

Appendix D

MOUNTAIN PARK SPECIFIC PLAN EXPLANATION OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS

1. BACKGROUND

This Specific Plan is regulatory and serves as zoning for all areas within the Mountain Park Specific Plan boundary. Conventional development standards, when applied to hillside planned communities such as Mountain Park, do not always produce optimal results and a tailored approach is needed. Accordingly, the development standards differ from Title 18 of the City of Anaheim Municipal Code in some areas. These differences provide the framework for more innovative housing and site planning, while the overall spirit and intent of the Anaheim Municipal Code is maintained.

The Mountain Park Specific Plan proposes development within six residential districts (RMP-1, RMP-2, RMP-3, RMP-4, RMP-5 and RMP-6), an Open Space (OSMP) district and a Public Recreation (PRMP) district. The RMP-4, RMP-5 and RMP-6 districts in particular were created especially for Mountain Park and cannot be compared directly to districts in the existing Municipal Code. However, Table 1 displays the proposed districts in the context of the Anaheim General Plan designations and the most applicable existing zoning designations. The following is a discussion of the development standards that vary from the current City of Anaheim Municipal Code based on the Table 1 comparison.

2. MINIMUM LOT AREA OR SITE AREA PER UNIT

Existing Code	Proposed Code
RS-4 11du/net ac (Lot size determined by CUP)	RMP-3 4,000 sq. foot lot
RMP-2 3,000 sq. foot area per unit	RMP-4 3,375 sq. foot lot
	RMP-5 2,100 sq. foot area per unit
	RMP-6 1,600 sq. foot area per unit

Explanation: An array of smaller lots allow project architects to cluster homes and create more diversity in home types. Homes in the RMP-5 district are subject to condominium maps.

3. MAXIMUM BUILDING HEIGHT

Existing Code (SC)	Proposed Code
RS-2 25 ft.	RMP-1 30 ft.
RS-3 25 ft.	RMP-2 30 ft.
RS-4 25 ft.	RMP-3 30 ft. (25 ft. in DA 3 and 7)
RM-2 40 ft.	RMP-4 30 ft. (25 ft. in DA 3 and 7)
	RMP-5 35 ft.
	RMP-6 35 ft.

Explanation: The proposed height will not impact the scenic nature of the area since most development is clustered in the canyon bottom, not along the visible ridgelines. In Development Areas 3 and 7 immediately adjacent to existing Anaheim Hills homes, the height is limited to 25 feet. The scale of all development is low compared to the surrounding ridgelines and the proposed SR-241 interchange ramps. For example, Windy Ridge rises over 1,000 feet above the proposed pad levels in the bottom of Gypsum Canyon. Center Hill rises over 360 feet above the same pad levels.

COMPARISON OF GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATIONS AND ZONING CATEGORIES

Existing General Plan Designation	Existing Zoning Code					Mountain Park Specific Plan (Amendment No. 1)				
	Zone	Type	Lot (min)	Net Density (max)	Site Area	Zone	Type	Lot (min)	Net density (max)	Site Area per Unit
LMH	RS-2	SFD	7,200			RMP-1	SFD	7,000		
LMH	RS-3	SFD	5,000			RMP-2	SFD	5,000		
LMH & LM	RS-4	SFD	CUP ¹	11 du/ac		RMP-3	SFD	4,000		
						RMP-4	SFD	3,375		
						RMP-5	SFD Condo			2,100
LM	RM-2	SFA			3,000	RMP-6	SFA Condo			1,600

¹ A conditional use permit is required for development of small lot single-family units in the RS-4 zone.
The minimum lot size is determined by the CUP, with a maximum density of 11 dwelling units per acre permitted.

SFD - Single-Family Detached
SFA – Single-Family Attached
LM – Low Medium Density Residential
LMH – Low Medium Hillside Density Residential

Additional height allows for greater architectural variety and pitched roofs. Existing code height limitations encourage flat and very low pitched roofs because most of the height is needed for the interior volumes. Flat roofs cause awkwardness in the proportion of the roof relative to the rest of the building mass and are unattractive in a community which will be viewed from above in many locations.

