I hate it and it's not feasible



**What features of Option 4 are NOT important to you?**

This plane looks like the least impactful of the four on the existing neighborhoods that surround Blair Park.
I do not want to see any housing built in Blair Park
Dog Park, Skate Park
None. It's a good option.
Trails. Skate park.
Blair Park remains intact
N/A
The dog park should not be preserved. It is not used a lot. Option #4 turns a bucolic area into an ugly one with a suburban structure. The field should be left as it is. Option #1 takes away from a few dogs. Option #4 takes away from our many children. Isn't it more important to walk our children? LOL
Dog park not important. There are hardly any dogs being walked there and there are other places to walk dogs in Piedmont. Kids having a place to play is more important. I don't like putting a sports field on top of a parking structure - it seems insane when there is a perfectly good field on ground level. Plus the expense to build a parking structure seems an unnecessary expense and will be an eyesore.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The parking structure being underneath the field is not as desirable as having the field on the ground for ease of access</li> <li>- It would be too crowded to have all of the elements on the north side of Moraga</li> <li>- I think more housing is more important than maintaining "Blair Park", which is not a park to me but a long thin strip of land on a busy street. Sure, some of it could be developed and improved to become a nicer area but in its current state it is not useful &amp; frankly not used by many</li> </ul>
Dog Park.
2 market rate houses on Abbott and Maxwellton.
parking garage
<p>I oppose the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Building of single family housing near Maxwellton and Abbott as they are not state requirements under the CA Housing Element and doubly impact our neighborhood congestion (the low income housing development and the addition of market value single family homes)</li> <li>- Expansion or any modification to Coaches Field, as this is a separate issue not related to the Housing Element and inclusion of it in the specific plans is confounding the issues</li> </ul>
Similar to 2,3
Seems like the most expensive option



Why are you keeping Blair Park open? it's basically used for dog walking. This is silly. And it's very expensive.
N/A
Signal
Dog park.
SFD are not part of housing element requirements. (last page of survey refers to the Housing element) New trail will increase illegal trespassing on nearby home owners and Mountain View cemetery and seriously impact ingress of Piedmont Fire department and emergency vehicles on Maxwelton and surrounding streets due to narrowness of streets/. Significant impact on Oakland home owners due to parking constraints.
Ridiculously expensive and disruptive just to keep an underutilized piece of property vacant?
Skate park Separation of 2 du
The raised parking and courtyard structure seem like a terrible idea. Adding a visual blight, exhaust, and noise directly in front of all the housing. Who would want to live in that kind of situation? And, it seems that again, the market rate housing gets the best views, and the least visual, blight, and traffic noise.
having a two story parking
Do not need to maintain a skate park/spot in Piedmont-- environmentally damaging, too. Offering 2 SFD's as part of a public land giveaway to developers is contrary to the goals of this housing project-- and I strongly oppose this element of any plan. Piedmont already has enough SFDs-- that's why we need to build denser housing options.
Massive changes to the canyon
While I would like to keep the Blair Park open space, we need to know the cost to build this new field and parking structure, which is not a necessary expense
Pedestrian trails, improved Moraga Avenue, 2 SFD, new skate spot.
The dog park is not needed - Piedmont has enough dog parks and there will still be open space in Blair Park.
Creating market rate housing with views of the flatlands of Oakland is not a priority at all. All the units should be affordable housing. Why would the residents of Piedmont want to subsidize market rate housing? It's a terrible idea from any angle you look at it.
status quo is not important
I want to be sure that there is enough parking
Blair park remaining as is
I do not like sacrificing city property for a housing project that does not benefit the current residents of the city. The only apparent benefits are to those who obtain the housing and the developer and contractors who profit from the project.
Dog park.





<p>Remove/relocate market rate housing to minimize impact on long-term Piedmont residents. Additionally, these are on steep and hard to get to locations. There is no grade shown on SFD lot on Maxwellton; in fact this is a very steep grade. How about placement somewhere that is flatter and requires less engineering. These two houses seemingly just appeared at the final hour with no community input and little thought put into location as they are on all four proposals.</p>
<p>Remove public trail access on Maxwellton. There is no parking available on Maxwellton or nearby streets, both in Piedmont and Oakland. Maxwellton is not wide enough for two-way traffic; the road cannot handle increase usage. Furthermore, we are concerned about access for emergency service vehicles. In the past when the gate was not able to fully shut, neighbors here experienced many disruptions late at night. Trailhead will promote illegal trespassing on Mountain View Cemetery property. Trailhead has potential to be a public nuisance.</p>
<p>What don't I like about this option? Building the sports field on top of parking will be very costly and difficult. How does Public Works feel about being relocated under ground?</p>
<p>Don't like the housing right by the sports field. Can guarantee the residents will complain about noise.</p>
<p>Added housing, signal at intersection.</p>
<p>Skate Park.</p>
<p>As with the other scenarios, I think the two dus off Maxwellton and Abbott are unimportant and should be eliminated entirely due to safety concerns along extremely narrow Maxwellton.</p> <p>I think placing the sports field above the parking structure is unimportant and potentially excessively expensive.</p> <p>Providing additional office space and dedicated parking areas for the City's maintenance fleet vehicles seems excessive and is unimportant to me.</p>
<p>Skate park</p>
<p>Dog park                  Soccer field                  New signalized intersection</p>
<p>Adding a full-sized U14 soccer field to Coaches Field.</p>
<p>I am uncertain about parking structure and how it will feel from street. It may feel very urban.</p>
<p>Market rate housing.</p>



Podium for corp yard to expensive and would not allow any spectator space at field
Minimum open space on north side of Moraga
Keeping underutilized Blair park seems to be a poor use of that space, especially if opening up hill to public access.
Affordable housing
dog park
dog park
way too much congestion at soccer field and housing waste of space in Blair Park, which has few dog walkers daily yes it is nice to have open space, but it needs to be better utilized for the entire community
housing
None. I think this is the best option by far.
Dog fun space
Keeping Blair Park intact. I'm ready to lose Blair Park
Keeping Blair park as it is. Skate spot. Dog park.
Skate Park
Leaving Blair Park intact.
Rooftop field is terrible idea.
We do not need a giant dog park. That's a poor use of valuable space.
Dog park having the entire Blair canyon. I don't know if there is enough demand for this use of this space.
I think the parking structure idea is weird...
Parking garage w/ field looks good but will be very expensive to build and maintain.
Don't care about the skate park. Not sure it's used much?
All of it
See below
Preservation of Blair park, sports field on top of parking structure
All housing plans
I think building the soccer field on a parking garage seems unnecessary since the other plans have shown there is plenty of room for parking, housing, soccer field, and corp yard without building this unnecessary structure
Dog park. Seriously, we don't need a dog park.
Corporation yard under the soccer field sounds nice, but cost prohibitive. Building down presents significant challenges and building up, like Salesforce Park, requires vision.
preserving Blair Park open space
none, it's all good



I see few benefits to have a sports field placed on top of a parking structure. This would define the perimeter and not allow the outer land use we have today. This parking lot is too expensive to consider.
The undeveloped open space on the south side of Moraga is wasted space at the expense of a lot of unrecoverable costs in the parking structure and negative effect on the city yard. I don't like that the sports field is out of service for so long.
Skate park
Housing
Dog park and skate park
See above
AGAIN - No parking is being listed for the housing units. This screams of developers prioritizing work over functionality vs. state subsidies for making housing.
I don't really care about the 2 new single family home sites.
If you don't develop Blair Park now, it will never be developed. I think you break the barrier now and go for it.
all
is this much more expensive?
Preserving Blair Park as open space is not important to me.
Parking under new sports field - bulky/ugly Existing dog park - not best use of space
Blair park remaining open space. It is really not very usable as it is now.
Don't like it.
keeping soccer field/xmas lot  you bought that land from Mtn View Cemetery for play not for human benefit  your priorities stink
Again densifying this area will create substantially more traffic and safety risk and lower the quality of life for residents due to the noise and congestion. This looks like a very high budget and higher risk project given the combination of all uses in one limited area.
I don't understand how the dog park would work, it looks huge. Would the existing trees remain?
I like the idea of separating the dog park from the residences in part because dogs can make some people nervous.
I don't like option 4
Do not leave Blair Park as is, the space is highly underutilized and should be developed for housing or another public amenity



I would rather see more (all?) of the parking under the field and the corp yard on the south side of Moraga, so that (a) there could be some sharing of parking because peak residential and field parking usage wouldn't overlap; and (b) more of the site could be used for housing so the housing didn't have to be so close to the field, which feels cramped in
Nothing; I like this option
Dog park is too big
This version will incur significantly more cost just to maintain a low quality trail and dog area. Piedmont Park and Dracena offer better dog walk locations.
Additional parking
I still think moraga canyon needs to have a field for our students/athletes.
Then of course, I think "oh if we did this, we could fit some more housing units in Blair park". Personally, I think Piedmont has way too many dog parks for residents most of whom enjoy houses with plenty of yard space.
Maintaining Blair Park in current state.
Seems like the most expensive option and I worry that it might impede the operations of the corp yard having it all below the field.
The location of the two market-rate houses.
Keeping Blair Park open space
Might be most costly option with dirt removal to create a giant parking/underground structure and new field on top. Lots of cars/traffic coming from this side of the road might be difficult for traffic flow.
Skate park eliminated
But maintaining the open space of Blair Park doesn't seem like it should be an overall priority. I had assumed it had to be sacrificed and was ok with that.
Soccer field.
Soccer field
SFD
parking garage w field on top is stupid idea and unnecessary
Parking structure Artificial turf field soccer
The signal will cause an absolute nightmare and is unnecessary. At least wait on it to see if after the fact it really is needed
blair park open space
Hate it and isn't feasible