4. MAXIMUM LOT COVERAGE

<u>Existing Code</u>		<u>Proposed Code</u>	
RS-3	40%	RMP-2	45%
RS-4	50%	RMP-5	55%
RM-2	40%	RMP-6	55%

Explanation: Over the past 20 years, consumers have consistently exhibited a preference for unit square footage over lot size. Common recreational facilities (private parks, pools, spas, etc.) compensate for smaller individual lot sizes. Usable front and rear yards would not be sacrificed by slight increases in lot coverage as overall area and minimum dimensions are maintained. By reorienting interior living spaces to make better use of a rear yard, a patio can become an extension of a den and foyer can provide sight lines “through” the house and out to a rear yard.

5. BUILDING SITE WIDTH

<u>Existing Code</u>		<u>Proposed Code</u>	
RS-3	50 ft (45 ft from Cul-de-sac or knuckle)	RMP-2	45
RS-4	Determined by Conditional Use Permit	RMP-3	40

Explanation: By using innovative lot concepts such as zero lot lines and “Z” lots, privacy and livability of the homes can actually be improved over conventional lots by combining two relatively unusable 5 foot side yards into one usable 10 foot yard. Careful placement of windows and the use of solid “windowless” walls can also provide more privacy than many longer lots. The proposed lot widths allow homes to be tailored to the individual lots; it also allows greater variety in site planning and streetscape design.

6. FRONT YARD SETBACKS

<u>Existing Code</u>		<u>Proposed Code</u>	
RS-2	25 feet or 25% of lot depth; 25 feet to any garage tilt-up door or 20 feet to any garage roll-up door.	RMP-1	15 feet for the first story; 20 feet for the second story and above; 25 feet to any garage tilt-up door or 20 feet to any garage roll-up door; side-on garages must have a roll-up door.
RS-3	10 feet with a 15 ft average; garage setback same as above.	RMP-2	15 feet; garage setback same as above.

Explanation: The revised setbacks will allow the living area of the house to be brought forward from the garage, creating more attractive traditional front elevations. This provides a desired emphasis on the architecture of the living area elevation (consisting of front door, windows, porches or balconies) while downplaying the driveway, garage and garage door.

7. REAR YARD SETBACKS

<u>Existing Code</u>		<u>Proposed Code</u>	
RS-2	25 feet or 10 feet if an equal usable open living area is provided elsewhere on the lot.	RMP-1	15 feet for the first story; 20 feet for the second story and above
RS-3	15 feet	RMP-2	10 feet with a 15 ft. average
RS-4	10 feet for single story structures; 15 feet for two-story structures.	RMP-3	10 feet with a 15 ft. average
		RMP-4	10 feet with a 15 ft. average
		RMP-5	10 feet
RM-2	10 feet for single story structures; 15 feet for two-story structures.	RMP-6	10 feet

Explanation: The proposed decreases and increases in minimum setbacks allow for more variety in home designs and street scenes.

8. REQUIRED RECREATION/LEISURE AREAS

<u>Existing Code</u>		<u>Proposed Code</u>	
RS-4	None	RMP-5	350 sq. ft.
RM-2	1,000 sq. ft.	RMP-6	350 sq. ft.

Explanation: Proposed setbacks and building coverage requirements ensure that an adequate amount of open space is provided. Common recreational facilities (private parks, pools, public and private trails, etc.) provide for recreational and leisure areas.

9. MINIMUM FLOOR AREA

<u>Existing Code</u>		<u>Proposed Code</u>	
RM-2	Studio: 550 sq. ft. One-bedroom: 750 sq. ft. Two-bedroom: 950 sq. ft. Three-bedroom: 1,150 sq. ft. Four-bedroom: 1,350 sq. ft.	RMP-6	950 sq. ft.

Explanation: The existing code provides for multi-family units while the proposed code is limited to single-family attached units.

10. PUBLIC AND SPECIAL PURPOSE ZONES

<u>Existing Code</u>	<u>Proposed Code</u>
PR – allows for a wide range of uses for city-owned land.	PRMP - The Public Recreational Mountain Park zone is based on the PR zone but allows for limited land uses specific to Development Area 6.

Explanation: Public Recreational Mountain Park Zone includes provisions for the types of land uses that are envisioned for Development Area 6. Land uses include a fire station, trail staging area, store concession, interpretive center, etc. Development standards associated with this zone are appropriate for the public, semi-public, and commercial land uses permitted in this development area.

11. SIGNS

Code: The Anaheim Zoning Code does not provide for comprehensive sign programs or for temporary planned community signs.

Proposed: The Mountain Park Specific Plan contains detailed regulations for temporary planned community signs and allows for sign programs.