### Is there anything else you'd like to share about Option 4?

This is my favorite option.
Integrate a basketball hoop somewhere for inclusivity.
This keeps this thru way beautiful and provides functional needs
I don't like that it hardens surfaces in watershed - needs to mitigate the amount of water runoff.
seems the best option
Same as option 3. Plus, cost efficiency.
Looks solid!!
Same as Option 3. Very unsafe option. Instant fire hazard zone for even higher risk for wildfires.
N/A
The complexity will be expensive..
- This is my least favorite option & I work on climate literacy & education so sustainability is very important to me but housing is a right that Piedmont needs to do a lot better job of providing to varied income levels & this option would cost more due to the large parking lot (the size of which is not necessary)
underground parking garage with field on top seems like a pretty massive project
- In my book, very high priority to maintain existing green space in Blair Park — the beautiful open space is central to what I love about living in the canyon, so I strongly prefer this option - Efficient use of space — love the under-field structure
Not supportive of this option
Adding this many units of low/mid-income housing to this area, regardless of the option, will negatively impact traffic, noise levels and property values for the Piedmont residents in this neighborhood. As previously pointed out by many residents of Moraga Canyon, this plan forces the majority of units on a single community, no matter how high the barriers for development. We were shocked at how quickly any proposals for build in the center of town were dismissed, despite having many merits. This reinforces the belief that residents with greater influence and financial clout are directing the build away from their homes.
Best option.
Please remove the two market rate SFD - this part of Piedmont is taking more than their fair share of new housing. We don't need those two homes there. Plus why sell off two parts? Keep the whole thing open as it is. There are already trails that go from Abbott way and a city gate.
N/A
no comment



<p>These projects put a significant, unfair burden on the residents near the proposed development - Piedmont should be fair and come up with a plan that reduces the impact on these residents and shares more equitably with the rest of Piedmont.</p>
<p>This option creates a very concentrated environment in one location and ignores the rest of the accessible space available.</p>
<p>This plan leaves more park land for people and pets and beauty.          I do think there should be some parking on the Blair Park side</p>
<p>least effective use of space, reduced quality of life for residential units.</p>
<p>I cannot support this. It would mean the affordable housing is unlikely to happen in the 8th cycle, maybe never. It is expensive, disruptive and I don't see the benefit!</p>
<p>BEST OPTION! Allows for housing that does not directly negatively impact the immediate/surrounding neighbors, better for noise and impact to wildlife and allows for people to continue to use Blair Park for exercise and dogs.</p>
<p>See my comments after each option, but especially option one.</p>
<p>Bad plan</p>
<p>Why is there a need for the 'additional' impermeable parking area outside of the parking/paved area under the entire U14-sized soccer field?</p>
<p>Not a good solution but better than 2 and 3</p>
<p>I feel very strongly that this is the best option presented. I believe that this option will have the lowest impact on traffic along Moraga Avenue.          I like how this plan is efficiency using the space available and allows the preservation of green space.</p>
<p>This is the best option</p>
<p>All the options include adding too much housing density to this small area. Housing should be spread out throughout Piedmont and not concentrated in this one corner of the city. This will affect the quality of life of the current neighborhood, will cause traffic jams, sound and light pollution, make the neighborhood less safe during fires and negatively affect the beauty of the canyon.</p>
<p>I strongly favor 4</p>
<p>If Public Works can be accommodated with this design, then it is an important feature to me. Seems unfeasible that all this activity (housing, recreation, public works) can be accommodated in that space. Strikes me as prohibitively expensive.</p>



<p>There is no information on what is defined as affordable housing. It should be the first item clearly defined in the site documentation and easily accessible. I attempted to find this information and could not find it. I know we would all like to see hundreds of affordable housing units built in the community, but the reality is that Piedmont is not an affordable community... it is an affluent community. To create housing for affluent people in the community makes sense because those are the people who can afford to live here after probably having bought their starter house in a lower priced housing area. It is illogical to put "affordable housing" in this neighborhood. The financial impacts are significant and multi-dimensional.</p>
<p>Option 1 is the best IF... we can move and shrink the Corp Yard and move the road to the south.</p>
<p>Is it really possible to get the corporation yard functions all under the field?</p>
<p>I hate the elevated field— it makes it very unwelcoming and ruins the character of the area. My least favorite option by far.</p>
<p>I'm anti dog-park in light of the very limited land available in Piedmont.</p>
<p>I have said it all above. Moraga Canyon is ill-suited for housing. There is already heavy traffic 24/7 on Moraga Ave. The site is 1 mile from the center of Piedmont and public transportation. Everyone would drive, adding even more traffic. Moraga Ave. is the one &amp; only evacuation route for nearby Piedmont &amp; Oakland residents and could not handle 200+ more cars in case of a wildfire or earthquake. It is a Severe Wildlife Fire zone, landslides occur (as recently as 1/10/24!), and 1/2 mile from the Hayward Fault. The Canyon is isolated from the rest of Piedmont.</p>
<p>This option seems very costly and not well thought out.</p>
<p>It's the best solution in the long run but cost of parking structure needs to be carefully estimated.</p>
<p>I support this option. It is the best design for use of space and innovative approach to ensure good long term use of area.</p>
<p>Regardless of the site plan, 132 additional units in narrow Moraga Canyon will have a deleterious impact on the safety of existing homes and lives in the area. Moraga Ave is a major transportation route for the Hwy 24/13 area (including Montclair and Upper Rockridge whose residents should have been notified of this endeavor). This plan puts thousands of people in the area at risk in the event of a major fire. The arterial already is at or near capacity during commute hours. Moraga is only one of two (the other being Park) connectors for the whole city of Piedmont to Montclair Village, Highway 13, and Hwy 24.</p>
<p>Do not agree with new signalized intersection that will cause more smog and traffic build up.</p>



Of the four options, this is the best, but I'm still concerned about what happens to baseball at Coaches Field. The current batting cage footprint is small, but it's used by a lot of people and it looks like it would now disappear.

Is it really reasonable to have multi-sport use of Coaches Field? The existing baseball/softball field drains poorly and is not maintained well. Would there be natural grass here or is it going to be yet another astroturf field (which we already have at Beach and most of Hampton)?

I believe Piedmont citizens would be willing to pay for better recreation facilities and adding a parking garage is a good idea.

I would prefer the City change the situation at Linda Beach courts and give us back the tennis courts that were stolen and converted to noisy pickleball. How about evicting the picklers at Linda Beach and putting them in Moraga Canyon where their noise won't affect neighbors?

Housing in this location will not loom over Moraga Ave. The feel of the canyon and open space will be maintained, while added infrastructure will help beautify the place.

This option also the best imo.

like putting the soccer field on top of the parking structure! Gives, lots more parking, doesn't waste space with a giant open field  
curbs noise complaints for the new housing nearby

get rid of affordable housing

If the underground parking lot is too costly, you could consider a garage structure.

This is bad - just bad. removing coaches is stupid.

Please pursue this one and this one only.

Did we lose the Corporation Yard? Under field parking a nice idea but is money no object? Perhaps I missed the budget numbers.

I think this is most expensive and not sure public works corp yard would work well under a sports field. I think you would loose civic space for tree lot and pumpkin patch. The open space of Blair park should be used for development. The hillside above Coaches field could be better used for trails and dog run.

I feel that the Blair Park space is currently underutilized and option 4 misses an opportunity to improve that space.





<p>There is no discussion about additional traffic signals outside the City of Piedmont and how this would impact traffic flows onto highway 13 when trying to enter and exit off of highway 13. These lanes (on Moraga and on the freeway) are already backed up without the additional housing structures. Will there be any additional road ramps, traffic signals or circles by the City of Oakland and/or State of California to aid in this project?                  If this option is selected, is there anything that could be done with some of the land in the Blair Park space to moderate traffic flow?</p>
<p>"best" option of all not great options.                  Traffic impact is still a huge issue.</p>
<p>Corp Yard is kept unobtrusive. Requires expensive underground parking structure. Not my favorite option but an acceptable one.</p>
<p>I don't see the point of leaving Blair Park as it is. Blair Park as it is doesn't serve any function other than a dog park. It doesn't even look nice.</p>
<p>Omit rooftop field.</p>
<p>This might be my second favorite. Although having all traffic (new housing and corporation yard) come down the same path to Moraga could be a problem.</p>
<p>You should maximize the number of affordable housing units across the several plans.</p>
<p>Underground parking with Corporate Yard included. Necessary?</p>
<p>I assuming making a two tiered field/parking structure will probably be expensive and I am not sure we need to do that to preserve Blair Park, which is underused.</p>
<p>See all comments to Option 1,2,and 3.</p>
<p>This and number two are my favorite options. Probably this one slightly more because it keeps Blair park open.</p>
<p>We lose recreation facilities it seems ?</p>
<p>Worst of the 4 options IMHO. Corp yard needs to be separated from the field better, and we don't need this much open space (barely gets used as it is)</p>
<p>Feels too built up around coches field</p>
<p>Why not build units instead of the dog park in this version? We need a lot more housing.</p>
<p>Seems like it's too much to place all the housing, the corp yard and soccer field in the same space. I'd be concerned about traffic and congestion and safety for pedestrians and cyclists</p>
<p>If we do build up, not only should we be thinking parking and Corp yard but also maybe a park &amp; ride, convenience store, and Amazon etc hub.</p>
<p>Any new housing should be privately funded. If any city or public items are being relocated, the new Moraga Canyon developments (not city wide) should cover the cost.</p>
<p>ugly parking structure?!? are we kidding?</p>
<p>This seems like a ridiculous waste of space not using Blair Park</p>



Bad option too expensive
<p>Why not add public works/ corporation yard back behind apartment buildings?</p> <p>Would like to see Blair park converted into usable field space in addition to coaches field. It will always benefit the community to repurpose that unused space into community field space.</p>
best one
Option 4 appears to have no advantages over choosing option 1 which keeps all the new residential units away from current recreational land use.
BEAUTIFY BLAIR PARK!!! Make it a welcoming entrance to Piedmont! Keep it an open space, but invest in Piedmont's beauty with trails, dog park, playground, seating areas, etc.
<p>Option 4 seems like the most expensive option for civic infrastructure costs. And there is big short term impact on sports and huge long term impact on the city. Again, this study's planners underestimate what is needed for a city corporation yard, yards are by their nature messy and where the big trucks are serviced. The parking structure would have to be unusually high off the ground to accommodate trucks and need extra ventilation due to truck exhaust. Think about how the big rubbish bins get loaded onto the back of a truck to be hauled away. And who wants to work in a parking garage all day?</p> <p>I don't like that the sports fields will be out of service for the length of time it takes to reconstruct the structure- a year plus. And the developer will want to build the housing first because the parking structure is in the way and the housing is where the developer will make their money, so you are talking several years with no sports field.</p> <p>Leaving the open space on the south side of Moraga seems a wasted opportunity. Open space is nice, but that space is just blah- it is not a great place for a useful open park. We can delay decisions on it for a few more years but the city will eventually be forced to do something with it, probably be mandated to build housing, let's just bite the bullet and do something with it.</p>
Don't think elevated structure like that belongs in piedmont at all . It's a precursor to public problems will look to urban
A compromise that makes everyone who lives past this point on Moraga worse off? Let me guess, you'll go with this one because we didn't complain as loudly as those people in the middle of town?
Traffic!



<p>Best option. Least impact. Sets units away from the street noise. Provides good access to the playing field. Maintains open space and mature trees for the general public. Optimizes space by concealing the corporation yard under the playing field structure while providing stepped development up the hill. Provides views from the units. Allow for bike and pedestrian paths along south side of Moraga away from the road.</p>
<p>I think this would be expensive.</p>
<p>This would take the playfield out of use for a long time.</p>
<p>Creative, but seems to be trying a bit too hard.</p>
<p>See comments on option 3</p>
<p>No.</p>
<p>Where does the "new public access trail" go? Will the path that connects Moraga to Abbott still exist? What does "improved Moraga Ave" mean? I would like to see the community commit to making new housing and recreation development accessible on foot and by other non-car means.</p>
<p>See above</p>
<p>AGAIN - No parking is being listed for the housing units. This screams of developers prioritizing work over functionality vs. state subsidies for making housing.</p>
<p>By far, the best of the four because of the parking structure combination and the preservation of Blair Park as open space.</p>
<p>Too much congestion in one area, this would be a terrible setup / issue.</p>
<p>The housing should be built in Blair Park. The larger NEW PUBLIC TRAIL ACCESS AREA in Option 1 is better for the people of Piedmont and a replacement for Blair Park!</p>
<p>Seems the less disruptive of the plans</p>
<p>it is a waste of resources</p>
<p>Option 4 seems to be much more expensive than Option 1 for the City and developers of housing projects.</p>
<p>All renderings are basically the same result with way to many people/ units and congestion that is not ideal for Moraga Avenue and it's a residence of Piedmont who have to travel on that road and for our public safety</p>
<p>Zone additional SFUs north of proposed to create more value for developer.</p>
<p>I walk through Blair park often and it is not usable as a park.</p>



<p>Of the current options presented, this is the only plan that demonstrates thoughtful care for the safety and social equity(the homes will not be segregated by cost of units) of the new neighbors who will be living in Moraga Canyon as well as the preservation of open spaces with their flora and fauna.</p> <p>One issue that must also be addressed is the mitigation of increased traffic on Moraga Ave which would impede safe fire and earthquake evacuation for all residents of the greater Canyon neighborhoods.</p> <p>Some of these new residential units should be placed in other areas of the City for safety and to provide walking opportunities to shopping and public transit.</p>
sucks
Placing all housing and recreation in one area for options 3 and 4 does not seem harmonious with this open area of Piedmont and think we can do better.
I do not like this option
I would love for the dog park idea to go away
This is the best option
I don't like option 4
If all the parking were underneath the field, could you build a compact apartment building (like 6 or 7 stories) where you are now showing parking along the north side of Moraga?
This will maximize investment and minimize public opposition. Probably more expensive to construct the structures in this scenario, but money is not Piedmont's problem.
Public transportation
Building everything including sports field and corp yard into the north side seems imbalanced for the canyon overall.
Don't see where the corporation yard will be.
The affordable and market rate housing must be integrated. Our value should be equality. A separate affordable group of housing units creates a stigma.
It's my favorite except for Moraga canyon remaining open space. It needs to be a field. The crazy we parents go through driving our kids all over the bay area fur field space to fields for soccer, lacrosse, baseball etc is insane.
Is there a cost difference between the four options. If so, I assume this would affect the choice
This seems like best approach to address all potential concerns. Would it be possible to combine option 4 with some enhancements to Blair Park to make area more usable for community?
My least favorite plan. Seems wasteful to do all that excavation and risk to put a soccer field on top of a parking structure. What do we gain here, preservation of an oversized dog park?



<p>This option makes the most sense to me in terms of preserving Blair Park and the scenic entryway to Piedmont.</p>
<p>A dog park for practically all of Blair Park is a bit much. That’s basically what it is now. A real park with play structures, walking paths, things for all people, not just people with dogs, is more desirable.</p> <p>The idea of a combined parking, corporation yard, playfield is very interesting, and clean looking, although sounds expensive.</p> <p>Is all that activity in one place, along with residents, recommended?</p>
<p>Seems like a lot of expensive infrastructure in pursuit of keeping Blair Park for a dog park.</p>
<p>This option and the previous option are very attractive to me. Keeping the field in this location and building the houses behind it and up the hillside with some views is a very functional design and minimizes the pedestrian crossings. Whether the corp yard is under the field or across the street needs more information. It could be good to keep it separated across the street because the dog park space has been underutilized. This option seems a bit less complex by allowing the field to remain on the ground and not built over a parking garage.</p>
<p>No downsides to option 4</p>
<p>Seems good but I understand the for corp yard</p>
<p>I have to get used to the idea of the soccer field on top of the parking garage. Would it feel claustrophobic? Would it be hard to integrate into the housing unit development? I don't want to rule it out but would want to see how it actually would look and function.</p>
<p>My personal favorite!!</p>
<p>this is a great option and seems the most efficient</p>
<p>Again, I'm opposed to this plan because the new housing units should not be right next to the sport field. Due to noise, this could create a dispute between the residents and people who use the field. Also, if we want to add lights to the sports field in the future, I think many residents of the new housing units will oppose to the idea (too bright, etc.) Also, this plan seems quite expensive.</p>
<p>like option 1 the best and 4 the least</p>
<p>Looks like a 1980s or 90s idea.</p> <p>Why not put housing and the parking structure where the tennis courts are downtown? There is a market, easy transportation, walk to school, church, city center, pool.</p>
<p>hard to imagine fields being adequate          feels to crowded</p>
<p>does not make sense to preserve blair park open space when it is severely underutilized by piedmont residents and could be more efficiently used</p>



I don't quite see how a raised field over a parking structure will work. As much as I would like to keep Blair Park this doesn't seem that feasible.

Hate it and isn't feasible



**What else would you like the project team to consider as they refine land use alternatives?**

<p>Said earlier. Consider the weather micro-climate of Blair Park. Its miserable much of the year. Secondly, consider increasing density where plan calls for SF units. Naturally occurring affordability can be achieved by developing duplexes or triplexes.</p>
<p>Moraga Ave. itself. The increase in traffic will be unwelcome but never-the-less necessary based on the fact that this many new dwelling units are going to be built here. Please take into consideration those of us that have made this area our home for many years...Although this is Piedmont's mandate, it affects those of us living in Oakland just as much, if not more, than most Piedmonters will be affected!</p> <p>And when there is an emergency, which there will be, egress is extremely important and must remain available to all.</p>
<p>I'm concerned about traffic and lights and what the plans are for that.</p>
<p>We have lived in this neighborhood (Oakland side) for almost 25 years and while we enjoy the peace and relative quietness, this area really needs better affordable housing options.</p>
<p>Please do not turn Blair Park into a corp yard or slap housing on the site. It is a lovely open space, please keep it as either passive or active recreational space. Thank you.</p>
<p>Mitigate effects on creek.</p>
<p>This neighborhood has no public transportation, how's that going to work for low-income residents? There is readily available public transportation on Grand Avenue and elsewhere in Piedmont.</p> <p>Also, neighborhood has bad streets, busy main road that cars regularly speed on, no sidewalks, unsafe for bicyclists, several dangerous intersections, not sure it is ready for additional uses.</p>
<p>What makes sense in Moraga vs. not? Let's be smart with our money and move everything for no very good reason.</p>
<p>Moraga Avenue is a major disaster escape route between the hills and lower Oakland. It's essential to plan to keep that escape route as accessible as possible.</p>
<p>Safety                  Wildfires (already hard to get insurance for houses here; please don't create any more risks)                  Cost efficiency                  Preserving open space</p>



(repeated comments from Option 1):

- Affordable housing developments, and all housing right now, are very expensive. Building on flatter raw land. A.k.a. Blair Park is feasible because it's less topography to deal with. Not to mention potentially contaminated soils and underground storage tanks at the corp yard would threaten any housing development's viability if located on that site.

- The northern parcel is not within what we call a Difficult to Develop Area (DDA), which provides additional funding for affordable housing and is often a requirement for feasibility for these types of developments.

- Building the affordable on Blair means that it can proceed on its own timeline without respect to any potential bond measures/construction for relocating the corp yard or soccer field.

- Keeping the existing uses in their existing locations, but modifying them, will be significantly less expensive than moving the pieces around.

Finally, unrelated to the different options but important for us to remember, is that the affordable and market can't be integrated within the same building because we will then lose all our affordable funding. I know there is a group of folks advocating for this, and while a wonderful concept it's not actionable because the way the funding works the units need to be in separate buildings/ owned by separate entities.

However, they could all co-locate on Blair (next door to one another) and have complementary design). I think it makes sense to at minimum do the affordable at Blair, possibly both if folks are ok going up 4-5 stories (with appropriate step backs to preserve a street frontage that's a little lower).

The Canyon is the wrong area to build.

Concentrating all the new units in one area is segregation not inclusion.

In fairness to all (including our new neighbors in the new units) and for genuine inclusion and integration, the units should be spread out all over Piedmont rather than creating "that area." But if it must be in Canyon, option #1 is the least negative plan.

Option 1 is the least intrusive.

- Incorporate sustainable/green building principles & elements into any new construction & landscaping; use many of the techniques & elements demonstrated in Berkeley's Ecology Center's Ecohouse

- Group the housing so that the lower-income "affordable" units are not ghettoized.

I support Option 1. Thank you.





Adding this many units of low/mid-income housing to this area, regardless of the option, will negatively impact traffic, noise levels and property values for the Piedmont residents in this neighborhood. As previously pointed out by many residents of Moraga Canyon, this plan forces the majority of units on a single community, no matter how high the barriers for development. We were shocked at how quickly any proposals for build in the center of town were dismissed, despite having many merits. This reinforces the belief that residents with greater influence and financial clout are directing the build away from their homes.

Fire evacuation safety,

Maintain hiking access from Abbott Way to the northern part of the plot

please, spread out the housing across Piedmont. All of the proposals create too much density in a high risk area for natural disasters (e.g. earthquake, wildfire).

Additionally, this side of Piedmont is prone to power outages relative to the homes on the other side of Moraga. Our infrastructure cannot support the existing community as it is.

I think it was irresponsible of the council to take the tennis courts off the proposed affordable housing list, especially as it was done late in a meeting (11:30 at night) by then Mayor Teddy King's proposal. You are basically relegating the lowest income housing to the far edges of town. If the affordable housing was at the tennis courts (easier to elevate tennis courts than coaches field) all the students could walk to classes from K-12. It may be too late to fix this, but I think this will look horrible in hindsight. And you can see it right now.

Since you can't fix that - please at least look at putting the homes on Blair Park which is only used to walk dogs. It will likely be the most affordable and feasible option. And preserves Coaches and area for future needs (which will come in the next housing element).

Please remove the two market rate SFD - this part of Piedmont is taking more than their fair share of new housing. We don't need those two homes there. Plus why sell off two parts? Keep the whole thing open as it is.



I do appreciate that options have to be explored, however the burden of putting 132 living units in this mean little space - I only live a few blocks away and know it very well - is just too much to expect that it can be done with any sort of grace and livability. Option 1 is my choice, because I guess I must chose one, but it confines the housing to an area where it takes on the air of being a " project " - an unpleasant word that is an echo from my very distant past in the architectural and planning world. I'm sorry you were given such a burden. The State's burden of 570+ units for Piedmont is unfair - draconian - over 9 times the requirement for the previous GP. For Piedmont to just take on this exercise without objection was a major mistake and now you are stuck with this dilemma. Good Luck! DC

Quality of the units being built.

Safety is paramount and even with a signaled traffic light and speed bumps, any developments will be challenging. Also, I worry about isolating/stigmatizing residents in the new housing

I like Option 3 best. My primary concern (to repeat again) is do NOT separate the affordable housing from market-rate housing. Whether the housing units would be sold or rented, the affordable ones should be seamlessly integrated into the project with no visual indication of which ones are inhabited by lower-income residents.

Please preserve as much recreation and open space as possible. We don't need more dog parks, as we already have 3, but we need more community and recreation space.

Concentrate on putting all housing in the little used Blair Park.



The following was submitted to the Planning Commission and City Council and I am copying here because it summarizes the important points for the project team to consider:

We live in the neighborhood above Coaches Field and are writing in response to the Moraga Canyon Specific Plan. It was a surprise to us that all four Moraga Canyon options presented at the November 30, 2023 meeting included two market value houses on Abbott Way and Maxwellton Road. We ask that you remove these from the Moraga Specific Plan.

The two places are on extremely steep and difficult to get to locations. Accessing and building in these two locations would not be cost-effective. Surely there must be other options to consider.

If these additional sites have been included as a way to provide additional income to the City of Piedmont, we are confident there must be multiple other more effective and less disruptive options for raising incremental funds. The financial assessment provided by the consulting firm at the November 30, 2023 meeting was overly simplistic, ignoring the real impact of their recommendations on current residents and placing too much emphasis on income from new, seemingly arbitrarily selected sites for market value housing.

Not only was the selection of these sites arbitrary, it also subjects our neighborhood to a double burden. First, a disproportionate number of new housing units (132) have been reserved for the Moraga Canyon area. Second, the City is selecting the same area in which to locate market value units to raise funds. So, in effect, we are being asked to assume the burden of raising funds to pay for a plan that already disfavors us. This is egregiously unfair.

It was a surprise to see fair market value housing even in the plans as this had never been raised in prior meetings and the rationale for adding it to the plan has not been disclosed to the community. It is a curveball at the final hour. Again, we ask that these sites be removed from the plan. A broader discussion about the role of market value housing in Piedmont should be a separate topic for the City Council.

As one of the two neighborhoods most impacted by the housing element, it would be nice to know that you all were looking out for us and our property values, to assure fair treatment across all of Piedmont. Plans presented, environmental impact reports, zoning discussions and the like miss the reality that we are most impacted. We ask that in good faith you factor in a buffer zone in these plans when you consider locations for the fair market housing.

We all moved to Piedmont for its sense of community. It now feels like our neighborhood is being treated differently. There were other neighborhoods that could



afford lawyers and understood early how to navigate the system to ensure low-income housing was removed from consideration in their areas. While it was uncomfortable to witness, for example, how quickly consideration of housing in the center or town was removed from the plan, it would be nice to know that you are looking out for us and assure fair treatment for all residents of Piedmont.

Added January 15:

Following the meeting last Monday, January 8, we'd like to update our letter. We request that you do not add a nature trail entrance where the current fire road gate is. We request that the fire road remains gated.

Last-minute notice: This was an absolute and outrageous curveball at the final hour. The January 8 meeting was the first time any of us learned about the nature trail proposal. As it is not even part of the housing element, we'd like it removed immediately.

Fire Safety: Maxwellton has limited access for fire trucks. This can be a major hazard. For example, some youths brought tiki torches and smoking materials to the field, causing grave concern. Removing the gate and giving public access will surely exacerbate the issue. Adding parking for trailhead parking would block PFD fire truck access.

Traffic: It is not safe to factor into your plans ideas that necessitate increased traffic on Maxwellton. The proposed nature trail entrance on Maxwellton is not safe. Maxwellton is a narrow and winding road with blind curves. It is not wide enough for two cars driving in opposite directions, one car needs to pull over for oncoming traffic.

Parking: There is no space for trailhead parking. Street parking only adds to the issue of clear passage on the road. When we have visitors, they need to find parking at least a block away so we can maintain a clear passage.

Buffer zones: We request buffer zones be designed into plans for current residents. The drawing of the trail goes right past three bedroom windows and a garden gate at 190 Maxwellton Road. Further, it makes the houses at 180 Maxwellton Road, 190 Maxwellton Road and 198 Maxwellton Road exposed to would-be walkers, causing concern for our safety.

Trespassing concerns and home safety: This trail would give direct access to our homes on Maxwellton and Mountain View Cemetery property. The cemetery is clear that walkers on their property are only allowed access through its Piedmont Avenue entrance.

Personal Safety: On a number of occasions the Piedmont Police were called when our own efforts to subdue drunk and disorderly late-night trespassers failed. Beer cans and other remnants from partying have been left on homeowners' property.



Sound travels: We hear it when there is batting practice or trespassers on the cemetery property. We are already subject to the noise of 130+ units, plus automobiles, adding the noise of walkers and increased traffic and parking adds insult to injury.

We would like to know the process in which the two single family dwellings were added to the four options and made public for community comment. There are no grade lines on any of the maps where the SFD on Maxwellton is located. This oversight therefore does not take into consideration the very steep grade. What other locations were considered? We reiterate our request that the two SFDs get removed from all four options without further discussion.

As expressed in our previous email, we are currently bearing the brunt of the Housing Element plans. This is not a "blank slate:" this is a community with our homes that we have spent considerable time and resources to create and maintain. We look forward to hearing from you on the changes you will make to ensure our concerns are addressed.

Less Housing

The location of the housing should be in keeping with the rest of Piedmont and not look like some public housing placed in the least desirable location.

transparency of discussion

Please reconsider building these multi tenant spots in Piedmont.

I'd like the team to consider my comments from option 1- put some or all of market rate on Canyon side (preferably some) and all of the affordable on Blair park with half of the market rate (perhaps at lower density). You can have two separate legal developments with shared private amenities (a courtyard, play structure, gardens, etc.) There are many precedent developments for this (Coggins Square affordable/Ironhorse townhomes in Pleasant Hill a good example).



<p>Do not take away Blair Park for housing or other buildings. This land is too narrow to develop, many people use it on a daily basis for exercise and dogs. Putting lots of housing in that small space is too disruptive to the immediate and surrounding neighbors, causes a traffic nightmare/safety issues and huge impact to all of the wildlife in the canyon. Also will hurt the neighbors home values. There is alot more open space above/around Coaches Field that would be better served.</p>
<p>TRAFFIC CONGESTION. HOW ARE WE GOING TO GET OUT OF HERE IN A FIRE??!</p> <p>MORAGA IS ALREADY TOO CONGESTED WITH TRAFFIC AS IT IS. VERY DIFFICULT TO GET OUT OF/ON TO STREETS LIKE HARBORD THAT ACCESS MUCH HOUSING AND THROUGH STREETS</p>
<p>Consider a lesser residential density for the specific plan</p> <p>Ability of Moraga Ave to accommodate 2 dedicated left turn lanes</p>
<p>Just to be clear, I think the City Council and the City have made a big mistake in choosing Moraga Canyon for such a large housing development. The new housing should be spread throughout the city, rather than bunched in an area that's too small for the project, provides significant and serious traffic and pedestrian safety problems, is isolated, does not provide public transportation, or safety for the residents, and most importantly affords no way to integrate these large numbers of people into City life. Shame on these decisions!</p>
<p>Change the location so that transportation and services are within walking distance. And safer than the Moraga race track. The solutions offered seem to lack innovation, creativity, and adaptation to the 21 c.</p>
<p>Have about just having the park like the law it promotes good feelings and is very pretty you are going to get people mad and looking at concrete make people mad. YOu are destroying us. We are not a big city SO STOP TRYIMG TO DO THIS if this is what you want MOVE!!!!</p>
<p>Eliminate any SFDs from the plan. Minimize paved areas. Maximize and incentivize biking and walking opportunities. Dedicate funds to revitalizing Blair Natural Park to a native landscaped woodland.</p>
<p>If new housing has to be built, please construct them fast. The canyon works like an echo chamber and the construction noise will be terrible for folks living around the canyon</p>
<p>Thank you for your tireless efforts to create needing housing!</p>
<p>I vote for option 4!</p>

What else would you like to team to consider as they refine land use alternatives?



Please remember that the state of California does not require that the City actually build/pay for any housing and related infrastructure, that the infrastructure for new developments are typically paid for by the developer, and we cannot afford to start building or improving recreation facilities as part of this.

Also, please provide us all with a comparison of the total public funds required to build each of the four options.

I feel that this state mandated plan that sacrifices precious undeveloped green space in our community is a disaster

Acquiring or using existing easements (EBMUD?) to allow pedestrian access to Blair Park from Scenic Avenue and to Coaches from Abbot Way. Solar installations on the hillside, feasibility of a micro-hydroelectric pumping station utilizing EBMUD reservoir above Blair Park (pump water up to reservoir using solar power during the day and generate electricity with water flow down to Corp Yard during the day. Would require EBMUD participation.

I support affordable housing broadly but the way this scheme is being forced down the throat of the residents of this community is starting to make me feel very uncomfortable. I strongly oppose all 4 options presented (with option #4 being the least horrible idea amongst those presented.)

This canyon isn't suitable for high density housing. The city of Piedmont isn't appropriate for affordable housing; because like me and most of my neighbors, Piedmont is a city of older adults that have worked hard to build up to living in Piedmont. We lived in other areas and saved and then moved here. I can't imagine what you're thinking affordable housing will look like in this neighborhood, unless you're planning to lower the property values significantly.

As I said, I support affordable housing but this is not the right way or place to do it.

The corp yard is almost totally vehicle oriented. Housing and recreation should be on the north which has good ped access.

see above. Please look at the entire footprint as a clean slate. Assuming that Moraga Ave needs to stay exactly on its current alignment is flawed thinking.

Thank you and please contact me if this is confusing. I would love to walk the site and share my ideas.

Tom Gandesbery tomgandesbery2@gmail.com

I assume a traffic signal is going in as well as crosswalks and plenty of parking.

Impact on moraga traffic of each location



<p>It seems like the proposal is glossing over the concept that the city is essentially giving away public property. Housing will be built and we are supposed to accept that fiscal impact to the city will be approximately neutral? Once the land is given away for housing, the city can't ever get it back. This is a loss of open space public land. The city should at least profit from this.</p>
<p>Create buffer for current residents to mitigate impacts regarding safety, noise and privacy.</p>
<p>Find and STUDY alternative sites in Piedmont as required by the State. IF Moraga Canyon does not attract a developer by end of 2026, the City MUST find alternative sites. Why are they not being considered and studied NOW?</p>
<p>Development costs must be included with each scheme. Without financial information there is no way to properly assess the merits of the options.</p>
<p>Preservation of open space should be a guiding principle.</p>
<p>The city's budget for making changes is very limited.</p>
<p>Be mindful of the 3 criteria: (1) Public safety; (2) integration is better than segregation; (3) minimize public discontent.</p>
<p>The human and political cost of intentional segregation will get exceed and short term benefits of separation</p>
<p>Do a study or survey to determine the usage level of the Skate Park. If low level use, then don't include it and use the space for other needs.</p>
<p>The project team should widen the area they consider impacted by the proposed project to include at least the Montclair and Upper Rockridge neighborhoods of Oakland. The project team should focus on traffic and safety impacts of new development in Moraga Canyon to better inform the proposed density of development.</p>
<p>Think about how trees and plants help to keep the air clean and temperature cooler.              This area already has a lot of smog from HWY 13              Mudslides              Emergency evacuation in case of fire or other natural disaster</p>
<p>I would like a better explanation of how the "market rate" housing works. I don't understand why ALL the required units are.. not to be a NIMBY.. in ONE backyard in Piedmont and not spread thruout the city.. Where did this public access trail come from?? I live across from the fire gate to the cemetery on Maxwelton.. in good weather we are inundated with kids sneaking into that property.. with serious parking and fire concerns. We've already had a house burn down in our neighborhood.</p>

*What else would you like to team to consider as they refine land use alternatives?*





<p>It's important to realize that the commitment of money for a band-aid project to try to solve multiple problems is likely to result in many people being unhappy. Why not put forth a bond measure to improve recreation opportunities for the City so that there are dedicated areas for specific uses rather than multi-sport abominations? Let citizens decide the value of such improvements and how much they're willing to spend to make the best use of our limited City spaces?</p>
<p>you need to be very concerned about the safety of individuals. Under previous Moraga canyon possibilities, they were all rejected because they weren't safe per the EIR's due to the curvy nature of Moraga Avenue</p>
<p>No additional car or pedestrian traffic going up Pala</p>
<p>Safe pedestrian crosswalks, with signals. Make sure cars are slowing down on Moraga Ave. by adding signal lights.                  Adding an enclosed dog park, so that people can have their dogs off leash in a large area.                  Making sure there is enough parking so that this is not a problem and does not create a lot of traffic on this road                  Maintaining the beauty of Moraga Canyon                  Designing contextual housing that blend into canyon</p>
<p>There are strengths and weaknesses to all options; I think above all else what is imperative for real success is:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A strong pedestrian connection to center of city. People should be able to walk to city hall, Piedmont Park--kids should be able to safely walk to school. This study should include the critical links/intersections along Moraga and Highland to illustrate this.</li> <li>2. There should be a real mix of housing (size, shape, and type) both for financial diversity as well as richness of character and aesthetics--the opposite of a series of similarly massed blocks. (Small variations go a long way here).</li> <li>3. There should be a strong urban design concept expressed: not just building blocks but a clear concept of the spaces between that includes a "heart" or core to the neighborhood.</li> </ol>
<p>I want a public garden</p>
<p>Play fields should maximize sun exposure, minimize overlap of baseball diamond and provide spectator area and restrooms</p>
<p>less emphasis on expanding sports field...we have plenty of places for sports in other areas of town and at the new high school track, field and baseball/soccer fields.                  creating safe sidewalk on Blair park side of street                  putting a signaled intersection to slow down traffic on Moraga Ave                  More affordable housing, less concern for market value homes</p>

*What else would you like to team to consider as they refine land use alternatives?*



Increase project transparency and accept community input.
How exactly is parking going to be created to support 120 units with multiple cars each?
Make sure the project is viable for low-income housing developer!!!!
Why do we need to do anything? I thought we just had to have a housing PLAN, not implement it. That's what we were told.
Go with option #1
please create as much affordable housing as possible
thank you for putting out this survey!
Why are all the options? 2, 3 and four totally keeping the big open space on Blair vacant? Is it a park, no, occasionally see somebody running a dog there. It is not a park.
The goal of this project is to create much-needed housing while preserving recreational and open space uses. Overbuilding large surface parking lots is a detriment to that goal - we should consider seriously how to consolidate parking, minimize its impacts, and provide alternatives to driving. This site needs sidewalks on both sides of the street, safe pedestrian crossings, bike lanes, AND transit options - not some of the above, as the first question in this survey seems to imply. It also needs parking consolidated in one area of the site, ideally in an underground or elevated parking structure and not in surface lots.
Also, in the demographics form on the next page, there is no option for the age group 25-34, which is my age group.
This is complete crap and an embarrassment to anyone with an intellect. Options 2-4 are so bad that it makes option 1 look tolerable. But that is the intent I bet - to force option 1 on an unsuspecting public. This whole thing needs to be stopped.
Street lighting on Moraga. Moraga is a winding road that is narrow and very dark at night. Pedestrians and people on bikes need protected space to walk all the way up and down this road. There are a couple of medians with grass on this road that don't have much purpose, that space would be better utilized on the sides of the road for sidewalks.
Go with option #1
I think this choice is a no-brainer: Option 4 dominates all of the over options.
Kids' sports are more important than dogs.



<p>Please consider the congestion along Moraga Ave. This is the main artery and putting dense housing near the current Coaches field will be incredibly unsafe. Instead, spacing the housing out along Moraga Canyon in the current Blair Park (option 1) makes the most sense.</p>
<p>Also please consider negotiating with the cemetery to find access out of Moraga Canyon to the North. This would benefit everyone and really increase the utility of the project for Piedmont residents. Putting in a new stop light at Coaches field is not enough, there needs to be better access out of Moraga Canyon as well as just new influx and choke points.</p>
<p>Cost would be helpful given that the residents will likely foot part of the bill (?)</p>
<p>Can small kid playgrounds and family gathering areas be incorporated into the new housing development in the Blair park open space. Maybe on the hill side of the space. I think these homes will help young families afford to move to Piedmont.</p>
<p>Traffic flow is of course critical and creating a pristine and welcome entrance to our town would be a benefit.</p>
<p>1. Parking. Parking is a critical issue. There are too many residences in Piedmont that have off street parking for one vehicle yet the residents own 2, 3 or 4 cars, SUVs, and/or trucks. Sadly, this is the norm. If the housing units that are being built are for 132 units, there should be enough parking for at least 275 vehicles not including the parking that will be needed for visitors to those residences and for recreational use of the baseball/softball &amp; soccer fields, hiking trails, skate park and dog park.</p> <p>2. Traffic flow. As mentioned on each of the options, traffic flow will be impeded dramatically - particularly during rush hours. Only one additional traffic light is shown in the design. However, traffic will be disrupted heading west to Highland and all the way down Moraga to Pleasant Valley as well as heading east to Harbord Dr and Estates Dr up to the entrances to the freeway. I'm wondering if any consideration has been given to increased public transportation or shuttle services. I didn't see anything mentioned in the presentation.</p> <p>3. Public safety. Most importantly, public safety along Moraga is vital.</p>
<p>You have done a thoughtful job of looking at options.</p>
<p>Keep as much natural space as possible.          Look at other sites in Piedmont to build and spread out homes (Hampton field, Bear Park, Offices in center of town, Piedmont Park, flat area of Dracena park)</p>
<p>Make safety a top priority for pedestrians, cyclists and autos,</p>
<p>We need open space, not more units and concrete. Any and all preservation of untouched land is of the utmost importance today and to future generations.</p>

*What else would you like to team to consider as they refine land use alternatives?*



<p>Having a new traffic signal will be annoying but it looks like that's included in all the scenarios.</p> <p>I really think that if it's done right with the new housing on the Coaches Field side of Moraga that the housing could be quite nice/pleasant for the occupants and at no real aesthetic cost to Piedmont.</p> <p>Options 2 and 4 I would support. Options 1 and 3 I would not support.</p>
<p>I support a project that causes as little disruption to existing infrastructure and the community as possible.</p>
<p>Minimize cost and do not plan to raise a special tax to cover this unfunded mandate from Sacramento.</p>
<p>Please consider the best way to move traffic in and out of the new development. I don't see how all this will not slow down traffic, cause back-ups at certain times of day, irritate drivers. However-- Piedmont has to do what it has to do. And this is one of the few areas in town that can accommodate this kind of housing. I don't know where else it can go.</p>
<p>I am glad to see that you are developing detailed plans to add affordable housing to the community but 60 units is not enough.</p>
<p>I haven't seen Blair Park used much as is. Seems like a good place for housing or Corporate Yard. Prefer not to see the playing field go there.</p>
<p>Which option is most likely to get housing built? I think that is how this should be thought of ... has the project team talked with any developers?</p>
<p>Safety:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Pedestrians will be running across Moraga if you add any or all these facilities</li> <li>2) Traffic lights will need to be added.</li> <li>3) Bicycle lanes are VERY unsafe in the uphill direction on Moraga</li> </ol> <p>2 market value lots should be found elsewhere. Surely, the citizens that want equity housing should be able to share the load of 2 lots elsewhere in Piedmont.</p>
<p>In my opinion siting the housing on the south side is highly problematic, esthetically, noise, traffic flow, land use etc. I understand that this is the least best (only) option that the built out city of Piedmont has. I hope that the developer can make the numbers work given all the moving parts. To me the most important thing is to not have this be an eyesore and a source of problems down the road.</p> <p>If the goal is to get families with kids to move into these units, there will need to be a lot of upgrades to the car and pedestrian access to the area. The city should not be exposed to the potential liability from site issues that are not of its making. The city cannot control for the suboptimal location that is its only option.</p>
<p>Maximize housing and improve safety please.</p>

What else would you like to team to consider as they refine land use alternatives?



The Moraga Canyon area does not have proximity to public transportation. It does not have pedestrian access either, without building sidewalks. Moraga Ave. is very narrow, even for cars. Bikes are now allowed on the same road as cars going west/south on Moraga. More cars and bikes sharing one lane on Moraga will become dangerous, mostly for bicyclists. Since Blair Park used to have a waterfall and underground springs, can the land even support the proposed structures? Will the buildings withstand the next Earthquake? There have been three mudslides along Moraga in the last 10-15 years. It caused Moraga Ave. to be closed for hours to days for clean up. How stable are the hillsides in this neighborhood?

No to a 132 unit "development" and no to new housing in Moraga Canyon.  
No to all 4 suggestions. Kindly tell the city to change course from this unwise direction. This area is the only open space around and it will be destroyed by this project. The entire idea is a waste of money and effort. There will be very serious traffic bottleneck issues. In addition, concentrating low income housing in the Canyon will potentially create a stigma-ed area.

Let housing be built elsewhere throughout the city, including on the busy Grand Ave corridor or near Lakeshore, or in the city center. That is far better for walk-ability, for multi family and for energy efficiency.

On a larger note, only a real developer who has taken real market risks and successfully built projects and is willing to bet its own money will be able to tell you how or where to build anything and whether it is worth it. It is far better to have such persons give advice on what to do. There are many real estate developers in town, who would give advice to you for free if you asked. A "consultant" is not a real world developer. It would be much wiser if City did not rely on "academic studies" for budgeting or decision making.

I really like option four because it seems like the most efficient use of space. Having access to the rec area from the housing without crossing the street seems like it would be a bonus for the residents. It will expand areas the kids can go play on their own.

The State of California seems to be backing off of this massive and unfair housing plan for California. Rob Bonita has backed off and Gov. Newsom has expressed interest in higher political offices. So he has apparently backed off of this housing plan as well. I'm aware of four municipalities suing the Gov. about this already and these Cities state that they are not going to comply. They are not spending the public funds as Piedmont is until. Court decides. Thank you.

No thanks

Making sure new sites are accessible with parking, sidewalks, and crossings. Improving the area with whatever is built to add to the beauty of the area. More landscaping less bramble like how Blair park is now.



Focus on recreational activities, safety, and beautification. I do not support housing development of any kind.
Our children need more field space.
We need a LOT more housing in Piedmont, so that has to be the priority. Getting larger and better sports fields would be nice and helpful.
Everything else doesn't really matter.
I appreciate seeing these different options. Good luck getting something that works!
A self contained community with tot lot, convenience store, package hub, carpool/vanpool/CSA drop, covered meeting space / amphitheatre.
Any new housing should be privately funded. If any city or public items are being relocated, the new Moraga Canyon developments (not city wide) should cover the cost.
I'd like to see Option 1 go forward with the housing in Blair Park. I think it's a better use of space
I think a pedestrian bridge is the only option for the new volume of pedestrians (and kids on bikes who go on sidewalks) to cross Moraga. I feel like this might be something Piedmonters might contribute \$\$ to build. There must also be federal and state grants for such safety investments. A crosswalk and light just won't be enough.
I'd like to see as little impact as possible on Moraga Avenue traffic. That's a thoroughfare on and off of highway 13 and to and from Montclair.
The residents in the Grand Avenue area do not want any high occupancy residential buildings built in our area of the city!!! Grand Avenue homeowners do not want to see our commercial property zone area use for several storied congested residential units. We are already a highly congested neighborhood and parking is already at a premium. We want to keep our single family home neighborhood environment as it is We do not want more congestion.
Let this canyon be Treated as one of the few remaining sites in our area that is in the same condition as it was in the time of the original people...:American Indians.
Minimize the cost of the project that the public will have to bear the full expense of. The city may have to subsidize the project just to make it happen. Housing will recoup some of that cost, but any cost of revamping the field or the corporation yard will be a lot and will not be the priority of a developer. The neighbors will bear the brunt of the impacts of this construction and added density. Let's not pour salt on that wound by making them and the rest of the city pay a lot to make it happen.



Consider that there are people already here paying taxes and raising funds for the community who will likely move away when their property values drop because realtors steer people away from the crowded and heavy traffic part of town.

Moraga barely works as it is. The police won't make sure that people drive the speed limit down it. It takes 10 minutes to drive less than a mile on it during school drop off times. It shuts down a couple times of year when a storm knocks down a tree and all the traffic is diverted up Maxwelton. Now you are adding hundreds of cars and more lights. Hoping for transit isn't a solution, AC Transit has been cutting routes for years and is largely non-functional.

We are forced into a bad position because the planners won't put housing in the center of town.

The playing field will likely become a gathering place for people in the housing units so to limit pedestrian and vehicle interaction it is preferable to locate them close together. The upper portion of Moraga currently functions as more of an open space. It would be nice to see that become more functional and inviting with improved landscaping, picnic tables, etc.. Ideally the units would be set back from the road for the benefit of the residents and to avoid creating a walled canyon of housing.

Thanks for trying. This is hard. The presentation of the alternatives was very well done.

As I mentioned toward the beginning of the survey, the City should not be spending money to make this happen. We soon will need to spend millions of dollars to refurbish, and perhaps relocate, certain City facilities (police, fire, etc.). My taxes, and the City's bond issuances, for such refurbishment should not be increased because the City spent funds unnecessarily on the Moraga Canyon project.

We want this development to happen, i.e., new housing in Piedmont with an affordable component. It must be attractive to prospective developers, and an expensive underground facility doesn't make sense to pursue, for that reason. Also, the current corp yard is such a waste of space, valuable space. The ease of a new, up to date facility with a curved drive-through driveway on Moraga would more than offset staff reluctance for change, once it's done.

See comments on Option 1.

Moraga Ave. has a blind curve opposite Blair Park. Trying to create safe access to Blair is too big a hurdle.(see previous attempt to create a massive sports field) Keep all the traffic and people on the Corp Yard side of the street.



<p>1. Earthquakes and proximity to the Hayward fault</p> <p>2. The location of the cemetery and their land usage.</p> <p>3. Fire hazards related to all the eucalyptus trees</p> <p>4. Hiking trails sound nice but Piedmont Moraga Canyon stops at the cemetery. You are dumping vagrants and bums into the backyards if homes that back on Mountain View cemetery .</p>
<p>Fight crime while interest rates are so high. Then build new projects once crime is down and interest rates are lowered.</p>
<p>Try to minimize covering up land with concrete. Keep Blair Park as open space.</p>
<p>Regarding all four options, the amount of traffic on Moraga would be severely impacted during and after construction. It is already very difficult to walk across Moraga at Monte and Mesa intersections. Your survey has already shown that most people use Moraga Road just to drive through and, we might add, at a high rate of speed. Many of them may not live in this town, but we do and realize the limitations of this narrow and winding road. Is there another street that allows these drivers to get from Highway 13 into Oakland without using Moraga Road?</p>
<p>Option 2 looks like a very viable setup, however a roundabout would be a very good solution for the signed intersection(s).</p>
<p>This whole project unfairly impacts Piedmont residents on both sides of Moraga. I haven't heard any discussion of developing Piedmont owned property on Grand Ave.</p>
<p>Lets please not stack a bunch of multi level housing right along Moraga, it does not fit with the general look and feel of Piedmont, and being that it is on one of the main entry points to the city I think it would really detract from the overall feel of our town. Lets build the housing but in a way that tucks it away from the main street, while also keeping the field available for our kids.</p>
<p>need to improve bike and pedestrian safety on Moraga, traffic calming important ..</p>
<p>Who's to pay for this</p>
<p>Allow the buildings to go one story taller and add commercial, if possible. Why not have a second revenue-generating area in Piedmont, especially if it could have cool views. Make it a community, not just housing.</p>
<p>The environment has to be a priority. Everyone has a right to affordable housing and housing is important, but it does not have to be located on our last open space filled with native trees.</p>
<p>Blair Park should be protected and enhanced with native plants. This will increase biodiversity and increase carbon sequestration.</p>
<p>It is a major constraint to effective traffic movement on Moraga Road.</p>

What else would you like to team to consider as they refine land use alternatives?





<p>This isn't really land use I think but was talking with friends and many of us are ready to downsize but like the Piedmont community and don't want to leave our friends. Housing that is market rate but with older people in mind (single story or easy to access apartments/condos) would be a great way to accommodate people who are aging and would allow us to make room for new families when we sell our homes</p>
<p>Open space in Piedmont should be preserved only if there is high use for recreational purposes. Due to its location alongside Moraga Ave. Blair Park has limited utility as a recreational space. Housing will fit in but making Blair Park a more user friendly park is highly unlikely.</p>
<p>Excited to see progress continue on schedule and to learn more about the fiscal impacts.</p>
<p>Please please please more sports fields. Soccer would be awesome. And a safe dog area is a great idea! Thank you!</p>
<p>Preserve the existing open space in Moraga Canyon by locating additional new housing elsewhere in Piedmont, and thereby minimizing additional density in only one area, Moraga Canyon.</p>
<p>Watch the amount of traffic that flows on Moraga Road daily and then tell me you want to add more housing, more parking, bigger sports fields, etc. it is Ludacris</p>
<p>Blair Park is a unique resource for the City and for the area where it's located. It's also important for dog owners throughout the City. Affordable housing is also important, but it should be integrated with market housing to avoid isolating and stigmatizing it.</p>
<p>Ensure connection between town to new development and sports areas are safe and accessible by walking, skating, biking so kids have a safe path of travel to/from highland. Allow flexibility in sports/rec programming. As specified currently with U14 soccer, softball and skating, community interest may change over time and these may not be in the best interest of community at time of development. Ensure adequate restrooms and dog wash facilities. Possible to include small concessions booth or pavilion.</p>



I would like to see a serious discussion of how this site will have transit integration. Moraga Ave is a busy street today; adding 100 units of housing is a good idea, but will have harsh impacts on the traffic. This amount of added density however, is very amenable to good transit integration! Prior to the pandemic, we were lucky to have the C line running down Moraga Ave to the MacArthur BART and SF. While this service was infrequent, it was very useful at commute hours.

All of the proposals so far have been devoid of commercial space, no? I think this site would be a great fit for some ground floor retail, whether smaller uses (e.g., coffee shop/restaurant) or bigger uses (e.g., grocery or drugstore). This has struck me as a particularly striking omission since these sites will have a large number of low income housing units. It doesn't seem logical to make an isolated site in a major urban area, and to then make all of the inhabitants beholden to having cars, especially since the site sounds like it will have limited parking capacity. The plan today appears to center the concerns of current city inhabitants, at the potential expense of the people who will actually live in the future dwellings day-to-day.

Likewise, childcare? Has there been any thinking about integrating (ideally, affordable) childcare into the site? Finding childcare for pre-school age children in the Bay Area is extremely challenging, especially in Piedmont where there are only a few, small in-home preschools. Logically, a number of these dwellings will be occupied by families, so it would make sense to plan for childcare up front.

Impact of additional units on traffic

Keeping intact the beauty of the land and vistas should be foremost in design. There is also a lot of animal habitat in the location.

Wildfire risk in the Moraga canyon. Emergency evacuation routes.

Please do consider plans to place some of the housing in other parts of the City, closer to public transit and shopping!

stop being fancy city w/ huge swimming pool, soccer fiels & amenities

prioritize humans not elegance

1. Consider and communicate with Oakland residents who live nearby. They will be just as or more affected by this development than many Piedmont residents.
2. The intersection at Moraga and Harbord is already very unsafe and this development will surely make it more so. Work with Oakland to mitigate that-perhaps Piedmont could share the cost of a light at that intersection.
3. Preserve the look and feel of the canyon as much as possible. Open space on the south side please.
4. Moraga floods and is in a fire prone area, it's very important to consider this.



<p>The more dense the housing and the more places to play and hike are right next repousing the better. Any option that requires extensive moving across a busy road is a problem. Option one seems like it would be a wasted opportunity as the housing would be very much separate from the rest of the recreation area, making new residents feel unwelcome</p>
<p>crowding and noise from the field for the new Piedmont residents. Thank you for all your hard work!</p>
<p>Traffic flow of cars passing through to get from Montclair to other parts of Oakland. This was flagged as an issue years ago when the City was considering field improvements.</p>
<p>If uses other than the corp yard are situated on the south side of Moraga, you'll need to be really thoughtful about how and where cars get in and out of the south side of the site. If it's too hard to make a left turn out of the south side of the site (toward central Piedmont), I am worried that cars will end up making illegal U-turns at Maxwelton Road, which is really dangerous and problematic.</p>
<p>Keep engaging the community. The more units the better. If there's a way to add or accommodate more than the state requirement, I would be supportive.</p>
<p>Minimize the motivation/opportunities for those opposing any new development by making it clear that noise and light mitigation measures will be incorporated into the project (whichever one gets greenlighted). Moraga Canyon would already have a soccer complex on the south side if folks had paid more attention to that last time some improvements were suggested for the area.</p>
<p>Public transportation</p>
<p>I like option 1</p>
<p>Consider how traffic volumes will change given increase in housing and demand for sports field use. How will this change the “feel” of the canyon, how can any plan preserve the most natural elements of the space as it exists? What are upstream and downstream impacts of the increased traffic volume. Could incentives be provided to not own a car.</p>
<p>Nice work. Is it possible to put in a miniforest when doing landscaping to reduce landscape maintenance costs and reduce fire hazards.</p>
<p>Ideally this housing would have integrated affordable and market rate housing. They should not be physically separate.</p> <p>It would also be preferable to have the project attain LEED Silver. These two things would reflect Piedmont's values to the media and the general public. I was the Director of Residential and Student Services Capital Projects for a couple of decades. Silver LEED was our standard for student housing during the last decade. I was able to get a five year payback on the extra cost and received large rebates.</p>

*What else would you like to team to consider as they refine land use alternatives?*



Keep up the great work. Some of us appreciate the effort to build more housing in Piedmont.
Keep getting feedback! I love where this is going. Can't wait for Piedmont to be a good example of a small and privileged city that figured out housing.
Consider option 4 plus plans to enhance Blair Park to make more accessible and usable community space.
Seems the scenarios want to please everyone in a small space. Some of the public amenities might need to be not included, or placed elsewhere in the city vs trying to cram everything together in the canyon. Also worry about lack of enough parking in several of the scenarios.
Option one is the absolute worst
Option one is the absolute worst
What about acquiring some parcels along Grand Avenue for some additional new housing?
Traffic will be awful! It's already bad. We will lose birds and wildlife. I walk here daily and it will be terrible to not have the greenery.
Traffic flow.
Any benefit to re routing Moraga Ave to the south against the hill to consolidate the available land?
Other attractions that could draw the community to this part of town. Could we have a small retail and restaurant space? Small playground near housing units and field? Amphitheatre leveraging the hillside for community gatherings? With so many residents in this new area, it would be great to make this a destination
More units could have been considered for this location given the large undeveloped plot of land.
Which features are highest use? The dog park and skate park seem very low use compared to fields.
I love the pumpkin patch and tree lot but I think they could relocate if needed. For example the pumpkin patch could be on a section of the Havens field for 4 weeks. The tree lot could be in a few stalls of the Community Center lot for a month.
The City contracted LSA 1986 Environmental Study Sport Field Report and specifically the traffic safety summary at page 9. Subsequent reports, both City contracted EIR for Coaches Sports Field, Blair Park Soccer EIR and privately contracted 2012 Creason Traffic Study uniformly note the limited roadway sightlines. Unless an entire block long hillside is removed, with the buy-out of several expensive homes, the sightline issues remaind and represent a significant safety challenge. Place the new sports field and homes and the North side and move the corporation yard to the south end of Blair Park.
I think they are doing a great job.
any option for ground level retail with these new projects?

*What else would you like to team to consider as they refine land use alternatives?*



For housing site, choose the option that will require least site work for developer. E.g. less grading, wildfire mitigation, etc. the easier the location is to develop, the more feasible development will be, especially for the affordable component.
An improved Spring Trail from Abbott down to Moraga needs to also be considered for residents on Abbott, Echo, Maxwellton and Nellie.
Insurance cost. Many residents who live near the Moraga Canyon are already facing difficulty securing fire insurance. The insurance cost for the new housing project in this area could prohibitively expensive... it is worth looking into.
add some lights to field even though just extend use time by an hour or two
Consider Davies, which is in Piedmont for housing. Soccer is not for everyone, but the "cult" loves to promote it.
How do we ensure that the affordable housing feels integrated into the community- so they don't feel like second class citizens?
Public Works needs functional space Recreation spaces are currently inadequate, these should be prioritized in this effort
Please make sidewalks on both side of street for school kids walking to school

## Gopika Nair

---

**From:** Pierce Macdonald  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 30, 2024 11:01 AM  
**To:** Gopika Nair  
**Subject:** FW: DBL

---

**From:** Randolph Wu <redacted> **Sent:** Tuesday, January 30, 2024 10:21 AM  
**To:** Kevin Jackson <kjackson@piedmont.ca.gov>; Pierce Macdonald <pmacdonald@piedmont.ca.gov>  
**Subject:** DBL

[EXTERNAL] This email originated from an **external source**. Please use judgment and caution when opening attachments, clicking links, or responding.

Hi Kevin and Pierce,

Good presentation last night. The City is really moving ahead, but there's no time to rest yet

I thought I should alert you to a potential ambiguity in the application of the proposed DBL ordinance.

As you know, and as Gopika explained last night, the DBL applies to housing developments of at least 5 residential units on a single lot or on contiguous properties.

With changes to the number of allowed ADUs and implementation of SB9 it will be possible to meet this housing development minimum of 5 new residential units on just 2 adjoining single family lots. I think the 5 units minimum could be met with ADUs/JADUs/SB9 fourplexes.

While there are just a few vacant lots in Piedmont I can think of two potential DBL eligible sites, one in the Moraga Canyon study area and another on EBMUD property on Harvard Rd. that could claim to meet the 5 residential units minimum.

To the extent this is not what the City intends for its new DBL ordinance, I think the City could state that it will count as qualifying DBL units only primary residential units, i.e. excluding ADUs. (This would leave open the remote possibility of a SB9 lot split adjacent to a single family home with 2 ADUs added or two adjoining SB9 lot splits.)

Randy

January 29, 2024

Members  
Piedmont Planning Commission

Re: Comments on Draft General Plan Amendments on Behalf of the PREC Housing Committee

Amending the General Plan to establish consistency among all elements is a key part of Housing Element implementation, and the City is making admirable progress on this challenging task. We have comments on the Draft General Plan elements, which we have reviewed with an eye to creating a document that will clearly embed the City's new policies throughout the document. Our intent is to support clear communication with the Piedmont community and an internally consistent document that fully supports Housing Element implementation.

Below we highlight three topics of concern relating to the proposed General Plan Amendments:

- (1) Narrative and policies relating specifically to Moraga Canyon**
- (2) Narrative and policies relating to Surplus Land, and**
- (3) Narrative language that may create conflict or confusion relative to the Housing Element generally and the Moraga Canyon Specific Plan in particular**

This is not intended to be an exhaustive list of the narrative and policy language that warrants modification. We hope these examples will highlight the need for a further review of the language to strengthen the Plan as an expression of the City's commitment to successful Housing Element implementation.

**(1) Narrative and policies relating specifically to Moraga Canyon**

- A. The Land Use Diagram appropriately maps the Moraga Canyon Specific Plan area as distinct and establishes a unique land use classification for the area. We suggest modifying the accompanying description of the Land Use classification to state clearly that housing production is the priority, and allow greater flexibility around other improvements. We suggest revising "Some long-term change in this area is likely" to: "This area is envisioned for development in the period **2023-2029**."
- B. The Land Use Classification incorporates ambitious objectives with the following language:

*"The City of Piedmont is developing a specific plan for all City-owned land in Moraga Canyon, including Blair Park, Coaches Field, Kennelly Skate Park, and the City's Corporation Yard, to plan for new housing and to maintain, replace, and improve existing City facilities, open space, and recreational amenities. The Moraga Canyon Specific*

*Plan will also plan for improved traffic, pedestrian, and bicyclist circulation and wildfire safety.”*

This language is echoed in Land Use Policy 4.3 and Action 4.C, and in the Parks, Recreation and Open Space Element’s narrative. In light of the growing understanding of the financial and physical challenges of meeting ALL goals for the Specific Plan area alongside meeting housing targets, we suggest that the language be modified to allow for some prioritization and flexibility in addressing City facilities, open space and recreational amenities in the Plan.

Consider amending this language as follows:

*The City of Piedmont is developing a specific plan for all City-owned land in Moraga Canyon, including Blair Park, Coaches Field, Kennelly Skate Park, and the City’s Corporation Yard, to plan for new housing, **including affordable housing**, and to maintain, replace, **or** improve existing City facilities, open space, and recreational amenities. The Moraga Canyon Specific Plan will also plan for improved traffic, pedestrian, and bicyclist circulation and wildfire safety, **as necessary to accommodate these uses.**”*

Consider including this language from Housing Element Appendix B.3.1 in the Land Use Element and elsewhere in the Plan:

*“Park and recreational uses will be reconfigured and remain in the study area as an integral amenity, with the parking to be reconfigured, as needed, as part of the specific plan. The specific plan will also be designed to accommodate the City corporation yard vehicle storage as efficiently as possible, with the potential for some of the storage uses to be relocated off-site, if needed, to ensure adequate space for intended residential development.”*

## **(2) Narrative and public land use policies relating to Surplus Land**

References to surplus public land should be consistent with the State Surplus Land Act’s parameters by which public agencies may sell or lease surplus public land for development by the private sector.

At Agenda Report pg. 91 Attachment B pg. 3-35 **Policy 3.2 Need for Public Land** should be corrected as follows:

*“In the event public land becomes available for another purpose, first priority shall be placed on **affordable housing as required under State law.**”*



At Agenda Report pg. 256, Attachment B pg. 7-17 add in the paragraph after “132 units of new housing” the phrase “**as a first priority as required under State law**”.

At Agenda Report 269 Attachment B pg. 7-21, **Action 23.G Surplus Land Inventory** should be corrected as follows:

“Maintain an inventory of potential surplus land. Consider the potential highest and best use of City open space, including parks, that may be underutilized. New uses **must** include **affordable** multifamily housing development **as a first priority** consistent with the Housing Element. See Housing element program 1.L”

At Agenda Report pg. 344 Attachment B pg. 9-29 **Policy 33.1 Municipal Real Estate** should be corrected as follows:

“Ensure that the City of Piedmont owns and retains a sufficient amount of land to meet the long-term operational needs of municipal government. Consider transfer of possible surplus lands under the **State** Surplus Land Act to support the development of affordable housing **as a first priority** and **then** the modernization and repair of City facilities.”

**(3) Policy and narrative language that may create conflict or confusion relative to the Housing Element generally and the Moraga Canyon Specific Plan in particular**

- A. We suggest modifying or deleting policy language in the Plan that is imprecise and subject to varying interpretations. We are particularly concerned with the use of undefined terms relating to character and form, such as the following from the Land Use Element:

*“Policy 1.2: Neighborhood Conservation: Sustain the balance between homes, private yards, and public space that defines Piedmont’s residential neighborhoods. The essential form of the city’s residential areas—including the scale and appearance of its homes, the mature vegetation, the views and vistas, the appearance of streets and public places, and the street layout—should be maintained for the long-term future.”*

*“Policy 1.3: Harmonious Development  
Maintain planning and development review procedures which ensure that new development is harmonious with its surroundings and will not conflict.”*

*“Policy 3.5: Protection of Open Space  
Protect environmentally sensitive open space in Piedmont from development to the greatest extent feasible. Recognize open space as an important aesthetic and ecological resource in the city, and a defining element of Piedmont’s character and natural setting.”*

*“Goal 6: Planning Administration*

*Maintain planning and building procedures which ensure the safety of all new construction and which protect the quality and character of Piedmont.”*

- B. Delete narrative and sidebar language that has no formal status and that may be interpreted as in opposition to Housing Element implementation, such as:

Park, Recreation and Open Space feature box on “Piedmont Parks in a Nutshell” that describes Blair Park and Coaches Field/Kennelly Skate Park without reference to the changes envisioned in the General Plan

Sidebar passages with no standing such as: *“It is important to us that the city keeps its original appearance and that everybody’s interests are taken into account when new construction projects are approved.”* - General Plan Survey Response

We appreciate your consideration and your commitment to the Housing Element Implementation Process.

Sincerely,

Ellen Greenberg  
Andrea Ruiz-Esquide  
Randy Wu  
Andy Madeira  
Carol Galante

on behalf of the Piedmont Racial Equity Campaign Housing Committee

**Sent:** Wednesday, January 24, 2024 2:12 PM  
**To:** City Council <[CityCouncil@piedmont.ca.gov](mailto:CityCouncil@piedmont.ca.gov)>  
**Subject:** Climate Action Plan and Building restrictions



Hello City Council,

I hope this message finds you well and you all are staying dry. I'm interested in whether the city is considering revising its policy regarding the correlation between the number of bedrooms and parking spaces. As Piedmont has been experiencing a decline in student enrollment at the school, resulting in reduced funding, the current regulations on room legality in relation to parking space size may be hindering the ability to have homes with additional rooms for children. This limitation affects the potential expansion of homes to accommodate additional students who could be enrolled in our schools. Given the growing number of residents working from home and requiring extra bedrooms for office or workspace purposes, such a change would prove highly advantageous for both the city and its community members.

**For a family of 4+ with both parents working from home many are limited with their functional spaces:**

1. Parents' bedroom
2. Kid 1's bedroom
3. Kid 2's bedroom
4. The office or guest bedroom
5. Extra guest room for grandparents and guests who do not live in Piedmont, a family room or additional office if both parents are working from home. If the family has 3 kids or more, this would be their room.

The lack of a third parking space creates a challenge for many homes looking to enhance or redesign their current layouts, aiming to add an extra office or guest room without necessarily accommodating an additional automobile. During the pandemic while Walking on Wednesdays, we saw quite a few people working in their garages as their office. As numerous homes in Piedmont reach the century mark, the need to modernize electrical systems, plumbing, and room configurations to meet the requirements of contemporary living poses a dilemma. The question arises: Is it financially feasible and practical to continue residing in Piedmont under these restrictions?

As per the latest US Census data, Piedmont has experienced a decrease in population by an

estimated 466 people between 2020 and 2022. This trend might be attributed to individuals relocating from Piedmont during the pandemic in search of more affordable housing options with additional rooms in their homes.

Population Estimates, July 1, 2022, (V2022) 10,811

Population estimates base, April 1, 2020, (V2022) 11,277

<https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/piedmontcitycalifornia/PST040222>

According to our building permit application:

**§17.90.010 Bedroom**

includes any room with features generally characteristic of bedrooms, regardless of its designation on a building plan. A bedroom has adequate privacy and meets the minimum size and habitation requirements of the Building Code. It includes and is not limited to a room with: (a) access to a full bathroom on the same floor or within half a floor, if the house has a split level; (b) **access to a full bathroom through a common hallway or other common space** such as a kitchen, living room and/or dining room. A bedroom need not have a closet.

If this application results in the net addition of one or more bedrooms, additional conforming parking spaces may be required on the property. The number of conforming parking spaces required is as follows:

Dwelling unit is 700 square feet or less space required	1 conforming parking
1 – 4 bedrooms (5) conforming parking spaces required	2
5 – 6 bedrooms conforming parking spaces required (6)	3
7 or more bedrooms conforming parking spaces required (6)	4

A conforming parking space is covered, non-tandem, and at least 8-½ feet wide by 18 feet deep, 7-½ feet wide by 15 feet deep for a compact space. A minimum 1-foot clearance must be provided between the length side of a parking space and the nearest wall or similar obstruction

(5) An applicant may increase the primary dwelling unit up to four bedrooms without adding additional parking, as long as:

- a. no existing parking space is eliminated if it creates a nonconformance;
- b. the required number of parking spaces are provided, even if uncovered or tandem;

- c. the parking spaces are not within the required 20 foot street setback; and
- d. the project does not fall under the provisions of City Code Section 17.30.010(B)(4).

(6) In Zone A, one of every three required parking spaces may be for a compact car

4. When considering an application, the city may strictly apply the parking regulations under subsection B.1 above if the proposed construction will have an undue adverse impact on neighborhood vehicular congestion. A determination of undue adverse impact must be based on evidence considering one or more of the following factors: existing street width; existing on-street parking conditions; lack of sidewalks; and street slope and curvature.

**Right now in our city's Planning and Use document we state:**

17.30.010 Single family residential use. (All zones)

A. Applicability. This section 17.30.010 applies to the following single family residential uses in any zone:

2. existing development (which may be nonconforming under division 17.50) when an applicant seeks a building permit or land use approval for an improvement or change that will affect the need for parking. **Either an increase in the number of bedrooms, as defined, or an increase in the intensity of use will affect the need for parking.** Existing street width and existing demand for on-street parking are factors in considering the intensity of use.

Given the accessibility of AC Transit's transbay P line, the 33, and the 12 for those who are commuting, in conjunction with Piedmont's commitment to a Climate Action Plan, it could be an opportune time to consider removing or adjusting the requirement for additional parking spaces and dependencies on gas driven cars.

**Climate Action Plan:**

[https://piedmont.ca.gov/services\\_\\_\\_departments/planning\\_\\_\\_building/general\\_plan\\_\\_\\_other\\_policy\\_documents/climate\\_action\\_plan](https://piedmont.ca.gov/services___departments/planning___building/general_plan___other_policy_documents/climate_action_plan)

"the residents of Piedmont recognize that we must all take action to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions through electrifying homes, **driving gasoline cars less**, and purchasing goods and services more responsibly. By

acting locally, our small city can make a contribution to a worldwide effort. Accordingly, the City of Piedmont has developed its second version of its Climate Action Plan (CAP) in a significant step toward achieving our greenhouse gas reduction goals."

<https://piedmont.ca.gov/cms/one.aspx?portalId=13659823&pageId=17181158>

## **2. Drive Electric, Use Public Transit, Walk, or Bike**

**Gasoline powered vehicles are a main source of emissions in Piedmont. Eliminating driving will lead to fewer emissions.** Alternatives include making fewer trips, using public transit such as bus lines, using a bicycle, walking, carpooling, or investing in electric vehicles. City staff is working to make streets more accessible for pedestrians and cyclists with the Safer Streets initiative and the work being done by the PBAC.

Kindly take into account the implications of the Climate Action Plan and the current trend of Piedmont incurring increasing costs each year while having a declining population. Providing the opportunity to expand properties, allowing more spaces for growing families who wish to remain in Piedmont but have outgrown their current residences, could be an attractive solution to increase our population more.

Thank you for your time,  
Meghan Bennett